

# FULL REPORT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2010 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Legend			
(E)	Efficiency	(Oe)	Outcome
		(Ot)	Output

## STRATEGIC GOAL:

## EFFECTIVELY MANAGED U.S. GOVERNMENT FINANCES

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: AVAILABLE CASH RESOURCES TO OPERATE THE GOVERNMENT

OUTCOME: REVENUE COLLECTED WHEN DUE THROUGH A FAIR AND UNIFORM APPLICATION OF THE LAW  
AT THE LOWEST COST POSSIBLE

### Financial Management Service

#### MEASURE: Amount of Delinquent Debt Collected Per \$1 Spent (E)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	36.5	40	43	43	43
ACTUAL	53.55	54.76	53.76	54.54*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure shows the efficiency of the Debt Collection program. The costs include all debt collection activities and all funding sources.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Collection of data and reporting on the cost of the debt collection program are performed on an annual basis.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Data from FMS' collection program systems is validated against data contained in FMS' Debt Management Accounting System by program staff and verified by senior management. Program costs are derived from FMS' accounting system and budget reports. The methodology and the origin of the data are consistent from year to year.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2011, FMS anticipates collecting \$43.00 per \$1 spent through implementing new debt collection tools, conducting partial matching services for agencies and states to update their debtor files to improve the accuracy of debt matching in TOP, as well as a pilot program with the Department of Education to remove the SAL (salary payments) bypass indicator from 170 of their direct loan debts, and expanding marketing efforts of the State Reciprocal Program to allow states to submit other state debt to TOP for offset against Federal Vendor Payments and offset of State Tax and Vendor payments to satisfy Federal Non-Tax Debt. In addition, this measure is estimated until costs are finalized.

\*Estimated

MEASURE: Amount of Delinquent Debt Collected Through All Available Tools (\$ billions) (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	3.2	3.4	3.9	4.65	4.84
ACTUAL	3.76	4.41	5.03	5.45	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure provides information on the total amount collected, in billions, through debt collection tools operated by Debt Management Services.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The process of collecting and reporting the debt collection data is performed on a monthly basis. The methodology and the origin of the data are consistent from month to month. The collection data is generated by the program systems (TOP and DMSC) and is reported on a monthly basis. The tools include: tax refund offset, administrative offset, private collection agencies, demand letters, and credit bureau reporting. FMS also collects debt through the State debt program and tax levy.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The data from the program systems is validated against the data contained in the Debt Management Account System (DMAS).</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2011, FMS anticipates collecting \$4.84 billion in delinquent debt through implementing new debt collection tools, conducting partial matching services for agencies and states to update their debtor files to improve the accuracy of debt matching in TOP, as well as a pilot program with the Department of Education to remove the SAL (salary payments) bypass indicator from 170 of their direct loan debts, and expanding marketing efforts of the State Reciprocal Program to allow states to submit other state debt to TOP for offset against Federal Vendor Payments and offset of State Tax and Vendor payments to satisfy Federal Non-Tax Debt.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage Collected Electronically of Total Dollar Amount of Federal Government Receipts (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	80	79	80	80	82
ACTUAL	79	80	84	85	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Electronic collections data are retrieved from the CASH-LINK system, which encompasses eight collection systems.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> This measure considers the percentage of government collections that are collected by electronic mechanisms (Electronic Federal Tax Payment System, Plastic Card, FEDWIRE Deposit System, Automated Clearinghouse (ACH)) compared to total government collections. The system receives deposit and accounting information from local depositories and provides detailed accounting information to STAR, FMS' central accounting and reporting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The agencies that report collections are responsible for ensuring the deposit reports are correct. Financial institutions and Federal agencies report deposits into the CASH-LINK deposit reporting system using an Account Key which identifies the collection mechanism (lockbox, which is non-electronic or ACH, electronic) through which the collection was made. FMS analysts gather deposit information from CASH-LINK reports and then report totals and percentages on a monthly Collections Summary Report and on the Total Government Collections Report. The Total Government Collections Report totals all deposits divided into electronic/non-electronic mechanisms and tax and non-tax totals within the mechanisms.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> FMS has exceeded the target performance measure for fiscal year 2010. Over the past few years, FMS has worked with agencies to convert their collections reporting from non-electronic to electronic mechanisms. This is in conjunction with our attempts to consolidate duplicative systems and in our implementation of Collections and Cash Modernization Management. FMS expects future increases. In fiscal year 2011, FMS anticipates collecting at least 82 percent of Total Dollar Amount of Federal Government Receipts electronically.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Delinquent Debt Referred to FMS for Collection Compared To Amount Eligible For Referral (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	94	95	97	97	97
ACTUAL	100	99	100	100	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The measure tracks the percentage of the dollar volume of debt referred to the total dollar volume that is eligible for referral.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The process of collecting and reporting the debt collection data is performed on a monthly basis. The methodology and the origin of the data are consistent from month to month. The referral data is contained in the program systems (TOP and DMSC). The referral data is loaded from the files received from Federal Program Agencies (FPAs).</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The agencies are responsible for certifying the debt referrals to Treasury.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> FMS has exceeded the target performance measure for fiscal year 2010. In fiscal year 2011, FMS is targeted to receive 97 percent of the delinquent debt eligible to be referred to FMS for collection. Over the past few years, FMS has exceeded the performance target due to high-performing agency outreach, education efforts, and improvements made to debt collection systems.</p>					

MEASURE: Unit Cost to Process a Federal Revenue Collection Transaction (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1.33	1.3	1.27	1.25	1.7
ACTUAL	1.19	1.195	1.57	1.67	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The unit cost to process a revenue collection transaction.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The cost data is captured through an activity based costing process. The unit cost is the calculated ratio of total direct and indirect costs over total government-wide collection transactions.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> At the end of each year actual costs for collections are accumulated and calculated for electronic and non-electronic collections. In addition, the number of transactions is calculated for each collection system. This information is calculated in conjunction with and verified by the program office, and is reviewed by senior level executives.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, the average cost of processing a collection item was \$1.67. This average is higher than our original projection of \$1.25 per item for fiscal year 2010, but slightly less than our revised fiscal year 2010 projection of \$1.70. The average cost to process a collection item has increased in recent years due to a downturn in the economy, and due to additional development expenses related to the Collections and Cash Management Modernization (CCMM) Initiative. While additional systems and services are being developed for the CCMM initiative, FMS continues to incur maintenance and operating costs from its legacy systems.</p>					

## Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau

**MEASURE: Amount of Revenue Collected Per Program Dollar (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>		Baseline	300	400	410
<b>ACTUAL</b>		313	427	478	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Represents the amount of federal excise taxes collected divided by the amount of resources expended to collect the taxes.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Taxes collected are captured by the Federal Excise Tax database; expense data are maintained in Oracle Financials.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Both of these components represent information that is subject to annual audits and routine reconciliation.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** TTB achieved 120 percent of its targeted return on investment for its revenue collection program in fiscal year 2010. In its second year of collections under the tobacco tax rate increase, TTB used targeted enforcement of high-risk taxpayers to collect nearly \$16 billion in tobacco revenue. In effectively administering its tax jurisdiction, TTB collected \$2 billion more in tobacco excise taxes than projected by the Joint Committee on Taxation prior to the passage of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (CHIPRA). In fiscal year 2011, to meet its performance target, TTB will continue to include in its audit plan a mix of comprehensive audits, limited scope audits, and examinations. This strategy maximizes TTB's limited audit resources and enables much broader industry coverage. TTB also plans to address revenue risk areas in fiscal year 2011 through audit programs developed for specific industry member types and enhanced risk modeling. To assure compliance in the importer community that TTB regulates, TTB is participating in joint federal agency initiatives designed to trace alcohol and tobacco product through the Customs warehouse system to ensure alcohol and tobacco products moving into domestic commerce are properly taxpaid and meet packaging and marking requirements. TTB also is involved in multiple ongoing criminal investigations of illegal activity in the industries TTB regulates. Using an integrated enforcement approach, auditors will follow up on referrals provided by the TTB Intelligence Division to address suspected illegal activity. TTB auditors and investigators also will support TTB agents, contracted from the Internal Revenue Service Criminal Investigation unit, in effectuating TTB's criminal enforcement operations by providing leads and forensic auditing support for criminal cases.

**MEASURE: Percent of Voluntary Compliance from Large Taxpayers in Filing Tax Payments Timely and Accurately (In Terms of Revenue) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>		Baseline	92	92	94
<b>ACTUAL</b>		94	94	94	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percentage of total revenue dollars from taxpayers who file over \$50,000 in tax payments annually collected on or before the scheduled due date (without notification of any delinquency from the National Revenue Center).

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The NRC maintains all tax return and payment information in the FET system.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The National Revenue Center (NRC) generates reports to identify late-filed returns and payments in the Federal Excise Tax (FET) system.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** TTB exceeded its performance goal in fiscal year 2010 through its continued efforts to promote industry member use of the online tax return and payment filing system, Pay.gov. Enhancements to its tax verification program also supported TTB's performance improvement efforts. In fiscal year 2010, TTB developed an Error Tracking Database (ETD) to identify late filers, non-filers, and errant filings of operational reports. The ETD identifies more than 40 different types of errors on industry operational reports, and generates compliance letters to notify industry of the compliance issues. In fiscal year 2011, TTB will continue to promote the use of Pay.gov and expand the development of the ETD to all commodity types for operational reports. TTB also intends to create a module in the ETD to address missing and late excise tax returns.

## Internal Revenue Service

### MEASURE: Automated Collection System (ACS) Accuracy (%) (0e)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	91	92	92	92.5	94
ACTUAL	92.9	95.3	94.3	95.9	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Percent of taxpayers who receive the correct answer to their ACS question.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Centralized Quality Review System (CQRS) monitors the calls as they are reviewed. Data is input to the Quality Review Database for product review and reporting.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1) CQRS management samples QRDv2 records and validates that sample plans have been followed. 2) CQRS management reviews QRDv2 employee input DCIs for consistency and coding. 3) CQRS tracks and reviews rebuttals quarterly, and an annual sample of each product line's rebuttals are performed. 4) A rebuttal web site is used to share technical and coding issues in CQRS.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Future plans include conducting analyses targeting specific attributes that impact the taxpayer.

### MEASURE: Automated Underreporter (AUR) Efficiency (E)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1932	1961	1855	1868	1945
ACTUAL	1956	1982	1905	1924	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The sum of all individual returns closed by AUR in SB/SE and W&I divided by the Total staff years expended in relation to those individual returns.

**EFFECTIVE:** 10/2006

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Each case initiated in AUR results in a closure either in the pre-notice or notice phases. All closing actions are posted on the system through the use of process codes that describe the reason and type of closure. Pre-notice closures (no taxpayer contact) include screenouts (discrepancy accounted for on the return), transfers and referrals. Pre-notice closures are included in the Efficiency Measure numerator. Notice phase closures can be posted at the CP2501, CP2000 or Statutory phases. Tax examiners evaluate taxpayer/practitioner responses to the notice and close cases using process codes that denote the respondent's full or partial agreement or disagreement, no change to the original tax liability, transfer or referral. Time: Examiners complete Form 3081 to record time charged to each program code. The Form 3081 is input onto the WP&C system and a Resource Allocation Report generated.

**SOURCE:** Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE).

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Closures - 1) AUR run controls are reviewed to see if the weekend processing has been completed and are accurate. 2) MISTLE Reports are reviewed with other AUR reports to see if processing has been completed and are accurate. 3) MISTLE reports are reviewed to see if information is complete and accurate.  
Time - 1) Managers review Form 3081 prior to input to verify that time is appropriately charged. 2) WP and C monitored to ensure appropriate time usage.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Future plans include better case selection and continued system enhancements to allow the closure of more cases per FTE.

MEASURE: Automated Underreporter Coverage (%) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	3.4
ACTUAL	2.5	2.55	2.6	3	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The sum of all individual returns closed, by SB/SE and W&amp;I AUR divided by the total individual return filings for the prior calendar year. Effective: 10/2006</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> NUMERATOR: The sum of all individual returns closed will be extracted as follows: SB/SE AUR: AUR MISTLE Report; W&amp;I AUR: AUR MISTLE Report</p> <p><b>DENOMINATOR:</b> The source for the total individual return filings for the prior calendar year is the Office of Research Projections of return filings as shown in IRS Document 6187 (Table 1A). AUR MISTLE AUR Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE)</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) AUR run controls are reviewed to see if the weekend processing has been completed and are accurate. 2) MISTLE reports are reviewed with other AUR reports to see if processing has been completed and are accurate. 3) MISTLE reports are reviewed to see if information is complete and accurate.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Future plans include better case selection and continued system enhancements to allow the closure of more cases per FTE.</p>					

MEASURE: Collection Coverage - Units (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	54	53	54.4	50.5	51.5
ACTUAL	54	55.2	54.2	50.1	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The volume of collection work closed as compared to the volume of collection work available.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data comes from the Collection Activity Report (CAR).</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) Changes to programming of Collection Activity Reports are generally made once a year. Those changes are tested and verified by program analysts at headquarters before the first new report is released. Monthly spot checks are also done to verify they match the data sent to the DataMart. 2) Accuracy of Automated Offer in Compromise database is validated by management checks in the operating units.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The target was not met primarily due to the ten percent (2M) decrease in planned Balance Due First Notices Issued resulting in a corresponding ten percent (1.2M) decrease in Balance Due Notice Dispositions. The IRS will continue to ensure dispositions are keeping up with the notices being issued in the future, however, a similar decrease in Balance Due First Notices Issued (1.6M) is projected for fiscal year 2011. Although this will have a positive impact on potentially collectible inventory, the notice decrease will negatively impact the collection coverage and efficiency.</p>					

MEASURE: Collection Efficiency - Units (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1723	1835	1872	1898	1884
ACTUAL	1828	1926	1845	1822	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The total work disposed (sum of all modules) by the Automated Collection System and the Collection field function divided by the total FTE realized for those areas (Total work disposed = delinquent accounts, investigations, offer-in-compromise, automated substitution for return).</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data comes from the Collection Activity Report (CAR) and the Integrated Financial System (IFS).</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) Changes to programming of Collection Activity Reports are generally made once a year. Those changes are tested and verified by program analysts at headquarters before the first new report is released. Monthly spot checks are also done to verify they match the data sent to the DataMart. 2) Accuracy of Automated Offer in Compromise database is validated by management checks in the operating units.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The year-end target was not met due primarily to Balance Due First Notices Issued being down ten percent due to lower balance due return volumes, causing Balance Due Dispositions to be down ten percent.</p>					

MEASURE: Conviction Efficiency Rate (Cost Per Conviction) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	314008	317625	317100	331000	340000
ACTUAL	301788	315751	327328	324776	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The cost of Criminal Investigatoin (CI) program divided by the number of convictions. The number of convictions is the total number of cases with the following CIMIS statuses: guilty plea, nolo contendere, judge guilty or jury guilty. The Criminal Investigation financial plan includes all appropriations and reimbursements for the entire year. It is the fully loaded cost, including employees' salaries, benefits, and vacation time, as well as facility costs (office space, heating, cleaning, computers, security, etc.), and other overhead costs.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The final fiscal year-end expenses as documented in IFS plus corporate costs as determined by the Chief Financial Officer divided by the number of convictions reported for the year. The source: CI Management Information System (CIMIS) and the Integrated Financial System (IFS)</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Criminal Investigation management dictates that the lead agent assigned to the investigation and/or the agent's manager(s) input investigation data directly into CIMIS. Agents and management are to enter status updates into CIMIS within five calendar days of the triggering event. Further, upper management directs first line managers to review individual work group CIMIS reports for accuracy each month to ensure any system input errors or omissions are corrected within 30 days of the initial issuance of the monthly data tables. The CFO, Associate CFO for Internal Financial Management, and Associate CFO Corporate Performance Budgeting ensure the functionality and accuracy of the Integrated Financial System-the Service's core accounting system of records. (Rev. 1-07)</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The IRS will continue to monitor Criminal Investigation's performance and adjust program focus as necessary to ensure efforts garner the greatest deterrent effect possible.</p>					

MEASURE: Conviction Rate (%) (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	92	92	92	92	92
ACTUAL	90.2	92.3	87.2	90.2	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	N	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The percent of adjudicated criminal cases that result in convictions. The conviction rate is defined as the total number of cases with CIMIS status codes of guilty plea, nolo contendere, judge guilty, or jury guilty divided by these status codes and nolle prosequi, judge dismissed and jury acquitted.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Cases are tracked in CIMIS with frequent updates to the status code.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Criminal Investigation management dictates that the lead agent assigned to the investigation and/or the agent's manager(s) input investigation data directly into CIMIS. Agents and management directs first line managers to review individual work group CIMIS reports for accuracy each month to ensure any system input errors or omissions are corrected within 30 days of the initial issuance of the monthly data tables. (Rev. 1-07) Standardized reports extract data related to the status codes cited above on a monthly basis. This calculation is performed monthly.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The reason for the shortfall is the increase in the number of dismissals. These dismissals are primarily money laundering investigations where more than three years passed since the date of indictment. Insert after Percentage of Importers Identified by TTB as Illegally Operating without a Federal Permit</p>					

**MEASURE: Criminal Investigations Completed (Ot)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	4000	4000	3900	3900	3900
<b>ACTUAL</b>	4269	4044	3848	4325	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	N	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The total number of subject criminal investigations completed during the fiscal year, including those that resulted in prosecution recommendations to the Department of Justice as well as those discontinued due to a lack of prosecution potential.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Criminal Investigations Management Information System (CIMIS)

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The guidance and direction given by upper management to first line managers is that the first line managers should review their individual work group CIMIS data tables at the beginning of each month. The use of this procedure will assure that system input errors are corrected no later than 30 days after the error is initially reported in the monthly CIMIS data tables. Additionally, national standard monthly reports and statistical information are circulated among the senior staff and headquarter analysts for their review and use. If the published information on the official critical measure appears to be out of line with what is normal or expected, headquarters analysts or senior staff request that the CI research staff verify that the published and circulated information and/or report is accurate. If the published and circulated information is not accurate, then the CI research staff corrects the error and issues revised data for the month.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS will continue to monitor Criminal Investigation's performance and adjust program focus as necessary to ensure efforts garner the greatest deterrent effect possible.

**MEASURE: Customer Accuracy - Customer Accounts (Phones) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	93.3	93.5	93.5	93.7	93.7
<b>ACTUAL</b>	93.4	93.7	94.9	95.7	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percentage of correct answers provided by a telephone assistor. The measure indicates how often customers receive the correct answer to their account inquiry and/or had their case resolved correctly based upon all available information and Internal Revenue Manual required actions.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Quality reviewers on the Centralized Quality staff complete a data collection instrument as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the Quality Review Database for product review and reporting.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Field 715 on the DCI is coded by the CQRS monitor as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the NQRS. The NQRS contains several levels of validation that occur as part of the review process. The input records are validated requiring entries and combinations of entries based upon the relationships inherent in different product lines or based upon an entry in a quality attribute. The national reviews conducted by CQRS site staff on telephone product lines are sampled by local management and management officials at the CQRS site. In addition, every review is available on-line to the site for verification purposes. Sites monitor their review records daily and have a small rebuttal period to contest any review.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Incremental improvement in performance is expected in the future from continued improvement efforts such as the development of new online tools for assistants to research taxpayer questions.



**MEASURE: Customer Accuracy - Tax Law Phones (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	91	91	91	91.2	91.2
ACTUAL	91.2	91.2	92.9	92.7	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percentage of correct tax law answers provided by a telephone assistant. The measure indicates how often customers receive the correct answer to their tax law inquiry based upon all available information and Internal Revenue Manual required actions.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Quality reviewers on the Centralized Quality staff complete a data collection instrument as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the Quality Review Database for product review and reporting.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Field 715 on the DCI is coded by the CORS monitor as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the NQRS. The NQRS contains several levels of validation that occur as part of the review process. The input records are validated requiring entries and combinations of entries based upon the relationships inherent in different product lines or based upon an entry in a quality attribute. The national reviews conducted by CORS site staff on telephone product lines are sampled by local management and management officials at the CORS site. In addition, every review is available on-line to the site for verification purposes. Sites monitor their review records daily and have a small rebuttal period to contest any review.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS will maintain Tax Law Accuracy above 90 percent. The type and complexity of tax law questions changes each year as new and often complex tax laws are enacted.

**MEASURE: Customer Contacts Resolved Per Staff Year (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	7702	8000	10386	9398	10181
ACTUAL	7648	12634	12918	10744	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of Customer Contacts resolved in relation to time expended based on staff usage. Customer Contacts Resolved are derived from all telephone and paper inquiries received by Accounts Management, in which all required actions have been taken, and the taxpayer has been notified as appropriate. The measure includes all self-service, Internet-based applications, such as the "Where's My Refund?" service available on www.irs.gov.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Contacts resolved volumes are derived from internal telephone management systems and modernization project websites. Staff year data is extracted from the weekly Work Planning & Control report and consolidated and included in the weekly resource usage report.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1. Data is compiled from several sources (see individual components below). Each area is responsible for component accuracy: Enterprise Telephone Data (ETD) Snapshot Report, Accounts Management Information Report (AMIR), Internet Refund/Fact of Filing, MIS Reporting Tool, Electronic Tax Administration (ETA) Website, Work Planning & Control (WP&C) Report, Resource Allocation Report (RAR)

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The Service will continue to handle customer contacts effectively with the resources available.

**MEASURE: Customer Service Representative (CSR) Level of Service (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	82	82	70	71	75
ACTUAL	82.1	52.8	70	74	
TARGET MET?	Y	N	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of toll-free callers that either speak to a Customer Service Representative or receive automated informational message divided by the total number of attempted calls.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Enterprise Telephone Database (ETD)

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1) Validation of monthly report data by W&I P&A staff. 2) The JOC validates CSR LOS data prior to publication of the weekly official Snapshot report. Independent weekly CSR LOS source data is also gathered and validated by comparing data with the data used to produce the official Snapshot report.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS will continue to properly staff toll-free sites in order to maintain the CSR Level of Service target.

**MEASURE: Examination Coverage - Business Corporations >\$10 million (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	8.2	6.6	5.8	5.1	5.0
ACTUAL	7.2	6.1	5.6	5.7	
TARGET MET?	N	N	N	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of Large and Mid-Size Business customer returns with assets greater than \$10 million examined and closed during the current fiscal year, divided by filing of the same type returns from the preceding calendar year.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The number of returns examined and closed during the fiscal year is from the Audit Information Management System (AIMS) closed case database, accessed via A-CIS (an MS Access application). Filings are from Document 6186, which is issued by the Office of Research, Analysis and Statistics.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1) Examination Support & Processing (ESP) group (SBSE) validates data on AIMS (Detroit server) and makes necessary correction. 2) LMSB picks closing codes and downloads data down to (A-CIS) Access database (Atlanta server). Charles Johnson (Plantation, FL) validates data, uploads to A-CIS. 3) (LMSB - Chicago) downloads LMSB version of data and performs data validation before providing data to CPP. 4) The information is Document 6186 is validated by the Office of Research, Analysis and Statistics before it is released.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS will continue to balance its audit coverage.

**MEASURE: Examination Coverage - Individual (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1	1	1	1.1	1.1
ACTUAL	1	1	1	1.1	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The sum of all individual returns closed by SB/SE, W&I, and LMSB (Field Examination and Correspondence Examination) divided by the total individual return filings for the prior calendar year. In fiscal year 2005, Automated Underreported (AUR) cases were included as part of this measure. In fiscal year 2006, AUR is covered as a separate measure.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The data comes from the Audit Information Management System (AIMS) closed case data base, the automated underreporter Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE) reports and Research projections for individual return filings.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** new measure - verification and validations will be supplied

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Future plans include leveraging NRP data to improve return selection criteria, streamline automation, emphasis on multi-year non-compliance and utilization of risk analysis/assessment in all business processes.

MEASURE: Examination Efficiency - Individual (1040 form) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	136	133	132	132	128
ACTUAL	137	138	138	140	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The sum of all individual returns closed by SB/SE, W&amp;I, and LMSB (Field Examination and Correspondence Examination) divided by the Total Full Time Equivalents (FTE) expended in examining those individual returns. In fiscal year 2005, Automated Underreporter (AUR) cases were included as part of this measure.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data comes from the Audit Information Management System (AIMS) closed case data base, the automated underreporter Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE) reports and Exams time reporting system and the Integrated Financial System.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Closures and AIMS Closures - 1) Case closing documents are reviewed for accuracy during sample reviews by managers and quality reviewers. 2) AIMS data is validated prior to distribution. 3) Queries used to retrieve data are reviewed for thoroughness and accuracy.            Frivolous Filers (Non-AIMS Closures): 1) Cases are reviewed by managers for accuracy, timeliness and completeness at any point in the process. 2) Headquarters Analyst reconciles WP&amp;C data to Summary Report in order to validate data.            SB/SE AUR: Closures - 1) Managerial review samples (phone calls, open and closed cases). 2) Checks and balances exist in the AUR Control System to validate the input. 3) Sample physical review of cases closed on the AUR Control System by Program Analysis System ("PAS") for accuracy and appropriateness of actions.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Future strategies to improve performance include improvements to the work stream through better case identification and classification, including leveraging NRP data to improve Exam's ability to select the best workload for examination. Emphasis will continue to be placed on multi-year non-compliance, reduced cycle time, streamlined automation and utilization of risk analysis/assessment in all business processes.</p>					

MEASURE: Examination Quality (LMSB) - Coordinated Industry (%) (0e)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	97	96	96	96	96
ACTUAL	96	97	95	95	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	N	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The average of the percentage of critical elements passed on Coordinated Industry cases reviewed.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Large &amp; Mid-Size Business (LMSB) Quality Measurement System (LQMS) database.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The Examination Teams make a reasonable effort to keep the CEMIS database accurate and timely with milestone completion information. The LQMS Industry Review Team Managers regularly review the work being performed by the Reviewers. Each Review Group has two senior Review Team Leaders (GS-14 employees) and they are actively involved in overseeing the reviews being conducted by their team members. The groups have regularly scheduled meetings at which consistent determinations on issues is reviewed by the entire group of Reviewers. The team of Managers and Analysts that prepare the quarterly reports are involved in reviewing the conclusions for mistakes and inconsistencies. The Coordinated Industry LQMS Program Managers also performs reviews of the work processes in the Coordinated Industry LQMS Groups. The review of Specialty issues (such as International, Engineering, Economist, etc.) is done by Specialists in those areas.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Factors contributing to the shortfall include - work papers not fully documenting the audit trail, techniques used and how conclusions are reached; and lack of examiner and manager signatures. The quality management staff continue to focus on the importance of meeting the quality measures through direct feedback to field teams, partnering with the Industries in quality improvement efforts, quality articles, quarterly reports/memos, and outreach to field teams.</p>					

MEASURE: Examination Quality (LMSB) - Industry (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	88	88	88	89	89
ACTUAL	87	88	88	87	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The average of the percentage of critical quality attributes passed on Industry cases (corporations, S-corps (pass through corporations) and partnerships with assets over \$10 million) reviewed.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Large &amp; Mid-Size Business (LMSB) Quality Measurement System (LQMS) database.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> There are controls and validity checks built into the ERCS database that ensure that it captures all closed cases. The LQMS Industry Review Team Managers regularly review the work being performed by the Reviewers. Each Review Group has two senior Review Team Leaders (GS-14 employees) and they are actively involved in overseeing the reviews being conducted by their team members. The groups have regularly scheduled meetings at which consistent determinations on issues is reviewed by the entire group of Reviewers. The team of Managers and Analysts that prepare the quarterly reports are involved in reviewing the conclusions for mistakes and inconsistencies. The Industry LQMS Program Managers also performs reviews of the work processes in the Industry LQMS Groups.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Factors contributing to the shortfall include- large, unusual and questionable items not identified by the agent and mandatory referrals to a specialist not made; taxpayer interviews not conducted as required or documentation of interviews inadequate in the case file; and report writing procedures not being followed regarding no-change reports. Feedback continues to be provided to field teams through the development and circulation of quality articles, reports, memos, and partnering with the Industries in improvement efforts.</p>					

MEASURE: Field Collection National Quality Review Score(Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	86	86	80	81	82
ACTUAL	84	79	80.5	80.6	
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The number of EQ quality attributes that are scored as "met" by an independent centralized review staff divided by the total attributes measured (mets + not mets) in a sample of closed cases. All measured attributes have the same weight when calculating the score.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Monthly reports supplied from the EQMS database.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Cases are sent to the review sites to be reviewed. The cases are then reviewed and results are recorded into the EQMS EQ database. A validity check is conducted by EQ review site management. Once the data has been validated the information is transmitted to the EQ website.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The year-end target was not met. The shortfall is attributed to transition issues associated with the new quality attributes. To minimize the impact of the changes, Collection developed a training module on quality and presented it at the Spring all-manager CPE, included monthly "Quality Tip" articles in the technical digest, and implemented a quarterly conference call to provide managers with a forum to ask questions about factors driving performance. Future plans include holding another Summit focusing on lower scoring attributes to look for additional improvement opportunities.</p>					

**MEASURE: Field Examination National Quality Review Score (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	87	87	87	86.3	86.3
<b>ACTUAL</b>	85.9	86	85.1	84.9	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	N	N	N	N	

**DEFINITION:** The score awarded to a reviewed Field Examination case by a Quality Reviewer using the Examination Quality Measurement System (EQMS) quality standards.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Monthly reports supplied from the EQMS database.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** A manual validation for inconsistencies in the data input is completed at the end of each monthly cycle. Potential errors are sent to the EQMS site managers for either verification or correction. Monthly consistency meetings are held with EQMS management, analyst and reviewers to ensure consistent application of the quality ratings.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Exam continues to focus on improving the lowest scoring quality attributes, including income probes and efficient resolution/time frames met. Actions to improve quality include: ongoing delivery of Income Toolkit training; establishing a Process Improvement Challenge team to focus on the quality of income determinations; and more emphasis placed on quality casework by Area Directors (especially income determinations, and timeframes) during their Operational Reviews and staff meetings.

**MEASURE: HCTC Cost Per Taxpayer Served (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	14.25	14.25	17	Discontinued	Discontinued
<b>ACTUAL</b>	14.93	16.94	13.79		
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** Costs associated with serving the taxpayers including program kit correspondence, registration and program participation.

$$\frac{[\text{IFS Monthly Disbursement} - (83 \text{ percent IT Cost} + 60 \text{ percent Program Management Costs} + \text{Special Projects and Costs} + (\text{IRS Non-Labor Costs} - \text{Printing}))]}{\text{Taxpayers Served}} \times 1.6$$

Where Taxpayers Served is the unique count of SSNs for primary candidates that are enrolled, and/or interact with the customer contact center including correspondence and program kits, 1.6 is a factor attributed to the average number of taxpayers served per primary enrollee, to reflect affected Qualified Family Members.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** IRS costs and exclusions: IFS disbursement report

**ACCENTURE COSTS AND EXCLUSIONS:** Monthly Work Request report. Taxpayers served: Health Care Tax Credit Siebel system provides data extracts to the HCTC reporting database, and further queries and reports are created from there.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1) Health Care Tax Credit Program office reviews IFS disbursement, 2) Health Care Tax Credit PMO team reviews and checks Contractor costs and exclusions 3) PMO reporting team verifies the source data against previous months of IFS data and Work Request data

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, HCTC rebaselined its targets. Fiscal year 2010 will represent the first full year of operation under the expanded HCTC Program.

MEASURE: HCTC Cost Per Taxpayer Served (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	10.00
ACTUAL				9.52	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Costs associated with serving the taxpayers including program kit correspondence, registration and program participation.            [(IFS Monthly Disbursement - (83 percent IT Cost + 60 percent Program Management Costs + Special Projects and Costs + (IRS Non-Labor Costs - Printing))) divided by Taxpayers Served *1.6.            Where Taxpayers Served is the unique count of SSN for primary candidates that are enrolled, and/or interact with the customer contact center including correspondence and program kits, 1.6 is a factor attributed to the average number of taxpayers served per primary enrollee, to reflect affected Qualified Family Members.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> IRS costs and exclusions: IFS disbursement report. Accenture costs and exclusions: Monthly Work Request report. Taxpayers served: Health Care Tax Credit Siebel system provides data extracts to the HCTC reporting database, and further queries and reports are created from there.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) Health Care Tax Credit Program office reviews IFS disbursement, 2) Health Care Tax Credit PMO team review and checks Contractor costs and exclusions, and 3) PMO reporting team verifies the source data against previous months of IFS data and Work Request data.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, HCTC rebaselined its targets. Fiscal year 2010 will represent the first full year of operation under the expanded HCTC Program.</p>					

MEASURE: HCTC Sign-up Time (days)(Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	97	97	97	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	93.3	94	91.3		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The calculation of this measure is the median number of calendar days that elapse per registration from the date the Program Kit is mailed to the date the first payment is received from the participant. This is calculated based on queries and reports from system data.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> 1) Dates captured in system during operations, 2) Data queried by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting team, 3) Measure calculated by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting team. Source: Siebel via Microsoft Systems Reporting.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) Data is reviewed by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting function and compared with previous months, 2) Diagnostic reports will be available for further review</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, HCTC rebaselined its targets. Fiscal year 2010 will represent the first full year of operation under the expanded HCTC Program.</p>					

MEASURE: HCTC Sign-up Time (days)(Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	125.0
ACTUAL				124	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The calculation of this measure is the median number of calendar days that elapse per registration from the date the Program Kit is mailed to the date the first payment is received from the participant. This is calculated based on queries and reports from the system data.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> 1) Dates captured in system during operations, 2) Data queried by Health Care Tax Program Evaluation and Reporting team, 3) Measure calculated by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting team. Source: Siebel via Microsoft Systems Reporting.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) Data is reviewed by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting function and compared with previous months, 2) Diagnostic reports will be available for further review</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, HCTC rebaselined its targets. Fiscal year 2010 will represent the first full year of operation under the expanded HCTC Program.</p>					

MEASURE: Number of Convictions (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	2069	2135	2135	2135	2135
ACTUAL	2155	2144	2105	2184	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Convictions are the total number of cases with Criminal Investigation Management Information System (CIMIS) status codes of guilty plea, nolo contendere, judge guilty, or jury guilty.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Standardized reports extract data related to the status codes cited above on a monthly basis.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Cases are tracked in CIMIS with frequent updates to the status code.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The IRS will continue to monitor Criminal Investigation's performance and adjust program focus as necessary to ensure efforts garner the greatest deterrent effect possible.</p>					

MEASURE: Office Examination National Quality Review Score (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	89	90	90	90.9	90.9
ACTUAL	89.4	90	92.1	91.6	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The score awarded to a reviewed Office Examination case by a Quality Reviewer using the Examination Quality Measurement System (EQMS) quality standards.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Examination Quality Measurement System</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> A manual validation for inconsistencies in the data input is completed at the end of each monthly cycle. Potential errors are sent to the EQMS site managers for either verification or correction. Monthly consistency meetings are held with EQMS management, analyst and reviewers to ensure consistent application of the quality ratings.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Future plans include establishing Executive commitments tied to quality improvements and continuing to work to identify and resolve both area specific and national quality weaknesses.</p>					

MEASURE: Percent of BSM Projects Within +/- Cost Variance (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	90	90	90
ACTUAL		92	60	40	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The percent of projects that were within +/- 10 percent cost variance by release/sub-release of a Business Systems Modernization (BSM) funded project's initial, approved cost estimate versus current, approved cost estimate. Cost variances less than or equal to +/- 10 percent are categorized as being within acceptable tolerance thresholds. Cost variances greater than +/- 10 percent of the variance are categorized as being outside of acceptable thresholds.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is collected from the approved and enacted Expenditure Plan and subsequent modifications resulting from changes to project cost plans as approved via the BSM Governance Procedures and documented by the Resource Management Office.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The baseline data will be reviewed/ validated by the Program Performance Management (PPM) Team and Manager. To indicate the baseline is valid and approved, the manager will send a notification that the data (Excel spreadsheets) may be placed in the PPM shared library. Before the measure is reported, the PPM Team and Manager will review/ validate the report. The PPM Manager will provide the monthly report to the Deputy Associate CIO for Business Integration for approval. Concurrence will be obtained from the Associate CIO for BSM. To indicate the report is validated and approved, the manager will send a notification to store the report in the PPM shared library and report on Improvement Measure externally.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Two out of five releases met the cost variance threshold. The cost of AMS Release 2.1 Milestone 5 deployment was less than planned due to the required realignment of AMS project funds to support R1.3 software and infrastructure design activities, and the cost of CADE Release 5.2 Milestone 4b was less than planned because legislative and Filing Season changes were reduced in scope and complexity. The MeF Release 6.1 Milestone 4a-5 required additional funding to support unplanned, required needs including Disaster Recovery activities, an automated interface to support external users, the development of a transactional national account profile and expanded software/hardware needs.</p>					

**MEASURE: Percent of BSM Projects Within +/- Schedule Variance (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	90	90	90
ACTUAL		92	90	100	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** The percent of projects that were within +/- 10 percent schedule variance by release/sub-release of a BSM funded project's initial, approved schedule estimate versus current, approved schedule estimate. Schedule variances less than or equal to +/- 10 percent will be categorized as being within acceptable tolerance thresholds. If schedule variances are greater than +/- 10 percent, the variance will be categorized as being outside of acceptable thresholds.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The data is collected at the time of Expenditure Plan creation and subsequent modifications resulting from changes to project schedule plans as approved via the BSM Governance Procedures and documented by the Resource Management Office.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The baseline data will be reviewed/ validated by the Program Performance Management (PPM) Team and Manager. To indicate the baseline is valid and approved, the manager will send a notification that the data (Excel spreadsheets) may be placed in the PPM shared library. Before the measure is reported, the PPM Team and Manager will review/ validate the report. The PPM Manager will provide the monthly report to the Deputy Associate CIO for Business Integration for approval. Concurrence will be obtained from the Associate CIO for BSM. To indicate the report is validated and approved, the manager will send a notification to store the report in the PPM shared library and report on Improvement Measure externally.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Variance exceeding the +/- 10 percent threshold is subject to IRS change notification process review, Executive Steering Committee approval and, if applicable, Modernization and Information Technology Services Enterprise Governance Committee approval. Schedule variances exceeding +/- 10 percent or \$1 million require Congressional notification. At each review juncture, management ensures that proposed project changes as reported in the BSM expenditure plan are valid and that mitigation plans are in place when applicable.

**MEASURE: Percent of Business Returns Processed Electronically (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	19.5	20.8	21.6	24.3	25.4
ACTUAL	19.1	19.4	22.8	25.5	
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of electronically filed business returns divided by the total business returns filed.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Work Planning and Control reports from W&I Submission Processing campuses.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1) At each Submission Processing Center, managerial oversight is used to ensure that the balancing instructions for the Balance Forward Listing are followed and that necessary adjustments are made. 2) Management Officials review Program Analysis Reports prior to its release to Headquarters personnel. 3) Headquarters Personnel release preliminary data for peer and managerial review prior to releasing data for the measure.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS expects the percentage of business returns filed electronically to slowly increase as previous mandates take effect.

**MEASURE: Percent of Individual Returns Processed Electronically (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	57	61.8	64	70.2	74.7
ACTUAL	57.1	57.6	65.9	69.3	
TARGET MET?	Y	N	Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** Number of electronically filed individual tax returns divided by the total individual returns filed.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Working Planning and Control reports from W&I Submission Processing campuses.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** 1) At each Submission Processing Center, managerial oversight is used to ensure that the balancing instructions for the Balance Forward Listing are followed and that necessary adjustments are made. 2) Management Officials review "II" Report prior to its release to Headquarters personnel. 3) Headquarters Personnel release preliminary data for peer and managerial review prior to releasing data for the measure.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Actual paper receipts for the year were over 5 percent higher than plan resulting in target not being met. Improved from previous year.



MEASURE: Refund Timeliness - Individual (paper) (%) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	99.2	98.4	98.4	98.4	98.4
ACTUAL	99.1	99.1	99.2	96.1	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Percentage of refunds from paper returns processed within 40 days.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Submission Processing Measures Analysis and Reporting Tool (SMART). Data is extracted from a Generalize Mainframe Framework computer run that processes data input by the processing centers.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The calculation for Refund Timeliness is a ratio of untimely IMF paper refunds in a sample compared against the total number of IMF paper refunds reviewed in a sample. The result of the ratio is weighted against the entire volume of refund returns a center has processed on a monthly basis. The monthly results are tabulated to determine the performance rating at the corporate and site level.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Refund timeliness fell short of the target due to delays caused by the computation of the Making Work Pay Credit and the First-Time Homebuyer Credit. During the 2010 filing season, nearly 8 million returns claiming the Making Work Pay credit were identified during processing as having error conditions present. All error conditions/inconsistencies must be resolved before the return can proceed through the pipeline to posting. The greater than anticipated workload resulted in some delays in resolving these cases during the March to May timeframe. In addition, most of these errors resulted in the Making Work Pay credit being changed from the taxpayer's original amount, which means a notice must accompany the refund explaining to the taxpayer the reason for the change in the anticipated refund. These notices can delay the issuance of the refund up to two weeks.</p>					

MEASURE: TEGE Determination Case Closures (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	118200	100600	94000	140465	99491
ACTUAL	109408	100050	96246	105247	
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Cases established and closed on the Employee Plans-Exempt Organizations Determination System (EDS) includes all types of tax exempt and employee plan application cases.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Tax Exempt and Government Entities (TE/GE) Determination System (EDS) Table 2A</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> 1) Group managers review data entered on closing documents by determination specialists prior to approving the case for closing. 2) Error registers/reports are generated for data not meeting system consistency checks</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The shortfall is attributable to two factors: a planned system conversion took longer than anticipated, requiring EO determinations staff to switch to manual processing on multiple occasions; and receipt of fewer defined contribution Form 5307 (Adopter of Master or Prototype Plans or Volume Submitter Plans) applications than expected, the work plan called for 100,000 Form 5307 applications; however, only 41,600 applications were received, of which only 16,600 met the criteria for minimal review. To address these issues TE/GE is currently analyzing determination processing improvements for future implementation. Additionally, TE/GE will conduct research on Form 5307 filers to determine the factors that contributed to lower than anticipated receipts in fiscal year 2010.</p>					

**MEASURE: Taxpayer Self Assistance Rate (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	48.6	51.5	64.7	61.3	62.7
ACTUAL	49.5	66.8	69.3	64.4	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percent of contacts that are resolved by automated self-assistance applications.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Enterprise Telephone Data (ETD) Snapshot Report, Accounts Management Information Report (AMIR), Internet Refund/Fact of Filing Project Site, MIS Reporting Tool, Electronic Tax Administration (ETA) Website, Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet tracking (Kiosk Visits)

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Automated Calls Answered + Web Services Completed Divided by: Assistor Calls Answered + Automated Calls Answered + Web Services Completed + Electronic Interactions + Customer Accounts Resolved (Paper) Taxpayer Assistance Centers Contact. This measure summarizes the following self-service activities: telephone automated calls answered, and web services (IRFOF, Internet EIN, Disclosure Authorization, P-TIN) compared to the volume of all interactions, including correspondence and amended returns electronic interactions such as from ETLA, & I-EAR and assistor calls answered.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS expects performance to increase as more taxpayers choose to use automated applications to resolve issues and questions instead of more traditional methods such as contact with the IRS by telephone and correspondence.

**MEASURE: Timeliness of Critical Individual Filing Season Tax Products to the Public (%) (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	85.2	86	92	94	94
ACTUAL	83.5	92.4	96.8	95.3	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure will assess the percentage of Critical Individual Filing Season (CIFS) tax products available to the public by the fifth workday in January. CIFS tax products are those tax forms, schedules, instructions, publications, tax packages, and certain notices required by a large number of filers to prepare a complete and accurate individual income tax return by April 15th.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Publishing Services Data (PSD) System

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Nightly processes provide analysts and management with reports concerning production status, missing data problems, and past due situations.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS expects to continue to timely deliver tax products to the public.

**MEASURE: Timeliness of Critical TE/GE and Business Tax Products to the Public (%) (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	79.6	86	89	90	91
ACTUAL	84	89.5	95.2	97.7	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percentage of Critical Other Tax Products, paper and electronic, made available to the public timely. Critical Other Tax Products are business tax products, Tax Exempt and Government Entities and miscellaneous tax products. This measure contains two components: (1) percentage of paper tax products that meet the scheduled start to ship date within five business days of the actual start to ship date and (2) percentage of scheduled electronic tax products that is available on the Internet within five business days of the ok-to-print date. The intent is to have the tax products available to the public 30 days before the form is required to be filed.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Publishing Services Data System (PSD)

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Nightly processes provide analysts and management with reports concerning production status, missing data problems, and past due situations.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The IRS expects to continue to timely deliver tax products to the public.

## OUTCOME: TIMELY AND ACCURATE PAYMENTS AT THE LOWEST POSSIBLE COST

## Financial Management Service

## MEASURE: Percentage of Paper Check and Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) Payments Made Accurately And On-Time (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	100	100	100	100	100
ACTUAL	100	100	100	100	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Accurately refers to the percentage of check and EFT payments that FMS makes which are not duplicate or double payments. On time means that FMS releases checks to the U.S. Postal Service and EFT payments to the Federal Reserve Bank such that normal delivery by them results in timely receipt by payees.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Accuracy data is captured through FMS' Regional Financial Centers which submit statistics on duplicate payments and data for the performance measure. The payments are balanced with payment certifications submitted to FMS by Federal Program Agencies. On time data on check and EFT volumes are captured monthly in a report from FMS' Production Reporting System.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Accuracy is ensured through payment processes and accounting systems that are subject to numerous internal controls and audit reviews. RFC managers validate payment controls. Systems and accounting reports are used to independently validate payment accuracy and identify the number of duplicate payments. RFCs balance the input to the PRS with a payment control file. The volume of checks released to the USPS is verified against the volume of checks listed on Postal Form 3600. USPS timeliness is ensured through Form 3600, which contains the time and date of release of checks from RFCs to the USPS. For EFT timeliness verification, the volume of payments released is verified against the volume of payments listed on the transmission report which also states the time and date of transmission from an RFC to the Federal Reserve Bank.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** At the end of fiscal year 2010, FMS remained on target to reach its goal of 100 percent of payments made accurately and on-time. In fiscal year 2011, FMS will continue to stay on target through internal controls and audit reviews.

## MEASURE: Percentage of Treasury Payments and Associated Information Made Electronically (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	78	79	80	81	83
ACTUAL	78	79	81	82	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The portion of the total volume of payments that is made electronically by FMS. Electronic payments include transfers through the automated clearinghouse and wire transfer payments through the FEDWIRE system.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The volume of payments is tracked through FMS' Production Reporting System. The amount and number of payments are also maintained under accounting control.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Accounting controls provide verification that the number of payments, both checks and EFT, is accurately tracked and reported. The number of inquiries made against Federal check payments, whether disbursed by FMS or by other agencies, is separately tracked and reported. Additionally, payment files are balanced with payment authorizations that are electronically certified and submitted to FMS by Federal program agencies. The Federal Reserve Banks also validate the payment files.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** At the end of fiscal year 2010, 82 percent of Treasury payments were made electronically. FMS exceeded its target by one percent due to a steady decline in check payments. In fiscal year 2011, FMS expects the percentage of Treasury payments made electronically to increase due to the Go Direct/Direct Express campaign and the All Electronic Treasury initiative.

MEASURE: Unit Cost For Federal Government Payments (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	0.39	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
ACTUAL	0.39	0.394	0.37	0.36*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Unit cost combines both paper and electronic payment mechanisms and includes the aftermath processes (reconciliation and claims) for both types of payment mechanisms.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The cost data is captured through an activity based costing process. The unit cost is the calculated ratio of cost per payment.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> At the end of each fiscal year, actual costs for issuing payments are accumulated and calculated for checks and EFT payments. This information is calculated in conjunction with and verified by the program office and is reviewed by senior executives. Additional accounting controls provide verification that the number of payments is accurately tracked and reported.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> FMS exceeded the anticipated target performance measure for fiscal year 2010. For fiscal year 2011, FMS anticipates the target to remain at \$0.40. In addition, the unit measure is estimated until costs are finalized.</p>					
*Estimated					

## OUTCOME: GOVERNMENT FINANCING AT THE LOWEST POSSIBLE COST OVER TIME

### Bureau of the Public Debt

MEASURE: Cost Per Debt Financing Operation (\$) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	228409	263306	256336	193962	201258
ACTUAL	235172	220732	170214	154790*	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This performance measure divides debt financing operations costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of auctions and buybacks.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The number of debt financing operations is captured on-line at TreasuryDirect.gov. Costs are captured in BPD's administrative accounting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Analysts determine the number of debt financing operations from TreasuryDirect.gov. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Based upon the third quarter year-to-date figures, Public Debt projects the cost per debt financing operation to fall below the fiscal year 2010 target as a result of an anticipated increase in the number of auctions held to meet government financing requirements. The projected cost for fiscal year 2011 of \$201,258 includes increases for inflation and planned upgrades to the TAAPS system. These upgrades will ensure that Public Debt keeps pace with technology changes and conducts financing operations timely and with 100 percent accuracy, with regularly scheduled auction volumes holding steady. Estimated fiscal year 2010 cost per item does not include fourth quarter data and is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.</p>					
*Estimated					

MEASURE: Cost Per Federal Funds Investment Transaction (\$) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	72.33	75.55	69.11	45.7	76.91
ACTUAL	68.53	64.98	41.71	74.05*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This performance measure divides the federal funds investment costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of issues, redemptions, and interest payments for more than 200 trust funds, as well as the Treasury managed funds.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The automated investment accounting system captures and reports transaction counts. Costs are captured in Public Debt's administrative accounting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Accountants review transaction reports for reasonableness and any unusual trends are investigated. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Public Debt forecasts that the cost per federal funds investment transaction will exceed the initial target of \$45.70. During fiscal year 2010 Public Debt re-examined projected transaction volumes, identifying reported volumes inconsistent with the costs reported. The estimated fiscal year 2010 full-year cost per item numbers reflect a more accurate association of volumes to costs. Due to inflationary cost increases and expected transaction volumes consistent with fiscal year 2010, Public Debt's fiscal year 2011 target is \$76.91. Estimated fiscal year 2010 cost per item is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.</p>					
*Estimated					

MEASURE: Cost Per TreasuryDirect Assisted Transaction (\$) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	6.16	9.25	9.34	8.57	7.95
ACTUAL	6.65	8.19	8.72	8.17*	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This performance measure divides TreasuryDirect customer service transaction costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of customer requests completed with assistance by a customer service representative.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> For customer service transactions received by mail and for some requests received by phone or internet, BPD obtains volumes from an automated tracking system. Simple phone and internet requests are manually counted. Costs are captured in BPD's administrative accounting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The accuracy of the system-generated volumes is verified twice a year by customer service staff performing manual counts. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Based upon the available year-to-date figures, Public Debt expects the cost per TreasuryDirect assisted transaction to fall below the fiscal year 2010 target of \$8.57. The fiscal year 2011 target is \$7.95. Public Debt will continue to align resources appropriately to handle the mixture of customer requests from both new and established TreasuryDirect account holders. Estimated fiscal year 2010 cost per item is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.</p>					
*Estimated					

MEASURE: Cost Per TreasuryDirect Online Transaction (\$) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	2.96	4.34	4.34	5.69	5.46
ACTUAL	3.24	4.34	5.21	5.6*	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	N	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This performance measure divides TreasuryDirect online transaction costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of TreasuryDirect online transactions.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Workload figures are captured from information stored in TreasuryDirect. Costs are captured in Public Debt's administrative accounting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Workload figures are electronically verified by the Treasury Direct system. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Based upon the available year-to-date figures, Public Debt expects the cost per TreasuryDirect online transaction to fall below the fiscal year 2010 target of \$5.69. The fiscal year 2011 target is \$5.46. Public Debt will continue to promote customer self-sufficiency in TreasuryDirect - a 24/7 online account system that provides one-stop shopping, account management and product information. Estimated fiscal year 2010 cost per item is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.</p>					
*Estimated					

MEASURE: Number of Government Agency Investment Services Control Processes Consolidated (0e)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	Baseline	2	0	5	0
ACTUAL	3	2	0	5	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Government Agency Investment Services (GAIS), one of the Bureau of Public Debt's primary Lines of Business, is responsible for the accounting of the Federal Investments, Special Purpose Securities, and Loans Receivable programs. In July 2005, Public Debt management announced a strategic direction to reduce the number of systems used to support GAIS. Through systems reduction, Public Debt will streamline the diversity of technology involved in supporting this business line. Additionally, this effort will allow Public Debt to consolidate and standardize the internal controls over processes common to all GAIS programs. The control environment consists of 18 processes that will be transformed into six standardized processes. The processes are funds management, investment accounting, standard reporting, customer interface, account maintenance, and enhanced reporting.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for tracking the status of the project using a project plan detailing all stages of the System Development Life Cycle. This plan includes milestones that help to measure significant accomplishments. This information is routinely shared with management of the program areas as part of an established and well-documented IT governance and change management process.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The Project Manager (PM) for the systems consolidation project is responsible for keeping management informed of the project plan and implementation dates of the system consolidation effort. The PM coordinates with program areas on all system related efforts to ensure the control environment is reduced with each system consolidation effort. With each milestone achieved in the systems consolidation project, there is a corresponding standardization and reduction of controls in the GAIS program. For example, in fiscal year 2007 the loans receivable program consolidated funds management, investment accounting, and standard reporting. This reduced the total processes from 18 to 15 with the ultimate goal of six standardized processes by fiscal year 2012.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> During fiscal year 2010, Public Debt consolidated five common processes within the Special Purpose Securities program, leaving only eight Government Agency Investment Services control processes remaining. Fiscal year 2011 will be a developmental period in which no processes will be reduced. By the end of fiscal year 2012, two additional processes will be consolidated, and the control environment, which originally consisted of 18 processes, will be consolidated to 6 processes. Through systems reduction, Public Debt is streamlining the diversity of technology involved in supporting this business line as well as consolidating and standardizing internal controls.</p>					

**MEASURE: Percent of Auction Results Released in Two Minutes +/- 30 Seconds (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	95	95	95	95	100
<b>ACTUAL</b>	99.1	100	100	100	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measures the elapsed time from the auction close to the public release of the auction results. The annual percentage of auctions meeting the release time target of 2 minutes plus or minus 30 seconds is calculated for the fiscal year.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** BPD's automated auction processing systems

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** For each auction, analysts verify and validate the system time stamps that record the auction close and auction posting times.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** A key component of Public Debt's mission is to borrow the money required to run the federal government at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer. An integral part of fulfilling this mission is to create an investment environment that is predictable and reliable. By consistently releasing Treasury auction results to the public in 2 minutes +/- 30 seconds, Public Debt is demonstrating its ability to reliably publish security information to financial markets. For fiscal year 2011, Public Debt has revised its target to 100 percent. Public Debt will continue to focus on identifying and correcting any auction system defects in order to ensure ongoing success with this performance metric.

**MEASURE: Percent of Overall Customer Satisfaction with Government Agency Investment Services.**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>				Baseline	56
<b>ACTUAL</b>				55	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>				Y	

**DEFINITION:** Government Agency Investment Services (GAIS) is one of the Bureau of the Public Debt's (BPD) five primary Lines of Business. GAIS is responsible for the accounting of the Federal Investments, the Special Purpose Securities, and the Federal Borrowings programs. To determine the level of customer satisfaction with the functionality of GAIS, BPD will conduct a customer satisfaction survey on GAIS. The first survey results will establish a baseline customer satisfaction percentage. Survey questions will focus on both program and system satisfaction. BPD will conduct future surveys to measure the percentage improvement from the baseline. The measurement supports an objective to provide quality customer service, transaction processing, and accurate and timely payments to investors.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** BPD will develop, coordinate, and administer the customer satisfaction surveys. BPD will distribute the surveys to both internal and external users. Survey questions will focus on both program and system satisfaction. Survey results will reveal areas of customer needs and wants concerning IT enhancements and program direction. This information will be routinely shared with management of the program areas as part of an established and well-documented IT governance and change management process.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Once the surveys are completed and returned, the results will be manually verified and validated. The project and system satisfaction ratings will then be examined and analyzed for trends with the results being communicated to management.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** During fiscal year 2010, Public Debt administered a satisfaction survey to customers of all Government Agency Investment Services (GAIS) programs. Survey results showed 55 percent of respondents rating their overall satisfaction with GAIS as "Excellent." This initial survey established the baseline for this measure. Using the survey responses, Public Debt plans to target areas for improvement, thereby progressively increasing the percentage of customers rating GAIS as "Excellent."

MEASURE: Percent of Primary Dealers that submit live bids from their disaster recovery site on two separate auction dates (%) (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	70
ACTUAL				78	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This performance measure tracks progress in meeting the Bureau of the Public Debt's long-term goal of having 90 percent of Primary Dealers submit live bids from their disaster recovery sites on two separate auction dates during fiscal year 2012. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> At the beginning of each fiscal year, Public Debt will begin counting anew the number of times a Primary Dealer submits live bids from its disaster recovery site to determine whether the goal is reached by the end of the fiscal year. Participation in an auction from a disaster recovery site is counted either electronically via tokens or by auction staff. <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Site participation by a primary dealer can be validated electronically and anecdotally by staff. Procedures require participants to call the Federal Reserve Bank of New York before and after each operation at the disaster recovery site. <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Public Debt will continue to encourage primary dealers to prepare for emergency situations by conducting dealer visits and discussing the dealers' plans to continue submitting live bids from their disaster recovery (DR) sites. Public Debt participates in the annual industry-wide contingency test where Treasury will fail over to its DR sites and enter bids in a mock auction. Public Debt continues to visit the dealers' DR sites to verify that those sites are ready to be activated in a contingency situation.					

MEASURE: Percentage of Retail Customer Service Transactions Completed within 11 Business Days (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	99.43	99.86			
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>DEFINITION:</b> The length of time to complete a customer service transaction is measured from the date each transaction is received to the date it is completed. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> For customer service transactions received by mail and for some requests received by phone or e-mail, Public Debt uses an automated tracking system that measures the length of time it takes to complete the transactions. Simple phone and internet requests are manually tracked. <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The accuracy of system-generated data is crosschecked at least twice a year by customer service staff performing manual counts. <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.					

MEASURE: Percentage of Retail Customer Service Transactions Completed within 5 Business Days (%) (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	86	87
ACTUAL			86	92.7	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> By fiscal year 2014, significantly improve the number of Retail customer service transactions completed within 5 business days. The length of time to complete a customer service transaction is measured from the date each transaction is received to the date it is completed. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> For customer service transactions received by mail and for some requests received by phone or e-mail, Public Debt uses an automated tracking system that measures the length of time it takes to complete the transactions. Simple phone and internet requests are manually tracked. <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The accuracy of system-generated data is cross-checked at least twice a year by customer service staff performing manual counts. <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Fiscal year 2010 marked Public Debt's first year for this new performance measure for retail securities services, to process 86 percent of time-sensitive retail customer service transactions within 5 business days. Public Debt exceeded its fiscal year 2010 target by processing 92.7 percent of those transactions within the time frame. For fiscal year 2011, the target will be to complete 87 percent of retail time-sensitive customer service transactions within five business days. This goal will be achieved by continually streamlining work processes and increasing the volume of electronic business actions.					



## OUTCOME: EFFECTIVE CASH MANAGEMENT

## Departmental Offices - S &amp; E

## MEASURE: Variance between estimated and actual receipts (annual forecast) (%) (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	5	5	5	5	5
ACTUAL	2.1	4.6	5.5	5.8	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N	

**DEFINITION:** Percentage error measures the accuracy of the Benchmark receipt forecasts produced monthly by the Office of Fiscal Projections (OFP). It measures the relative amount of error or bias in receipt forecasts.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** OFP within the Office of the Fiscal Assistant Secretary creates estimates of Federal receipts by major categories (e.g., withheld income/FICA taxes, individual/SECA taxes, corporate taxes, customs deposits, estate and gift taxes and excise taxes) as well as by collection mechanisms (e.g., electronic and paper coupons) as a part of an extensive cash flow forecast used to inform Treasury's debt management decisions. OFP is also responsible for forecasting the daily tax receipts in order to manage the federal government's cash flow. Data on daily and monthly estimated and actual federal tax receipts are compiled by the office and used to report on the United States' daily, monthly, and annual cash position.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The percentage error is computed by subtracting the forecast value of tax receipts from the actual ( $A_t - F_t$ ), and dividing this error of forecast by the actual value, and then multiplying it by 100.  $PE_t = ((A_t - F_t)/A_t) * 100$   $A_t$  is actual value of receipts at time  $t$ , and  $F_t$  is forecasted value of receipts at time  $t$ . The average percentage error is more general measure that will be used to compare the relative error in the forecasts. This measure adds up all the percentage errors at each point and divides them by the number of time point  $APE = |(\sum_{t=1}^T PE_t)|/T$  where  $PE_t$  is the percentage error of forecasts in (1) and  $T$  is the total number of time point. The absolute value of the average percentage error will be used to measure the magnitude of error or bias in the receipts forecasts.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** To analyze the effectiveness of the forecasting methodologies employed, the Department measures the variance between actual and projected receipts. Given economic uncertainties and legislative changes, the forecasts for fiscal year 2010 were not as good as those for fiscal year 2009. The actual variance for fiscal year 2010 is 5.8 percent, higher than the 5.0 percent target for fiscal year 2010 and the 5.5 percent actual variance in fiscal year 2009. fiscal year 2010 proved very challenging to forecast due to the heavy influence of 2009 tax liability on fiscal year 2010 receipts and lingering uncertainty concerning the pace of the economic recovery.

The economic downturn and subsequent signs of recovery in fiscal year 2010, along with the government's policy response to these events, had great impact on Federal revenues and on the ability to forecast trend changes in Federal tax receipts. Key economic factors such as GDP and employment did not improve as much as assumed in the Administration's fiscal year 2011 Budget. Final individual tax payments in April came in well below forecast as liability for tax year 2009 was much lower than expected. Also, newly-enacted credits from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 further reduced these taxes. Corporate profitability and thus corporate tax receipts turned around, showing strong increases in fiscal year 2010. Federal Reserve Earnings, reflecting the increase in the return on the Federal Reserve System's investment portfolio, more than doubled from their level in fiscal year 2009.

In fiscal year 2011, OFP's targeted variance between estimated and actual receipts will continue to be 5 percent. OFP will continue to actively monitor and update existing models with any new programs and initiatives that are enacted by Congress. In addition, OFP will continue to meet quarterly with senior staff in the Office of Macroeconomic Analysis (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy) and the Office of Tax Analysis (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy), identifying the impact that key macroeconomic indicators may have on short- and long-term receipts forecasts.

Further, OFP is currently working on two enhancements to its forecasting system. OFP is developing a new short-term forecasting system, incorporating more econometric and regression modeling to facilitate and strengthen short-term (up to one year) daily cash and monthly budget forecasts produced. In addition, OFP has undertaken an effort to produce a long-term (two to five year) monthly cash forecast. This effort is expected to be used to inform and improve short-term forecasts.

## OUTCOME: ACCURATE, TIMELY, USEFUL, TRANSPARENT AND ACCESSIBLE FINANCIAL INFORMATION

## Bureau of the Public Debt

## MEASURE: Cost Per Summary Debt Accounting Transaction (\$) (E)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	10.98	9.91	10.01	11.81	12.54
ACTUAL	9.29	9.11	8.66	11.41*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This performance measure divides summary debt accounting transaction costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of summary debt accounting transactions.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Public Debt's investment accounting systems capture and report transaction counts. Costs are captured in Public Debt's administrative accounting system.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Accountants review transactional activity reports for reasonableness and any unusual trends are investigated. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Based upon third quarter year-to-date figures, Public Debt forecasts the cost per summary debt accounting transaction to be below the fiscal year 2010 target of \$11.81. Due to inflationary cost increases and constant volume projections, Public Debt establishes a target for fiscal year 2011 of \$12.54. Public Debt will continue to increase governance and maintain efficiency in order to ensure the integrity of operations and accuracy of the information provided to the public. Estimated fiscal year 2010 cost per item is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.

\*Estimated

## MEASURE: Percent of Summary Debt Accounting business processes restructured or eliminated (%) (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	6
ACTUAL				6	
TARGET MET?				Y	

**DEFINITION:** Measures the progress in migrating Summary Debt Accounting to a shared service solution.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for tracking the status of the project using a project plan detailing all stages of the System Development Life Cycle. This plan includes milestones that help to measure significant accomplishments. This information is routinely shared with management of the program areas as part of an established and well-documented IT governance and change management process.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Project Manager (PM) responsible for migrating Summary Debt Accounting (SDA) to a shared service solution will identify the total number of business processes for the SDA program. The PM will then develop a schedule and report to management on the percentage of SDA business processes that have been restructured or eliminated. The project will be considered complete when 44 percent of SDA business processes have been restructured or eliminated.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In an effort to modernize the debt accounting environment, Public Debt is engaging in a thorough reengineering of business processes to best support Summary Debt Accounting needs. The percent of Summary Debt Accounting business processes restructured or eliminated during fiscal year 2010 was six percent with an ultimate goal of 44 percent restructured or eliminated by fiscal year 2013. The Bureau expects the project to provide requirements for moving to a shared service solution, to ensure consistent processes across the board, to drive improvements in the subsidiary reporting systems, and to ultimately create greater efficiency within our debt accounting programs at the summary and subsidiary levels.

## Financial Management Service

MEASURE: Percentage of Government-Wide Accounting Reports Issued Accurately (%) (0e)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	100	100	100	100	100
ACTUAL	100	100	100	100	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> All Government-wide financial data that FMS publishes relating to U.S. Treasury cash-based accounting reports (i.e., the Daily Treasury Statement, the Monthly Treasury Statement, and the Annual Combined Report) will be 100 percent accurate.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> A monthly tracking system reports on the various published statements and monitors errata as it pertains to this data.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> There are no errata in any of the published government-wide financial information.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> GWA will continue to report on accuracy of its reporting. This will be measured by the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ensure 96 percent of agency monthly Statement of Transactions and Statements of Accountability are received by the 4th business day after month-end;</li> <li>2) Ensure 94 percent of agency original monthly Statement of Transactions and Statements of Accountability are received by the 3rd business day after month-end;</li> <li>3) Ensure 92 percent of the Statement of Differences for all reporting Agency Location Codes are no older than three months; and</li> <li>4) 85 percent of unreconciled intra-governmental 'material differences' are explained at year-end in the Closing Package report.</li> </ol>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Government-Wide Accounting Reports Issued Timely (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	100	100	100	100	100
ACTUAL	100	100	100	100	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> All Government-wide financial data that FMS publishes relating to U.S. Treasury cash-based accounting reports (i.e., the Daily Treasury Statement, the Monthly Treasury Statement, and the Annual Combined Report) will be on time 100 percent of the time.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> A monthly reporting system is used to track the release dates to the public of all of the various government-wide statements.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Procedures are in place to validate that the statements are released on time to the public 100 percent of the time.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> GWA will continue to report on the timeliness of its reporting. This will be measured by the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ensure 96 percent of agency monthly Statement of Transactions and Statements of Accountability are received by the 4th business day after month-end;</li> <li>2) Ensure 94 percent of agency original monthly Statement of Transactions and Statements of Accountability are received by the 3rd business day after month-end;</li> <li>3) Ensure 92 percent of the Statement of Differences for all reporting Agency Location Codes are no older than three months; and</li> <li>4) 85 percent of unreconciled intra-governmental 'material differences' are explained at year-end in the Closing Package report.</li> </ol>					

MEASURE: Unit Cost to Manage \$1 Million Dollars of Cash Flow (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	10.69	11.72	12.38	11.77	10.15
ACTUAL	10.36	8.958	7.08	7.36	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This Unit Cost Measure assesses Government Wide Accounting's (GWA's) Cost to Manage Government Operations. The Government Operations consists of total GWA costs which consist of all Directorates, Systems, Administrative Overhead, and major initiatives performed within GWA. On a monthly basis the Cost-per-Million of Cash Flow managed by GWA is calculated.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Total GWA Cost data is retrieved from the year ending Cost Accounting Report. The Operating Cash, which is rounded in millions, is determined from the final DTS of each month for the fiscal year. The ratio of total costs to GWA per month over Deposits and Withdrawals (Excluding Transfers) gives us the cost to manage \$1 Million dollars of cash flow. This ratio is calculated for GWA alone to determine controllable costs, and using Information Resources / TWAI and Management Overhead to determine the uncontrollable costs attributed to GWA.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> At the beginning of each month, the actual operating cash of the United States in the form of Deposits and Withdrawals is obtained from the Last Daily Treasury Statement (DTS) of the previous month. GWA total costs are broken down and retrieved from the Cost Accounting Report that is prepared at the end of the fiscal year. This information is verified and excludes Financial Services. Additional data is retrieved from this source and included in the report and is reviewed by senior executives.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> U.S. Cash flows fell well outside the 10 year trend causing the number to lower substantially. The unit measure is estimated until costs are finalized.</p>					

## Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Release Federal Government-Wide Financial Statements on Time (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1	1	1	1	1
ACTUAL	Met	Met	Met	Met*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This report is the audited consolidated financial report (FR) of the Federal Government required by the Government Management Reform Act.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Data are collected from the audited financial results of all federal agencies and is audited by GAO.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Report is released to the public with a release date that can be independently verified. The due date is established by OMB policy. The statutory deadline is March 31st.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The FR release is still an estimate as we won't know the actual until December 15th.</p>					
*Estimated					

**STRATEGIC GOAL:****U.S. AND WORLD ECONOMIES PERFORM AT FULL ECONOMIC POTENTIAL****STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:** IMPROVED ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, MOBILITY AND SECURITY WITH ROBUST, REAL, SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH AT HOME AND ABROAD**OUTCOME:** STRONG U.S. ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS**Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau****MEASURE: Average Number of Days to Process an Original Permit Application at the National Revenue Center (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>		Baseline	72	72	70
<b>ACTUAL</b>		64	64	65	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The average number of days to process an original permit application (including those rejected) at the National Revenue Center (NRC). An application is stamped when received and recorded when processed.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The NRC generates statistical reports, searches, and queries from the IRIS system.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The NRC maintains data in the Integrated Revenue Information System (IRIS) database that reflects the receipt date of the application and the permit issue or close date. The IRIS system contains built-in data integrity controls to validate the information.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** TTB exceeded its targeted performance level for this measure by ten percent through the effective use of management reporting tools to monitor work assignments and the implementation of a Balanced Scorecard initiative, which uses this integrated strategic planning and performance management system to tie employee performance to mission success. In addition, TTB completed its annual OMB Circular A-123 risk assessment identifying risks and mitigating factors that impact performance in the applications branch of the TTB National Revenue Center. In fiscal year 2011, TTB will begin its phased release of the new Permits Online (PONL) system, which will enable the electronic submission and internal processing of original permit applications. With industry support and adoption of PONL, and following the release of the next phase of the system in fiscal year 2012, TTB expects to significantly reduce processing times for both original and amended permit applications. Further efficiencies will be gained through a new triaging procedure for incomplete paper applications for an original permit, and by updating the telephonic interview process for applicants according to a revised risk model.

**MEASURE: National Revenue Center (NRC) Customer Satisfaction Survey Results (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>		Baseline	85	85	85
<b>ACTUAL</b>		90	89	89	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The NRC conducts a customer survey to determine satisfaction levels among industry members applying for a permit or filing a claim with TTB. The questions used in this survey are standardized for each commodity.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Data is captured from clients through a survey mechanism. Results are posted to a detailed Excel spreadsheet. There are periodic reports generated for management.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Supervisor reviews report of summary data developed by National Revenue Center (NRC) staff.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** TTB met its fiscal year 2010 performance target for customer satisfaction with the permits and claims services at the National Revenue Center (NRC), in part, through its implementation of a Balanced Scorecard initiative, which enabled closer monitoring of internal business processes and improved responsiveness to customer needs. TTB also provided refresher training and developmental opportunities to NRC employees to increase job knowledge and improve customer service. With the phased rollout of Permits Online (PONL) scheduled during fiscal years 2011 and 2012, TTB anticipates reduced processing times for original permit applications and permit amendments. As the user adoption rate for PONL increases, TTB expects that customer satisfaction scores will improve, as applicants experience faster response times and the ease of using the electronic filing system. Additionally, to streamline the permit application process, TTB created a task force to analyze and improve TTB bond forms and instructions, as well as internal business processes, for efficiency gains.

**MEASURE: Percent of Electronically Filed Certificate of Label Approval Applications (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	47	52	53	78	81
<b>ACTUAL</b>	51	62	74	79	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Calculated by dividing the number of e-filed applications by the total Certificate of Label Approval applications (COLA) submissions (paper and electronic). The quarterly results are cumulative.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Data is captured through the COLAs Online database system. There are periodic statistical reports, searches, and queries that are generated.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Supervisor reviews report generated from the COLAs Online database.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** At the close of fiscal year 2010, 79 percent of alcohol beverage producers and importers electronically filed applications for label approval with TTB. TTB exceeded its target by 1 percent, due in part to one-on-one instructional assistance with applicants and targeted promotion of the e-filing system, COLAs Online. Further, usage rates have increased in response to faster turnaround times for e-applications versus paper applications. In fiscal year 2011, TTB will continue to reach out to industry members regarding the benefits of e-filing and will continue to provide instruction on system use through demonstrations and the COLAs Online newsletter. The introduction of Formulas Online (FONL), the new e-filing system that enables the online submission of alcohol beverage formulas, will also support increased user rates for COLAs Online. The integration of FONL with the existing COLAs Online system will streamline the process of obtaining both formula and label approval for those in the alcohol beverage trade.

**MEASURE: Percentage of Importers Identified by TTB as Illegally Operating without a Federal Permit (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>		Baseline	20	19	15
<b>ACTUAL</b>		22	15	15	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure estimates the rate of occurrences in which an individual or business imports tobacco illegally (i.e., without a Federal permit) in the United States by dividing the number of illicit importers, as determined by a comparison of data in U.S. Customs International Trade Database System (ITDS) and TTB's Integrated Revenue Information System (IRIS), by the total number of importers operating, as captured in ITDS. TTB revised the methodology for this measure in September 2008, finding that the use of data from ITDS on active importers in a given reporting period better reflects the level of illicit activity in the marketplace.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Data is captured through the ITDS and compared with that of the NRC permit database. There are periodic statistical reports, searches, and queries that are generated.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Supervisor reviews report developed based on the comparison of data from ITDS and IRIS, the TTB permit database.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** TTB exceeded its fiscal year 2010 targeted rate for tobacco importer compliance by 21 percent. In its monitoring of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's International Trade Data System, TTB has been able to identify entities illegally importing cigarettes and other tobacco products and, through issuing cease and desist letters, has brought them into compliance with federal permit requirements or has ensured that operations were stopped. For fiscal year 2011, TTB will continue to monitor imports of tobacco products by non-permitted entities, placing special emphasis on enforcing the Prevent All Cigarette Trafficking Act, legislation enacted in April 2010 to prevent tobacco smuggling and ensure the proper payment of all tobacco taxes. The method most commonly used to import tobacco products without a permit and without payment of the appropriate taxes is Internet and mail-order purchases. The PACT Act prohibits shipments of tobacco products via the U.S. Postal Service (USPS). In fiscal year 2011, TTB will coordinate with the USPS and other common carriers to provide enforcement assistance. These efforts, in addition to current methods used to identify entities illegally importing tobacco products, will help reduce the number of entities circumventing federal permit and tax requirements. Furthermore, under the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (CHIPRA), all importers of processed tobacco are required to obtain an importers permit from TTB. In the year ahead, TTB will assess the number of legitimate importers of processed tobacco and ensure they apply for and obtain a permit, or cease importations. Currently, TTB is internally monitoring the compliance rate of this new class of permittees.

**MEASURE: Percentage of Instances where the Utilization of International Trade Database System Identified Importers Without Permits as a Percentage of Total Permits on File (0e) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		15	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL		15			
TARGET MET?		Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The percentage of occurrences in which any individual or business importer has no known authorization (e.g., permit) to operate in the alcohol or tobacco industries in the U.S. where instances in the ITDS fail to match those within the NRC's integrated Revenue System (IRIS). The results reported quarterly are cumulative findings for the year up through the reporting date.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Data is captured through the ITDS and compared with that of the NRC permit database. There are periodic statistical reports, searches, and queries that are generated.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Supervisor reviews report developed from ITDS compared to National Revenue Center (NRC) permit database.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.

**Community Development Financial Institutions Fund****MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Financial Assistance Application Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	6920	6920	6920	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	7180	7200	3283		
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The cost per application for Financial Assistance (FA) applications.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Fund will analyze the cost of materials as well as staff time and contractor's time to determine the total fixed and variable cost per application.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Fund will conduct an analysis of the total cost of processing a single FA application. The analysis will include both fixed and variable costs for the project.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure is being replaced by two new performance measures: CDFI-FA Administrative Cycle Time from Application to Award (E) (Number of Days) and by CDFI-FA Administrative Cycle Time from Award to Disbursement (E) (Number of Days).

**MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Number of Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) Applications Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1455	1455	1455	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	1950	3070	2366		
TARGET MET?	N	N	N	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The fixed and variable cost per application for Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) applications.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Fund will analyze the cost of materials as well as staff time and contractor's time to determine the total cost per application.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Fund will conduct an analysis of the total cost of processing a single BEA application. The analysis will include both fixed and variable costs for the project.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure is being replaced by two new performance measures: BEA Administrative Cycle Time from Application to Award (E) (Number of Days) and by BEA Administrative Cycle Time from Award to Disbursement (E) (Number of Days).

**MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Number of Native American CDFI Assistance Applications Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	9090	9090	9090	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	13510	10990	3162		
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The Fund will determine the total cost associated with Native American CDFI Assistance (NACA) applications based on fixed and variable costs.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Fund will capture this information through budget documentation.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Fund will determine the total cost of a single NACA application based on material costs as well as the amount staff and contractor time per application.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure is being replaced by two new performance measures: NACA Administrative Cycle Time from Application to Award (E) (Number of Days) and by NACA Administrative Cycle Time from Award to Disbursement (E) (Number of Days).

**MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Number of New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) Applications Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	4875	4875	4875	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	5320	7400	3254		
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The cost per application for New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) applications.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Fund will analyze the cost of materials as well as staff time and contractor's time to determine the total fixed and variable cost per application.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Fund will conduct an analysis of the total cost of processing a single NMTC application. The analysis will include both fixed and variable costs for the project.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure is being replaced by two new performance measures: NMTC Administrative Cycle Time from Application to Award (E) (Number of Days) and by NMTC Administrative Cycle Time from Award to Disbursement (E) (Number of Days).

**MEASURE: Annual Percentage Increase In The Total Assets of Native CDFIs (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	33	15	15	15	19
ACTUAL	19	19	23	26	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Measure the percent change in total assets that Native CDFIs report from one year to the next. The Fund will calculate:  $[\text{Total Assets in Current Year} - \text{Total Assets in Previous Year}] / [\text{Total Assets in Previous Year}]$

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Indicator

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Native CDFIs financial data is captured through the annual Institution Level Report.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Native CDFIs report their total assets to the Fund in their Institution Level Report. The Fund verifies the total assets reported against the organization's submitted balance sheet. Organizations are contacted regarding any discrepancies in the data reported. The Fund compares the total assets of CDFIs from year-to-year.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The CDFI Fund will continue to make investments in NACAs to ensure that Native CDFIs' assets will continue to grow.



MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - BEA					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				4.75	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The BEA program will continue to refine its review process to make it more efficient and effective. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with application cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.</p>					

MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - CDFI					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				8	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The CDFI Program will continue to refine its review process to make it more efficient and effective. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with application cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.</p>					

MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - NMTC					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				6.75	
TARGET MET?				N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Fiscal year 2009 data. Target was exceeded largely because of scheduling problems for announcing the awards. The CDFI Fund is researching ways to factor out scheduling delays in measuring application cycle time. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will also be combined with application cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.</p>					

**MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - Native Initiatives**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				6.75	
TARGET MET?				N	

**DEFINITION:** Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Target was not met principally because of IT problems in receiving applications. The CDFI Fund will provide extended guidance and technical support to ensure a timely application process. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with application cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.

**MEASURE: Commercial Real-Estate Properties Financed by BEA Program Applicants That Provide Access to Essential Community Products And Services In Underserved Communities (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	Baseline	285	285	285	Discontinued
ACTUAL	301	287	500	283	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** Number of commercial real-estate projects financed by BEA applicants.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Each BEA Program applicant is required to submit an application containing a Report of Transactions. The BEA Program Unit administers the BEA application. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The data is self-reported by applicants during the application process.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This performance measure will be discontinued after the close of fiscal year 2010 because bank awards have not been used in this manner. Financial institutions have changed their portfolio priorities away from commercial real estate. Yet, the BEA program missed its goal by only 0.7 percent. The CDFI Fund will monitor applicants' use of funds to better match bank portfolios to future targets.

**MEASURE: Community Development Entities' Annual Investments In Low-Income Communities (\$ billions) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
ACTUAL	2.5	3.3	3.6	3.1	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Amount of investments in Low Income Communities that Community Development Entities have made with capital raised through their New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) allocations. The Fund will report NMTC Qualified Low-Income Community Investments (QLICs) that are supported by NMTC Qualified Equity Investments (QEIs).

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Fund will capture the data in the CDEs' annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** CDEs will attract private sector equity in the form of QEIs. CDEs will have 12 months to invest these QEIs in QLICs. The CDEs will self-report QLICs in their annual Transaction Level Report. The Fund uses these reports for research, reporting, and compliance. The Fund is confident that CDEs will accurately report, as the consequence of misinformation may be recapture of the New Markets Tax Credits.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The CDFI Fund will continue to make allocations to CDEs to increase their capacity to support NMTC projects, pending Congressional authorization.

MEASURE: Community Development Entities' Cumulative Investments in Low-Income Communities (\$ billion) (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	4	6	11.4	10	10
ACTUAL	5.6	8.9	12.5	15.8	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Amount of cumulative investments in Low Income Communities that Community Development Entities have made with capital raised through their New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) allocations in billions. The Fund will report NMTC Qualified Low-Income Community Investments (QLICs) that are supported by NMTC Qualified Equity Investments (QEIs).					
<b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure					
<b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Fund will capture the data in the CDEs' annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports.					
<b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> CDEs will attract private sector equity in the form of QEIs. CDEs will have 12 months to invest these QEIs in QLICs. The CDEs will self-report QLICs in their annual Transaction Level Report. The Fund uses these reports for research, reporting, and compliance. The Fund is confident that CDEs will accurately report, as the consequence of misinformation may be recapture of the New Markets Tax Credits.					
<b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable					
<b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually					
<b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The CDFI Fund will continue to make allocations to CDEs to increase their capacity to support NMTC projects, pending Congressional authorization. This measure will be discontinued for fiscal year 2011 because it is redundant given the CDE annual investment measure.					

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - BEA					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				2	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)					
<b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure					
<b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted					
<b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.					
<b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable					
<b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually					
<b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The CDFI Fund will continue to monitor disbursements for their timeliness. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with disbursement cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.					

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - CDFI					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				2	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)					
<b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure					
<b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted					
<b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.					
<b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable					
<b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually					
<b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The CDFI Fund will continue to monitor disbursements for their timeliness. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with application cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.					

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - Native Initiatives					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				2	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The CDFI Fund will continue to monitor disbursements for their timeliness. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with disbursement cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.</p>					

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - NMTC					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	Discontinued
ACTUAL				2	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Cycle time from the date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Fiscal year 2009 data. fiscal year 2010 tax allocation authority has not yet been authorized by Congress as of this writing. When tax allocations resume, the CDFI Fund will continue to monitor their timely and efficient disbursement. In fiscal year 2011 this measure will also be combined with disbursement cycle measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.</p>					

**MEASURE: Dollars of Private and Non-CDFI Fund Investments That CDFIs are Able To Leverage Because of Their CDFI Fund Financial Assistance. (\$ million) (0e)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	861	750	635	600	1080
<b>ACTUAL</b>	778	621	1298	1989	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	N	N	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure represents the dollars of private and non-CDFI Fund investments that CDFIs are able to leverage because of their CDFI Fund Financial Assistance (FA) award. For CDFIs, leverage is defined as the one-to-one non-federal match (as required by the FA program), plus funds the CDFI is able to leverage with CDFI Fund FA grant and equity dollars, plus dollars that the awardees' borrowers leverage for projects. (Project leverage example - Of the total financing needed for a housing development is \$5 million and the awardee lends \$1 million, while other investors lend the remaining \$4 million, then the \$4 million is the project leverage).

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** FA award disbursements are made once CDFIs provide documentation showing that they have received or been committed matching funds. Disbursements of FA are tracked by the Financial Manager and are used as the proxy for matching funds raised. The CDFI Program annual Institution Level Report captures the leverage ratio for FA grants and equity dollars, as well as project level leverage.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** CDFI awardees' one-to-one match is equal to the amount disbursed to awardees. The FA grant and equity dollar leverage ratio is taken from the awardees' financial statements. (In most cases, the financial statements have been audited.) Project level leverage is reported by the awardee and is not verifiable by the Fund.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Private-sector dollars leveraged significantly exceeded targets because Congressional appropriations were higher than originally projected when setting target. This performance measure is being retained despite the difficulty in forecasting targets due to the disparity between administration requests and congressional appropriations. Research is being conducted to devise better target forecasting techniques.

**MEASURE: Increase in Community Development Activities Over Prior Year For All BEA Program Applicants (\$ million) (0e)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	100	180	202	210	210
<b>ACTUAL</b>	227	232	292	290	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measures the Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) applicants' increase in qualified community development activities over prior year.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Each BEA Program applicant is required to submit an application containing a Report of Transactions. The BEA Program Unit administers the BEA application. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The data is self-reported by applicants during the application process.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The BEA Program will continue to review community development activities during the application process to ensure sufficient participation by awardees.

MEASURE: Increase in the Percentage Of Eligible Areas Served by a CDFI (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	8	15	15	21	20
ACTUAL	19.5	17.8	25.1	27.5	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> From 2000 census data, there are 24,795 geographic tracts in the U.S. that are designated as eligible to be served by CDFIs. The CDFI Fund captures portfolio data at the specific project address level from organizations receiving awards. By having this information, it can be determined how many eligible tracts CDFIs are serving in an annual reporting year.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Each awardee collects and tracks their portfolio data in its own management information system(s). It is then uploaded into the CDFI Fund's Community Investment Impact System (CIIS). This information is self-reported by the awardees.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The CDFI Fund will collect portfolio data thru the annual transaction level reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the CDFI Fund. Awardees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The CDFI Fund will continue to monitor awardees' target market compliance and promote expansion into previously unserved areas through technical assistance.</p>					

MEASURE: Number of Full-Time Equivalent Jobs Created Or Maintained In Underserved Communities By Businesses Financed by CDFI Program Awardees (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	34009	28676	30000	85000	85000
ACTUAL	35022	29539	70260	80796	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Jobs maintained are jobs at the business at the time the loan or investment is made. Jobs created are new jobs created after the loan or investment is made. Total jobs are derived from all business loans outstanding in the CDFI portfolio. Jobs created and maintained serve as an important indicator of the economic vitality of underserved areas. Underserved communities are those that qualify as CDFI Program Target Markets (which include a specific geography called an Investment Area or a specific community of people with demonstrated lack of access to credit, equity, or financial services called a Low-Income Targeted Population or an Other Targeted Population).</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks job data in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees. Many organizations track the number of jobs projected to be created. A smaller number collect annual information on actual number of jobs created. Some do not collect the data and respond "don't know." Each CDFI Financial Assistance awardee and NMTC Allocatee is required to complete a Transaction Level Report. CDFI awardees report FTE data in the Institution Level Report or Transaction Level Report, while NMTC Allocatees report FTE data in the Transaction Level Report only.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The Fund will collect FTE through the annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Target has increased over prior fiscal year ranges due to an anticipated large increase in the CDFI Fund's budget. Actual reported jobs created/maintained were lower principally because of the effects of the economic crisis. The CDFI Fund will research methods to take into account budgetary and economic conditions when setting future jobs targets. Additionally, in fiscal year 2011 this measure will be combined with job creation/maintenance measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.</p>					

**MEASURE: Number of Small Businesses Located In Underserved Communities Financed by BEA Program Applicants (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	Baseline	329	288	252	250
<b>ACTUAL</b>	375	906	640	1005	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Number of loans provided to small businesses financed by BEA applicants.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Each BEA Program applicant is required to submit an application containing a Report of Transactions. The BEA Program Unit administers the BEA application. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The data is self-reported by applicants during the application process.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Financial institutions' shifting portfolio priorities have meant greater interest in small business financing, resulting in the BEA program exceeding its target. The CDFI Fund will monitor applicants' use of funds to better match bank portfolios to future targets. In fiscal year 2011, this measure will be combined with business financing measures for the other CDFI Fund programs.

**MEASURE: Percent of CDFIs that Increased Their Total Assets (Cumulative) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	70	70	70	65	60
<b>ACTUAL</b>	82	87	88	84	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Measure the number of CDFIs that reported an increase in total assets in the current year compared to the original year that was first reported to the CDFI Fund.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** CDFIs financial data is captured through the annual Institutional Level Report.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** CDFIs report their total assets to the CDFI Fund in their Institutional Level Report. The CDFI Fund verifies the total assets reported against the organization's submitted balance sheet. Organizations are contacted regarding any discrepancies in the data reported.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The CDFI Fund will continue to make awards that expand the asset base of CDFIs and increase their capacity. This performance measure is being discontinued after the close of fiscal year 2010 because it is redundant to the annual performance measure "Percent of CDFIs that increased their total assets (annual) (Oe)" and is thus unnecessary.

**MEASURE: Percent of CDFIs that Increased Their Total Assets Over the Previous Year (Annual) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	70	70	70	66	Discontinued
<b>ACTUAL</b>	74	80	69	52	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	N	N	

**DEFINITION:** Measure the number of CDFIs that reported an increase in total assets over the previous year.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The CDFIs financial data is captured through the annual Institution Level Report.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** CDFIs report their total assets to the CDFI Fund in their Institutional Level Report. The CDFI Fund verifies the total assets reported against the organization's submitted balance sheet. Organizations are contacted regarding any discrepancies in the data reported. The CDFI Fund compares the total assets of CDFIs from year-to-year.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The economic crisis has contributed to a shortfall in annual asset growth for many financial institutions, including CDFIs. The CDFI Fund will examine other methods of measuring industry health, such as a regular survey of all certified CDFIs, and/or a weighted average of asset growth (in dollars) across awardees rather than a percentage.

MEASURE: Percentage of Eligible Areas Served by One Or More CDFI (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1	3	3	5	Discontinued
ACTUAL	4.2	3.4	14.8	16.6	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Same definition as the measure "CDFI - Increase in the pct. of eligible areas served". The difference is that this measure focuses on one or more CDFI serving the same geographic tract, which would indicate demand for CDFIs. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Each awardee collects and tracks their portfolio data in its own management information system(s). It is then uploaded into the CDFI Fund's Community Investment Impact System (CIIS). This information is self-reported by the awardees. <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The CDFI Fund will collect portfolio data thru the annual transaction level reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the CDFI Fund. Awardees are contacted regarding any discrepancies. <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This performance measure is being discontinued because the underlying cohort number of CDFIs participating in the program is not large enough or a stable enough number to track successfully over time.					

MEASURE: Percentage of Loans and Investments that Went Into Severely Distressed Communities (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	66	66	66	66	66
ACTUAL	76	73	81	73.4	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Portfolio data being reported by allocatees' at the project level is used to determine the percentage of loans going into a distressed community. A distressed community is composed of any of the following criteria: 1) Poverty > 30 percent 2) Median Income < 60 percent 3) Unemployment Rate 1.5x National Average <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Each allocatee collects and tracks their portfolio data in its own management information system(s). It is then uploaded into the CDFI Fund's Community Investment Impact System (CIIS). This information is self-reported by the awardees. <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The CDFI Fund will collect portfolio data thru annual transaction level reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the CDFI Fund. Awardees are contacted regarding any discrepancies. <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This higher result principally reflects more rigorous application scoring. The CDFI Fund will continue to monitor applications closely for their potential to serve distressed communities.					



## OUTCOME: FREE TRADE AND INVESTMENT

## Departmental Offices - S &amp; E

## MEASURE: Number of New Trade and Investment Negotiations Underway or Completed (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	6	6	6
ACTUAL		14	15	13	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of international trade or investment agreements underway or completed during the period and the number of those that reflect commitments to high standards, including new commitments by a foreign government to open its financial services markets to U.S. providers. It includes bilateral agreements such as Free Trade Agreements, Bilateral Investment treaties, and multilateral undertakings (e.g., WTO) from which the U.S. benefits.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** International Affairs staff and U.S. Trade Representative's office reporting.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Based upon a count by International Affairs staff responsible for such negotiations and verifiable by reference to U.S. Trade Representative.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations were re-launched this year and are expected to intensify in the coming fiscal year, and the Administration is committed to moving forward with pending free trade agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama as soon as possible. Rising protectionist sentiment around the globe is impeding efforts to complete both bilateral and multilateral negotiations that are underway. Progress towards Department goals could be slowed if weaker economic conditions exacerbate this protectionist trend. The Department will make every effort to complete additional negotiations for 2011.

## MEASURE: Number of Specific New Trade Actions Involving Treasury Interagency Participation in Order to Enact, Implement, and Enforce U.S. Trade Law and International Agreements (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	30	40	50
ACTUAL		68	98	83	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Specific trade actions involving Treasury interagency participation under legislation, decision whether to initiate trade disputes, review of country eligibility for preference programs, and review of specific trade petitions and recommendations (under preference programs, Section 301, CITA, Section 337, etc.)

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** International Affairs staff and U.S. Trade Representative's (USTR) office, USTIC, and the Federal Register.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Based upon a count by International Affairs staff responsible for such negotiations and verifiable by reference to USTR, Federal Register notices, USTIC notices, and other official websites.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Challenging economic conditions ensured that the number of new trade actions for 2010 beyond initial expectations. As the global economy improves, the chances for similar economic conditions in 2011 are not likely; therefore the target for 2010 has been adjusted to 50.

## OUTCOME: PREVENTED OR MITIGATED FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC CRISES

## Departmental Offices - S &amp; E

## MEASURE: Average days to close a FOIA case

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	64	80
ACTUAL			67	95	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** This measure tracks the average number of days it takes to close a FOIA case after it is received by OFS.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The OFS analysts log all incoming FOIA requests upon receipt and update the status of each case in the FOIA database.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** OFS analysts ensure that OFS program office staff respond promptly and accurately to all FOIA cases and update the status of each case in the FOIA database.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, OFS had a backlog of fiscal year 2009 FOIA cases that were unresolved, in addition to the new FOIA cases which OFS received in fiscal year 2010. Additionally, the Department added an unforeseen step to the FOIA case review process that OFS did not anticipate in developing its fiscal year 2010 target. Consequently, the average days required for OFS to close a FOIA case were higher than anticipated. OFS has worked diligently to eliminate the FOIA case backlog and has built in time for Departmental review to ensure that OFS can reduce the number of days it takes to close a FOIA case.

## MEASURE: Changes that Result from Project Engagement (Impact) (Oe)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	3.1	3.1	3.1
ACTUAL		3.1	3.1	3	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** The extent to which a Technical Assistance project objective contributes to the achievement of the goal(s) described in the Terms of Reference and addresses the country problem describe

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Generated by the Financial Technical Assistant Advisor who manage the project in the countries were technical assistant project exist.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The data is verified by the five contracting office representatives, the Associate Director of OTA and approved by the director of OTA.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** During fiscal year 2010, Treasury OTA responded to a U.S. Government request for technical assistance to a selected group of developing countries hard-hit by the global financial crisis. These projects began half-way through the fiscal year and low scores for Impact were the norm (Average 1.6). The unusually large number of projects beginning under very difficult conditions accounts for the slight decline in Impact score and is not expected to be part of a future pattern. No remedial plans have been made nor are deemed necessary.

## MEASURE: Clean audit opinion on TARP financial statements

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	1	1
ACTUAL			Met	Met*	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure identifies whether OFS receives a clean audit opinion from the GAO on its TARP financial statements.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The OFS Office of the Chief Financial Officer generates the TARP financial statements and will receive and communicate the audit opinion from GAO.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** TARP financial statements are subject to an audit conducted by GAO.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** OFS successfully met its target for fiscal year 2010 by receiving a clean audit opinion from GAO. OFS will continue to strive for accuracy and transparency in its financial statements so that OFS can continue to receive clean audit opinions.

\*Estimated

**MEASURE: Percentage of SIGTARP and GAO oversight recommendations responded to on time**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	100	100
ACTUAL			100	93	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** This measure tracks the percentage of SIGTARP and GAO oversight recommendations that were responded to within the required timeframes.

SIGTARP: 30 days.

GAO: 60 days.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Upon completion of an audit, SIGTARP and GAO have the opportunity to issue recommendations to which OFS provides responses detailing actions, if any, taken by Treasury to remedy the SIGTARP and GAO recommendations.

OFS staff inputs GAO recommendations and OFS responses into Treasury's Joint Management Enterprise System (JAMES). SIGTARP inputs SIGTARP recommendations into JAMES and OFS inputs the associated responses.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The data in the periodic reports are compared to data entered into JAMES. The number of recommendations and their associated statuses are tallied and analyzed by OFS analysts.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** OFS was unable to attain its fiscal year 2010 target due to a delay in the clearance process on one recommendation. This was an isolated issue, and OFS is confident that it will be able to respond to all SIGTARP and GAO recommendations within the 60 day requirement going forward.

**MEASURE: Percentage of Congressional correspondence responses drafted within 48 hours**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	90	93
ACTUAL			87	97	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure tracks the percentage of congressional correspondence letters sent to OFS that have a response letter drafted within 48 hours of receipt.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Correspondence is logged in Main Treasury's TACT system. OFS staff maintains a subsidiary tracking report in Excel to monitor and calculate the response time.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The OFS team lead confirms all correspondence response times by reviewing TACT-generated and COO response emails to verify dates and lapsed time.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** OFS met and exceeded its performance target for fiscal year 2010 for the percentage of Congressional correspondence responses drafted within 48 hours. OFS continues to streamline its correspondence response process and will continue to improve its response time.

**MEASURE: Percentage of customers satisfied with FinancialStability.gov**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	70	65
ACTUAL			65	63	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** This measure tracks the percentage of customers that are sufficiently satisfied with the information provided on our website as well as the ease of navigating the site itself.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The survey presents randomly to 60 percent of the visitors who have viewed at least two pages of the web site. Respondents are asked to evaluate a series of questions around the website's content, functionality, look and feel, navigation, transparency, and performance. The results are combined into a single customer satisfaction score.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** ForeSee employs random sampling and seeks a response rate in excess of 8 percent to ensure data validity.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** OFS will continue to use the user survey analysis provided by ForeSee Results, Inc. to identify opportunities for implementing new layouts and functionality to improve the experience of visitors to the FinancialStability.gov website.

MEASURE: Percentage of statutorily-mandated reports submitted on time					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	100	100
ACTUAL			100	100	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Timely submission of statutorily required reports to the Congress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$105 Report: by the 10th of each month</li> <li>• Transaction Report: two business days following a TARP transaction.</li> <li>• Tranche Report: 7seven calendar days after each interval of \$50b commitment of TARP funds is reached.</li> </ul> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> OFS posts all statutorily-mandated reports submitted to the Congress on FinancialStability.gov.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The submission date for each report is posted alongside each report link on FinancialStability.gov.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OFS will continue to publish and submit all reports to the Congress by statutorily-mandated deadlines.</p>					

MEASURE: Scope and Intensity of Engagement Traction (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	3.6	3.6	3.6
ACTUAL		3.6	3.7	3.5	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The degree to which a Technical Assistance project brings about changes in behavior among the counterparts and other country participants.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Generated by the Financial Technical Assistant Advisor who manage the project in the countries were technical assistant project exist.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The data is verified and validated by the five contracting office representatives, the Associate Director of Office of Technical Assistance (OTA) and approved by the Director of OTA.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> During fiscal year 2010 Treasury OTA responded to a USG request for technical assistance to a selected group of developing countries hard-hit by the global financial crisis. These projects began half-way through the fiscal year and low scores for Traction were the norm (Average 1.9). The unusually large number of projects beginning under very difficult conditions accounts for the slight decline in Traction score and is not expected to be part of a future pattern. No remedial plans have been made nor are deemed necessary.</p>					

## Office of Comptroller of the Currency

**MEASURE: Percentage of Licensing Applications and Notices Completed within Established Timeframes (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	95	95	95	95	95
<b>ACTUAL</b>	96	95	95	96	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure reflects the extent to which OCC meets its established time frames for reaching decisions on licensing applications and notices. The OCC's timely and effective approval of corporate applications and notices contributes to the nation's economy by enabling national banks to engage in corporate transactions and introduce new financial products and services.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Chief Counsel's office uses the Corporate Activity Information System (CAIS) to identify applications completed during the fiscal year. For each filing, the actual decision date is compared to the target action date to determine whether the application was completed within established standards. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of licensing applications processed within the required time frames to the total number of licensing applications processed during the fiscal year. The processing time is the number of calendar days from the date of OCC receipt to the date of OCC's decision. The established processing time frame depends on the application type and if the application qualifies for expedited processing.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Licensing Department tracks processing of all applications and notices through the Corporate Activity Information System (CAIS). The analyst who is assigned the application will verify the accuracy of the CAIS data as the application is processed. The senior analyst or manager who approves the final decision also verifies the accuracy of the CAIS data.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Target Exceeded. OCC plans to maintain its high level of timeliness in completing licensing applications and notices by hiring qualified staff as vacancies arise; providing staff training through annual conferences and rotational assignments, revising licensing manuals to address new circumstances and changed policies; and maintaining frequent communications between Headquarters office management and licensing analysts and District Office staff.

**MEASURE: Percent of National Banks With Composite CAMELS Rating 1 or 2 (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	90	90	90	90	90
<b>ACTUAL</b>	96	92	82	70	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	N	N	

**DEFINITION:** This measure reflects the overall condition of the national banking system at fiscal year-end. Bank regulatory agencies use the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, CAMELS, to provide a general framework for assimilating and evaluating all significant financial, operational and compliance factors inherent in a bank. Evaluations are made on: Capital adequacy, Asset quality, Management, Earnings, Liquidity, and Sensitivity to Market Risk. The rating scale is 1 through 5 where 1 is the highest rating granted.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Indicator

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Supervisory Information office identifies the current composite ratings from Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) at fiscal year-end. The number of national banks at fiscal year-end is obtained from the Federal Reserve Board's National Information Center database. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks with current composite CAMELS ratings of 1 or 2 to the total number of national banks at fiscal year-end.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Either quarterly or semi-annually, an independent reviewer compares a sample of Reports of Examination to the Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) data to ensure the accuracy of the recorded composite ratings. Any discrepancies between the supporting documentation and the systems data are reported to the respective Assistant Deputy Comptroller or Deputy Comptroller for corrective action.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Target was not met. The decline reflects the difficulty many banks are experiencing recovering from the recent economic climate. We will continue to closely monitor the performance of all our banks and when necessary, initiate formal and informal agreements to enhance our level of supervision.

**MEASURE: Percentage of National Banks that are Categorized as Well Capitalized (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	95	95	95	95	95
<b>ACTUAL</b>	99	99	86	90	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	N	N	

**DEFINITION:** This measure reflects whether the national banking system is well capitalized at fiscal year-end. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act established a system of prompt corrective action (PCA) that classifies insured depository institutions into five categories (well capitalized; adequately capitalized; undercapitalized, significantly undercapitalized; and critically undercapitalized) based on their relative capital levels. The purpose of PCA is to resolve the problems of insured depository institutions at the least possible long-term cost to the deposit insurance fund.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Indicator

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** National banks file quarterly Reports of Condition and Income with the Federal Finance Institution Examination Council through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's data processing center. The Supervisory Information office reviews the Reports of Condition and Income (i.e., call reports) for each quarter to identify national banks that meet all of the criteria for a well capitalized institution. The number of national banks at fiscal year-end is obtained from the Federal Reserve Board's National Information Center database. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks that meet all of the established criteria for being well capitalized to the total number of national banks at fiscal year-end.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The banks' boards of directors attest to the accuracy of the reported data. The reliability of these quarterly reports is evaluated by OCC examiners during bank examinations.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Target was not met. This is primarily due to the long term effects of the economic downturn on the banking industry. More banks have been issued enforcement actions lately and this precludes them from being labeled as well capitalized. We will continue to closely monitor the capital levels of all our banks and ensure that appropriate corrective action is instituted on a timely basis.

**MEASURE: Percentage of National Banks with Consumer Compliance Rating of 1 or 2 (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	94	94	94	94	94
<b>ACTUAL</b>	97	97	97	95	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure reflects the national banking system's compliance with consumer laws and regulations. Bank regulatory agencies use the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, Interagency Consumer Compliance Rating, to provide a general framework for assimilating and evaluating significant consumer compliance factors inherent in a bank. Each bank is assigned a consumer compliance rating based on an evaluation of its present compliance with consumer protection and civil rights statutes and regulations, and the adequacy of its operating systems designed to ensure continuing compliance. Ratings are on a scale of 1 through 5 in increasing order of supervisory concern.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Indicator

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Supervisory Information office identifies the number of banks with current consumer compliance ratings of 1 or 2 and the total number of national banks from Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) subject to consumer compliance examinations at fiscal year-end. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks with current consumer compliance ratings of 1 or 2 to the total number of national banks subject to consumer compliance examinations at fiscal year-end.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Consumer compliance ratings are assigned at the completion of each consumer compliance examination. These ratings are entered into OCC's management information systems, EV and SIS, by the banks' Examiner-in-Charge and reviewed and approved by the Supervisory Offices' Assistant Deputy Comptroller (Mid-Size/Community banks) or Deputy Comptroller (Large banks).

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** Target exceeded. To sustain this level of achievement, the OCC will continue to encourage and ensure that national banks have strong compliance management functions in place. The OCC also will continue its recruiting of entry-level examiners, aligning supervision resources to the areas of greatest risk, training the examiner staff, and enhancing examination guidance.

MEASURE: Rehabilitated National Banks as a Percentage of Problem National Banks One Year Ago (CAMEL 3,4, or 5) (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	40	40	40	40	40
ACTUAL	52	47	29	23	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure reflects the successful rehabilitation of problem national banks during the past twelve months. Problem banks can ultimately reach a point where rehabilitation is no longer feasible. The OCC's early identification of and intervention with problem banks can lead to successful remediation of problem banks.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Indicator</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Supervisory Information office in OCC's headquarters office uses Examiner View (EV) and the Supervisory Information System (SIS) to identify and compare the composite CAMELS ratings for problem banks from twelve months prior to the current period composite CAMELS ratings for the same banks. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks that have upgraded composite CAMELS ratings of 1 or 2 from composite CAMELS ratings of 3, 4 or 5 to the total number of national banks that had composite CAMELS ratings of 3, 4 or 5 twelve months ago.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Either quarterly or semi-annually, an independent reviewer compares a sample of Reports of Examination to the EV and SIS data to ensure the accuracy of the recorded composite ratings. Any discrepancies between the supporting documentation and the systems data are reported to the respective Assistant Deputy Comptroller or Deputy Comptroller for corrective action.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Target was not met. This is primarily due to the difficult economic situation the entire industry is facing which presently results in a larger population of problem banks. The impact of the past and current economic climates on these banks requires longer term rehabilitation efforts. We will continue to closely monitor the performance of all our problem national banks and when necessary, increase formal and informal agreements to enhance our level of supervision.</p>					

MEASURE: Total OCC Costs Relative to Every \$100,000 in Bank Assets Regulated (\$) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	9.55	9.55	9.22	9.22	9.22
ACTUAL	8.89	8.39	8.81	9.28*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure reflects the efficiency of OCC operations while meeting the increasing supervisory demands of a growing and more complex national banking system.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> OCC costs are those reported as total program costs on the annual audited Statement of Net Cost. Banks assets are those reported quarterly by national banks on their Reports of Condition and Income.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> OCC's financial statements and controls over the data are audited by an independent accountant each year. National banks file quarterly Reports on Condition and Income with the FFIEC through the FDIC's data processing center. The banks' boards of directors attest to the accuracy of the reported data. The reliability of these quarterly reports is evaluated by OCC examiners during bank examinations.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Below target at this time. Using a rounded preliminary estimate for bank assets, as well as un-audited costs from Statement of Net Cost. Estimate at this time. September 30, 2010 bank asset data not yet available.</p>					
*Estimated					

## Office of Thrift Supervision

MEASURE: Percent of Safety and Soundness Exams Started as Scheduled (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	90	90
ACTUAL	95	94	94	97	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> OTS examines savings associations every 12-18 months for safety and soundness, compliance and consumer protection laws. OTS performs safety and soundness examinations of its regulated savings associations consistent with the requirements in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (FDICIA) as amended by the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. When safety and soundness or compliance issues are identified during its risk-focused examinations, OTS acts promptly to ensure association management and directors institute corrective actions to address supervisory concerns. OTS staff often meets with the savings association's board of directors after delivery of the Report of Examination to discuss findings and recommendations.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> When a savings association is examined, OTS staff enters into the Examination Data System the examination type, examination beginning and completion dates, report of examination mail date, and CAMELS or equivalent ratings. The percentage success rate for this measure is calculated by dividing the number of examinations that were started by the number of examinations that were scheduled to be started during the review period.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The Managing Director, Supervision and her staff along with the regional personnel continuously monitors the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of Exam start dates are available online through the Examination Data System.</p> <p>OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including CAMELS ratings, and reports of examination with start date for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OTS plans to maintain its current high level of achievement for this measure. The fiscal year 2011 Budget/Performance Plan describes the goals, strategies, and priorities that will guide OTS's operations. OTS will continue tailoring supervisory examinations to the risk profile of the institutions, while effectively allocating resources to oversee and assess the safety and soundness and consumer compliance record of the thrift industry.</p>					

MEASURE: Percent of Thrifts that are Well Capitalized (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	95	95	95	95	95
ACTUAL	99	98.4	97	95	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Capital absorbs losses, promotes public confidence and provides protection to depositors and the FDIC insurance funds. It provides a financial cushion that can allow a savings association to continue operating during periods of loss or other adverse conditions. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act established a system of prompt corrective action (PCA) that classifies insured depository institutions into five categories (well-capitalized; adequately capitalized; undercapitalized, significantly undercapitalized; and critically undercapitalized) based on their relative capital levels. The purpose of PCA is to resolve the problems of insured depository institutions at the least possible long-term cost to the deposit insurance fund.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> PCA ratings are stored in the Examination Data System and can also be found in the Thrift Overview Report and off-site financial monitoring reports. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of OTS-regulated savings associations that are well capitalized by the total number of OTS-regulated institutions.</p> <p>PCA ratings are stored in the Examination Data System. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of OTS-regulated savings associations that are well capitalized by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that received a compliance examination rating of 1 or 2 on their most recent examination by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that have been assigned a compliance examination rating.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The Managing Director, Supervision and her staff along with the regional personnel continuously monitors the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of compliance ratings are available online through the Examination Data System and are provided to each association at the conclusion of an exam. The composite rating is used semi-annually in the assessment process.</p> <p>OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including compliance ratings, and reports of examination for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OTS plans to maintain its current high level of achievement for this measure. The fiscal year 2011 Budget/Performance Plan describes the goals, strategies, and priorities that will guide OTS's operations. OTS will continue tailoring supervisory examinations to the risk profile of the institutions, while effectively allocating resources to oversee and assess the safety and soundness and consumer compliance record of the thrift industry.</p>					



MEASURE: Percent of Thrifts with Composite CAMELS Ratings of 1 or 2 (%) (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	80	80
ACTUAL	93	90	84	77	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N	

**DEFINITION:** On December 9, 1996, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) adopted the CAMELS rating system as the internal rating system to be used by the Federal and State regulators for assessing the safety and soundness of financial institutions on a uniform basis. The CAMELS rating system puts increased emphasis on the quality of risk management practices. 'CAMELS' stands for Capital adequacy, Asset quality, Management, Earnings, Liquidity and Sensitivity to market risk. OTS assigns a composite CAMELS rating to savings associations at each examination. OTS adjusts the level of supervisory resources devoted to an association based on the composite rating. The CAMELS rating is based upon a scale of 1 through 5 in increasing order of supervisory concern.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Composite CAMELS ratings are stored in and retrieved from the online Examination Data System. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of savings associations having a composite CAMELS rating of 1 or 2 by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that have been assigned a composite CAMELS rating.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Managing Director, Supervision, and her staff along with regional personnel continuously monitor the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of CAMELS ratings are available online through the Examination Data System and are provided to each association at the conclusion of an exam. The composite rating is used semi-annually in the assessment process. Quarterly press releases provide a summary of the thrift industry's CAMELS ratings to the public.

OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including CAMELS ratings, and reports of examination for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** OTS goal of 80 percent for this measure was not met for fiscal year 2010 due to continued weakness in the housing markets and rising unemployment resulting in increased problem assets, additional reserves and losses. Weak housing markets and continued high levels of unemployment continued to challenge our institutions. In turn, these factors necessitated ratings downgrades.

As a fiscal year 2011 agency priority, OTS will continue to actively take timely and effective actions to address problem institutions, inappropriate risks and violations of law and encourage thrifts to obtain additional capital or seek alternative strategies to remain viable.

MEASURE: Percent of Thrifts with a Compliance Examination Ratings of 1 or 2 (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	90	90
ACTUAL	97	95.8	95	92	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** A uniform, interagency compliance rating system was first approved by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) in 1980. The FFIEC rating system was designed to reflect, in a comprehensive and uniform fashion, the nature and extent of an association's compliance with consumer protection statutes, regulations and requirements. The Compliance Rating System is based upon a scale of 1 through 5 in increasing order of supervisory concern.

OTS began to combine safety and soundness and compliance examinations in 2002 to attain exam efficiencies and to improve risk assessment. Using comprehensive exam procedures, compliance with consumer protection laws is reviewed at more frequent intervals, which has improved the quality of the examination process.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Compliance examination ratings are stored in the Examination Data System. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of OTS-regulated savings associations that received a compliance examination rating of 1 or 2 on their most recent examination by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that have been assigned a compliance examination rating.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The Managing Director, Supervision and her staff along with the regional personnel continuously monitors the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of compliance ratings are available online through the Examination Data System and are provided to each association at the conclusion of an exam. The composite rating is used semi-annually in the assessment process.

OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including compliance ratings, and reports of examination for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** OTS plans to maintain its current high level of achievement for this measure. The fiscal year 2011 Budget/Performance Plan describes the goals, strategies, and priorities that will guide OTS's operations. OTS will continue tailoring supervisory examinations to the risk profile of the institutions, while effectively allocating resources to oversee and assess the safety and soundness and consumer compliance record of the thrift industry.

MEASURE: Total OTS Costs Relative to Every \$100,000 in Savings Association Assets Regulated (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	14.33	15.08	23.04	22	24
ACTUAL	13.9	15.1	19.88	24.01	
TARGET MET?	Y	N	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Beginning in fiscal year 2006, OTS included a performance measure that reflects the efficiency of its operations while meeting the increasing supervisory demands of a growing and more complex thrift industry. This measure supports OTS's ongoing efforts to efficiently use agency resources. The efficiency measure is impacted by the relative size of the savings associations regulated. As of June 30, 2006, 63 percent of all savings associations have total assets of less than \$250 million and are generally community-based organizations that provide retail financial services in their local markets. In addition, the measure does not include over \$7 trillion in assets of holding company enterprises regulated by OTS.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The OTS expenses published in OTS's annual audited financial statement are used in this calculation. If the performance measure calculation is provided before the audited financial statement is available, the estimated expenses are derived from OTS's Budget Variance System. The OTS regulated assets are published in the OTS quarterly press release of thrift industry financial highlights and are derived from the institutions quarterly Thrift Financial Reports. The measure is calculated by dividing total fiscal year expenses by total thrift assets.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> OTS expenses are verified during the annual CFO audit and reflect those published in the OTS annual audited financial statements. The industry's assets are reported by OTS's regulated institutions in the quarterly Thrift Financial Report, edited and verified by OTS staff, and then published in the OTS quarterly press release and available to the public on the OTS Internet site. OTS allows amendments from the industry for six months after the filing date.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OTS plans to maintain its current high level of achievement for this measure. The fiscal year 2011 Budget/Performance Plan describes the goals, strategies, and priorities that will guide OTS's operations. OTS will continue tailoring supervisory examinations to the risk profile of the institutions, while effectively allocating resources to oversee and assess the safety and soundness and consumer compliance record of the thrift industry.</p>					

## OUTCOME: DECREASED GAP IN GLOBAL STANDARD OF LIVING

### Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Improve International Monetary Fund (IMF) Effectiveness and Quality through Periodic Review of IMF Program (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	100	93	23		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure tracks efforts by International Affairs (IA) staff to monitor quality of IMF country programs and ensure the application of appropriately high standards. IA staff endeavors to review each country program and provide a synopsis, analysis, and recommendation for action at least one week before each program is voted on by the IMF Board. The measure tracks the percentage of times the staff review is completed in a timely manner (at least one week before Board action) to allow for alterations in language if deemed necessary. Note: IA has modified this measure beginning in fiscal year 2010 such that the staff review must be completed prior to the IMF Board date rather than one week in advance (see below).</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> International Affairs staff tracks and accounts for actions undertaken during the reporting period.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Publicly available accounts of meetings (press, etc.), communiqués issued following multilateral or bilateral meetings.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Semi-Annual</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.</p>					

MEASURE: Monitor Quality and Enhance Effectiveness of International Monetary Fund (IMF) Lending Through Review of IMF Country Programs (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	100
ACTUAL				97	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure tracks efforts by International Affairs (IA) staff to monitor quality of IMF country programs and ensure the application of appropriately high standards. IA staff endeavors to review each country program and provide a synopsis, analysis, and recommendation for action at least one day before the IMF Board voting date. The measure tracks the percentage of times the staff review is completed in a timely manner (at least one day before Board action) to allow for alterations in language or policy position if deemed necessary.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> International Affairs staff tracks and accounts for actions undertaken during the reporting period.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Publicly available accounts of meetings (press, etc.), communiqués issued following multilateral or bilateral meetings.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Semi-Annual</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The ongoing international economic and financial crisis will continue to result in significant IMF program activity for emerging market and developing countries. Normally, IMF program documents are distributed to the Executive Board at least two weeks in advance of the Board date. In fiscal year 2009, however, the IMF regularly activated 'emergency procedures' to facilitate rapid IMF Board approval of country lending programs (i.e., Board discussion 2-3 days after program documents are circulated by the IMF). The shortened review period in many cases made it impossible for IA staff to complete the staff review of the country program one week before the Board date. The Office of International Affairs will continue to closely monitor IMF program activities and conduct thorough reviews of IMF country programs in a timely fashion in advance of IMF Board discussions.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Grant and Loan Proposals Containing Satisfactory Frameworks for Results Measurement (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	90	90
ACTUAL	92	94	94	92.5	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The percentage of grant and loan project proposals that contain a satisfactory framework for measuring project results (such as outcome indicators, quantifiable and time-bound targets, etc.) This information is measured on an annual basis.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> MDB monthly operational report, special requests to MDBs for loan and grant approvals, MDB annual reports and U.S. voting positions</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Data provided by the MDB is compared with Treasury MDB Office vote history database and internal supporting memoranda.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Semi-Annual</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The Department will continue to closely monitor the quality of MDB results measurement efforts. In various fora, the Department is seeking to increase the emphasis on impact evaluation in the MDBs, taking results measurement beyond the calculation of project inputs and outputs.</p>					

## STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:

## TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN U.S. CURRENCY WORLDWIDE

OUTCOME: COMMERCE ENABLED THROUGH SAFE, SECURE U.S. NOTES AND COINS

## Bureau of Engraving and Printing

## MEASURE: Currency Production (billion notes) (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	9.1	7.7	6.2	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	9.1	7.7	6.2		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** A measure of BEP's ability to meet customer order delivery schedule. The customer considers this measure satisfied when complete shipments of finished currency are received in the Federal Reserve vault where it is held prior to final distribution to Federal Reserve district banks.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Product delivery data is collected and verified through various BEP's product accountability systems.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Product delivery data is reconciled to invoices generated by BEP, and confirmed by the customer.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.

## MEASURE: Currency Shipment Discrepancies Per Million Notes (%) (Ot)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
ACTUAL	0.01	0.01	0	0*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** A qualitative indicator reflecting BEP's ability to provide effective product security and accountability. This measure refers to product overages or underages of as little as a single currency note in shipments of finished notes to the Federal Reserve Banks.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The customer captures this data and report to BEP on a monthly basis.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** BEP reports product discrepancy data based on monthly information provided by the customer.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** A low shipment discrepancy rate is a qualitative indicator reflecting BEP's ability to provide effective product security and accountability. This measure refers to product overages or underages of as little as a single currency note in shipments of finished notes to the Federal Reserve Banks. BEP accountability includes physical plant security and personnel security, product accountability and asset control. Internal accountability on notes occurs at every step of the manufacturing process. It is because of BEP's strict accountability processes that very few shipment discrepancies are noted by the customer.

\*Estimated

## MEASURE: Improper and/or Erroneous Payments or Purchases (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	500	500	500	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	0	0	0		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** An indicator reflecting the ability of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to make payment for goods and services for only authorized expenses and in a timely manner.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS)

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** BEP Annual Financial Audit, The CFO Performance and Accountability Report

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.

**MEASURE: Maintain ISO Certification (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1	1	1	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	Met	Met	Met	N/A	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The effectiveness of the manufacturing program is also demonstrated by the attainment of ISO 9001 certification. ISO is an internationally recognized quality assurance program aimed at promoting the adoption of a management system that establishes a process that governs the transformation of inputs into outputs to meet customer requirements. Components of the Bureau's ISO certified system include elements of the accountability activity in that the identification and traceability of product tracking procedures are tested for consistency and reliability.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** ISO compliance is verified by periodic audits of the Bureau's quality management system by an independent ISO designated firm. Periodically the International Organization for Standardization updates the quality standards, thereby, requiring organizations already ISO certified to upgrade their quality management systems in order to maintain certification.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Certification is achieved based on a successful compliance audit by an independent firm under the auspices of the International Organization for Standardization.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.

**MEASURE: Manufacturing Costs For Currency (Dollar Costs Per Thousand Notes Produced) (\$ (E))**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	32.5	33	37	37	44
ACTUAL	28.71	29.47	32.77	44.85*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** An indicator of currency manufacturing efficiency and effectiveness of program management. This standard is developed annually based on the past year's performance, contracted price factors, and anticipated productivity improvements. Actual performance comparison against the standard depends on BEP's ability to meet annual spoilage, efficiency, and capacity utilization goals established for this product line.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Cost data is collected through BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system is audited annually as part of the financial statement audit.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** BEP began production of the next generation of \$100 notes in 2010. The next generation \$100 note includes new overt and covert counterfeit deterrent features and is the most complex and costly note to be produced by BEP to date. Due to the great international usage of the \$100 note, production plans demanded a large inventory buildup before the note could be introduced into circulation by the Federal Reserve Board. BEP has identified a problem with sporadic creasing of the paper during printing of the new \$100 note, which was not apparent during extensive pre-production testing. The root cause of the sporadic creasing is currently unknown, sometimes hard to detect, and causes unacceptably high spoilage. Because this issue remains unresolved, the Bureau was unable to fulfill its delivery requirements of new \$100 notes to the Federal Reserve Board. The BEP is working to resolve the creasing problem with its paper supplier; however, it is because of the high spoilage caused by the creasing problem and the work being done to find a solution, that BEP did not meet the performance goal of manufacturing costs for currency in 2010. Going forward, once the problem has been identified and corrected, BEP expects to meet its manufacturing goals.

\*Estimated

**MEASURE: Other Financial Losses [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	0	0	0	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	0	0	0		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The face value of product theft that has been reported, investigated as unrecoverable, and verified, during the production, delivery and destruction process.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Indicator

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS)

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** BEP Annual Financial Audit, the CFO Performance and Accountability Report

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.

**MEASURE: Percent of Currency Notes Delivered to the Federal Reserve that Meet Customer Quality and Requirements (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
ACTUAL	100	100	99.9	97.5*	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** A qualitative indicator reflecting the Bureau's ability to provide a quality product. All notes delivered to the Federal Reserve go through rigorous quality inspections. These inspections ensure that all counterfeit deterrent features, both overt and covert are functioning as designed.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Quality inspections are performed at each Federal Reserve Bank. Any discrepancies found are reported to BEP on a per shipment basis.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Quality review audits are performed by internal BEP auditors on all Federal Reserve inspection systems as well as the procedures followed in reporting data to BEP. These audits are conducted on an annual basis with additional audits performed upon request by Federal Reserve Banks.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** BEP began production of the next generation of \$100 notes in 2010. The next generation \$100 note includes new overt and covert counterfeit deterrent features and is the most complex and costly note to be produced by BEP to date. Due to the great international usage of the \$100 note, production plans demanded a large inventory buildup before the note could be introduced into circulation by the Federal Reserve Board. BEP has identified a problem with sporadic creasing of the paper during printing of the new \$100 note, which was not apparent during extensive pre-production testing. However, the creasing problem was identified after notes were delivered to the Federal Reserve vault here at the Bureau; these notes are unacceptable and fail to meet the customer's requirements for quality. Therefore, BEP did not meet the performance goal of percent of currency notes delivered to the Federal Reserve that meet customer quality and requirements. This issue remains unresolved. BEP is working to resolve the creasing problem with its paper supplier. Going forward, once the problem has been identified and corrected, BEP expects to meet our manufacturing goals.

\*Estimated

**MEASURE: Security Costs Per 1,000 Notes Delivered (\$) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	6	5.65	5.65	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	5.92	5.63	5.76		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** An indicator reflecting the cost of providing effective and efficient product security and accountability. This standard is developed annually based on the past year's cost performance and anticipated cost increases. The formula used to calculate this measure is the total cost of security divided by the number of notes produced divided by 1000.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Cost data is collected through BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system. This standard is developed annually based on the past year's cost performance and anticipated cost increases.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system is audited annually as part of the financial statement audit.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.

MEASURE: Total Financial Losses (0e) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	30500	28000	20500	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	8304	0	16000		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A
<b>DEFINITION:</b> The aggregate amount of annual financial losses that have been reported, investigated, and verified as unrecoverable, as a result of the following: improper and/or erroneous payments or purchases (including late payment penalties); total regulatory fines and claims paid; and other financial losses. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Indicator <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS) <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> BEP Annual Financial Audit, the CFO Performance and Accountability Report <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.					

MEASURE: Total Regulatory Fines and Claims Paid (0e) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	30000	27500	20000	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	8304	0	16000		
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A
<b>DEFINITION:</b> The annual amount of all regulatory fines and tort claims paid by the BEP. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Indicator <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS) <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> BEP Annual Financial Audit, the CFO Performance and Accountability Report <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.					

## United States Mint

MEASURE: Absolute Value of Production Percent Deviation from Net-Pay (%) (0e) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL			6.5		
TARGET MET?			Y	N/A	N/A
<b>DEFINITION:</b> The absolute value of the percentage deviation of cumulative fiscal year total circulating coin production from cumulative fiscal year total net-pay less any inventory adjustment planned and agreed upon by the Federal Reserve Banks or needed to fulfill the United States Mint contingency stock requirements. Monthly production targets are set to smooth production over the fiscal year and ensure cumulative production is sufficient to satisfy Federal Reserve demand. <b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure <b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> United States Mint analysts receive Federal Reserve net-pay and inventory data reports by denomination. Coin production data is maintained in Oracle manufacturing system. <b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Results and data are captured and verified by United States Mint and Federal Reserve Bank analysts. <b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable <b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly <b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.					

MEASURE: Circulating On-Time Delivery					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	88
ACTUAL				99.8	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> On-time delivery to the Federal Reserve Banks (FRB) is the percentage of total scheduled orders shipped on time to the FRB. The United States Mint is responsible for providing the nation's coinage in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of commerce. To accomplish this mission, the United States Mint must supply coinage in the quantities and timelines specified by the FRB. The FRB is then responsible for distributing coinage to the commercial banking sector.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Each month, the Federal Reserve Bank (FRB) provides United States Mint analysts a report detailing the next month's requirements for coinage. Based on this report, United States Mint analysts establishes a shipment schedule that is captured in the Oracle manufacturing system. Changes to the schedule are only made when the FRB provides formal documentation of a requested adjustment to scheduled orders. Coin shipment data is maintained in the Oracle manufacturing system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Results and data are captured and verified by United States Mint analysts.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The United States Mint shipped 99.8 percent of scheduled orders on-time to the FRB in fiscal year 2010. This was a baseline year for the performance measure so no target was set. The bureau continuously monitors the circulating supply chain to ensure circulating coins are timely and accurately provided to the FRB when needed to enable commerce.</p>					

MEASURE: Conversion Costs Per 1000 CE (% deviation from target) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		0	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL		11	11		
TARGET MET?		N	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The United States Mint's costs vary by product, and the product mix has been variable over time. This makes it difficult to compare operating results from year to year. The coin equivalent calculation converts the production output to a common denominator based on the circulating quarter. Production costs, excluding metal and fabrication, are then divided by this standardized production level, thus resulting in conversion costs per 1,000 coin equivalents. This allows comparison of performance over time by negating the effects of changes in the product mix. Starting in fiscal year 2008, the target and results will be presented as a percentage difference from the baseline. By showing the target and performance as a percentage, this allows for the impact of fixed costs as they get spread over varying levels of production.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Conversion costs are pulled from financial reports from the accounting system. Production data is pulled from the enterprise resource planning system via queries and converted to coin equivalents</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> United States Mint analysts review the data pulled from the accounting system for reasonableness and accuracy on a monthly basis.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Monthly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.</p>					



**MEASURE: Conversion Costs per 1000 Coin Equivalents (\$) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	7.27	7.09	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	7.23	8.46			
TARGET MET?	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** Cost per 1000 coin equivalents is the cost of production (conversion cost) divided by the number of products made. Conversion costs are controllable costs within manufacturing. Those costs include manufacturing payroll, non-payroll, and depreciation costs. To determine the coin equivalents, an equivalency factor is assigned to each circulating denomination and numismatic product based on the resources it takes to make the product (indexed against the resources it takes to make one product, the quarter). The production quantity for each product is multiplied by the equivalency factor, resulting in a coin equivalent quantity.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Conversion costs are pulled from financial reports from the accounting system. Production data is pulled from the enterprise resource planning system via queries and converted to coin equivalents.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** United States Mint analysts review the data pulled from the accounting system for reasonableness and accuracy on a monthly basis.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.

**MEASURE: Customer Satisfaction Index (%) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	88	88
ACTUAL			88.3	86.1	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	

**DEFINITION:** The United States Mint conducts a quarterly Customer Satisfaction Measure (CSM) Tracking Survey among a random sample of active customers. The CSM Survey is intended to capture customer satisfaction with the United States Mint's performance as a coin supplier and the quality of specific products. The Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) is a single quantitative score of CSM Survey results.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** A professional survey consultant administers quarterly CSM survey to a random sample of active customers.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Results and data are captured and verified by the professional survey consultant.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** CSI was 86.1 percent in fiscal year 2010, below the target of 88.0 percent and down from the fiscal year 2009 result of 88.3 percent. Satisfaction with performance as a coin supplier declined through most of fiscal year 2010 due to product unavailability. About 77.0 percent of respondents reported high satisfaction with the United States Mint's performance in this category, down from 80.5 percent in fiscal year 2009. Customer satisfaction with product quality declined slightly from fiscal year 2009 but remained strong with 95.2 percent of respondents highly satisfied with the quality of products.

At the close of fiscal year 2010, the United States Mint began repositioning manufacturing and sales operations to offer popular numismatic products for sale in January 2011. Early release of core products will augment numismatic sales and customer satisfaction in fiscal year 2011.

**MEASURE: Employee Confidence in Protection (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	86	86	83	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	81	81	81		
TARGET MET?	N	N	N	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** Percentage of United States Mint employees reporting a favorable response to their confidence in the Protection Department to safeguard United States Mint assets and assets in the custody of the United States Mint.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Indicator

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Contractor administered Employee Pulse Check survey which assesses the attitudes of United States Mint employees concerning their work environment.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Results and data are captured and verified by a professional survey consultant.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.

MEASURE: Numismatic Customer Base (Units)(0t)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	0.9	1
ACTUAL			1.06	0.798	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Total number of unique purchasers over a fiscal year, where a unique purchaser consists of an account number and address/name without a prior purchase in the fiscal year.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Customer account data for each Numismatic product purchase is maintained on CW Direct, a real time system. Daily automatic queries of CW Direct populate a data warehouse. Contracted analysts identify the number of unique purchasers from this data warehouse based on United States Mint defined criteria.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Results and data are captured and verified by a professional data analyst consultant.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The numismatic customer based totaled 798,515 in fiscal year 2010, below the target of 976,000 and down from 1.06 million in fiscal year 2009. The United States Mint customer retention and acquisition performance declined because the bureau was unable to offer several core numismatic products for sale after January 2009. In particular, popular American Eagle numismatic products were unavailable because precious metal planchets were diverted to the bullion program in accordance with the United States Mint's statutory requirement to fulfill bullion demand. Economic conditions may have also curtailed customer spending on collectibles from prior years.</p> <p>By the close of fiscal year 2010, the United States Mint had sufficiently expanded gold and silver planchet supply to fulfill bullion demand and redirect a portion of blanks for numismatic production. Releasing popular gold and silver numismatic products will improve customer retention and acquisition as well as customer satisfaction in fiscal year 2011. The United States Mint will also work to identify and remedy inhibitors to customer satisfaction in the upcoming fiscal year.</p>					

MEASURE: Numismatic Net Margin (%) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL			9.4		
TARGET MET?			Y	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The return to Numismatic (non-bullion) operations, calculated as program net income divided by total program sales revenue.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Numismatic program net income and total revenue are included in the financial statements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.</p>					

MEASURE: Protection Cost Per Square Foot (\$) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	32.99	32.5	31.75	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	31.75	31.76	31.57	32.26	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Protection cost per square foot is the Protection Department's operating costs divided by the area of usable space in square feet that the United States Mint Police protects. Usable space is defined as 90 percent of total square footage. The year-to-date result is then annualized on a straight-line basis.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Protection costs are automatically pulled from the United States Mint's accounting system on a quarterly basis. The square footage is relatively stable and is monitored by the Protection Department and United States Mint management.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> United States Mint analysts review the data for reasonableness and accuracy on a quarterly basis.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.</p>					

MEASURE: Safety Incident Recordable Rate					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET				Baseline	3.34
ACTUAL				2.29	
TARGET MET?				Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Safety incident recordable rate measures the occurrence of work-related incidents involving death, lost time and restricted work, loss of consciousness, and medical treatment. This definition follows Part 1904 of Title 29, Code of Federal Register (29 CFR 1904).</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is captured in the Safety and Health Information Management System (SHIMS). SHIMS is used to record, track, and manage safety incidents and workers' compensation claims.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Results and data are captured and verified by United States Mint analysts.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The safety incident recordable rate fell to 2.29 in fiscal year 2010. This was a baseline year for the performance measure so no target was set.</p>					

MEASURE: Seigniorage per Dollar Issued (\$) (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	0.53	0.41
ACTUAL			0.55	0.49	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Seigniorage per total face value of circulated coinage shipped to Federal Reserve Banks.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Seigniorage and the total value of circulating coinage shipped to the Federal Reserve Banks are included in the financial statements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Seigniorage per dollar issued was \$0.49 in fiscal year 2010, below the performance target of \$0.53. Base metal expenses and the mix of circulating coin ordered by the FRB largely determine seigniorage per dollar issued performance. In fiscal year 2010, increasing metal costs and a shift in the mix of ordered coins toward lower denominations reduced seigniorage per dollar issued. Market prices of copper, nickel and zinc recovered from fiscal year 2009 lows and climbed back to prior fiscal year levels. This caused circulating Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) to increase relative to the value of shipments. The composition of circulating coins ordered by the FRB shifted to lower denomination coins. Higher shipments of one-cent and five-cent coins reduce seigniorage relative to the value of shipments because these coins are minted and issued at a loss.</p> <p>Metal market prices are expected to hold at higher levels as the global economy improves. To mitigate the challenge of rising metal prices, the United States Mint and the Department of the Treasury continue to work with Congress to examine options for changing the composition of circulating coinage to less expensive materials. This would improve future seigniorage per dollar issued performance.</p>					

**STRATEGIC GOAL:****PREVENTED TERRORISM AND PROMOTED THE NATION'S SECURITY THROUGH STRENGTHENED INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEMS****STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:** PRE-EMPTED AND NEUTRALIZED THREATS TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM AND ENHANCED U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY**OUTCOME:** REMOVED OR REDUCED THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY FROM TERRORISM, PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, DRUG TRAFFICKING AND OTHER CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ON THE PART OF ROGUE REGIMES, INDIVIDUALS, AND THEIR SUPPORT NETWORKS**Departmental Offices - S & E****MEASURE: Impact of TFI programs and activities**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>			Baseline	7.4	7.6
<b>ACTUAL</b>			7.81	8.1	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>			N	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure is used to assess TFI's impact as an organization through its sanctions, law enforcement, intelligence, regulatory and diplomatic programs to reduce threats to U.S. national security. The Office of Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes (TFFC) is responsible for the impact of policymaking, outreach and diplomacy. The Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is responsible for the impact of economic sanctions. The Office of Intelligence and Analysis is responsible for the impact of information and analysis used by Department decision makers. The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network is responsible for the impact of activities that create safer and more transparent financial systems.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** "An annual survey is conducted by OIA. Performance measure actuals are captured in PRS to determine the rating for FinCEN's performance measures. OFAC and TFFC provide documentation of activities, and use a self assessment rating, all information is kept by Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management (OSPPM) as the outside validator.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The OSPPM validates all final information. TFFC and OFAC provide a self-assessed rating and supporting documentation. OIA uses an internal (within the Department) customer satisfaction survey to achieve its performance rating. The survey and raw data are provided, and validated at the SECRET level to ensure reliability of the data. The Department reviews/validations, and gives suggestions and recommendations to each office, with a chance to provide additional information.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** TFI offices will continue to examining their measures to make sure they effectively cover a broad range of priorities.

**MEASURE: Increase the Number of Outreach Engagements with the Charitable and International Financial Communities (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	70	70	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	85	80			
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The effectiveness of the USG's efforts to combat terrorist financing and other forms of illicit finance depends upon the understanding and cooperation of the domestic and international private sector, particularly the financial services industries and other vulnerable sectors such as charities. The Office of Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes (TFFC) outreach engagements allows the USG to assess first-hand domestic and international Anti-money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) practices by governments and private institutions alike and engage with these entities to ensure that they safeguard themselves and the financial system against illicit activity. When followed-up consistently, this outreach has proven to be one of our most efficacious tools for changing behavior, raising awareness, and improving capacity among foreign governments as well as domestic and foreign institutions with gaps in their AML/CFT programs.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Data collected by the Department of Treasury's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence (TFI); Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes (TFFC).

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Department of the Treasury's TFI data based on outreach events.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.

**MEASURE: Number of Countries that are Assessed for Compliance with the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) 40+9 Recommendations (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	6	12	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	6	12			
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** TFFC is the lead Treasury component and representative to the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). As such, TFFC is responsible for leading international efforts to identify and close money laundering and terrorist financing vulnerabilities in the international financial system, and to ensure that countries throughout the world comply with international anti-money laundering/counter-terrorist financing standards. In concert with the international community, Treasury is deploying a three-prong strategy that 1) objectively assesses all countries against the FATF 40+9, 2) provides capacity-building assistance for key countries in need and 3) isolates and punishes those countries and institutions that facilitate terrorist financing. TFI is working with international bodies like FATF, IMF (International Monetary Fund) and World Bank to ensure compliance. The IMF and World Bank have adopted the FATF 40+9 and they use those standards to assess countries for compliance.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Data collected by the Department of Treasury's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence (TFI); Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes (TFFC).

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** TFFC data undergoes multiple quality checks to ensure accuracy.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:**

MEASURE: Number of Open Civil Penalty Cases that are Resolved within the Statute of Limitations Period (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	85	120	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	296	233			
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Timely imposition of civil penalties plays a major role in deterring and appropriately punishing violations of sanctions by U.S. persons. OFAC receives a very high volume of law enforcement referrals regarding potential violations. It is devising strategies to reduce the backlog of civil penalty and enforcement actions and increase efficiency in drafting warning and cautionary letters, assessing penalties, negotiating penalty resolutions and processing monetary penalties.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Penalty case information is recorded in OFAC's main Oracle database (FACDB). That database has a Report function that allows us to query the database and generate reports according to a number of variables such as status, date of action, etc. Information generated from these reports is used to calculate the number of cases that were closed during a given time frame. Additionally, we have implemented a process to check a representative sampling of the closed cases to verify that the data within the system matches our hard copy records.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The Assistant Director for Civil Penalties Cases reviews every case that is closed. Cases that involve a settlement, an assessment, or penalty come under additional review by OFAC's Chief Counsel's Office. Cases that result in settlement or an assessment or penalty are also posted on OFAC's public website.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.</p>					

## Treasury Forfeiture Fund

MEASURE: Percent of Forfeited Cash Proceeds Resulting from High-Impact Cases (%) (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	75	75	75	75	80
ACTUAL	84.18	86.91	87.65	93.11	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> A "high impact case" is a case, based on designation or executive order, resulting in a cash forfeiture equal to or greater than \$100,000. This measure is calculated by dividing the amount of cash forfeited in amounts equal to or greater than \$100,000 (as measured by individual deposits that are equal to or greater than \$100,000) divided by the total amount of cash forfeitures to the Fund (as of the end of the year, or other reporting period.)</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Treasury Forfeiture Fund is able to capture this data on a monthly basis and the source of the data is the Detailed Collection Report (DCR).</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The source of the data that supports our performance calculation comes from the general ledger of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund which data is audited annually pursuant to our financial statement audit. Therefore, the annual financial statement audit process serves to "verify and validate" the data used to support our performance measure on an annual basis.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> With an emphasis on high-impact forfeitures by Treasury Forfeiture Fund management, our member law enforcement bureaus work hard to meet the target of 75 percent, and they have done so for the past several years. We anticipate this same excellent level of performance for fiscal year 2011.</p>					

## OUTCOME: SAFER AND MORE TRANSPARENT U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEMS

## Financial Crimes Enforcement Network

## MEASURE: Average Time to Process Enforcement Matters (in years) (E)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	1	1	1	1	1
ACTUAL	1.1	0.7	1	0.8	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The average time to process an enforcement matter is determined from the date a case is referred from the Office of Compliance to the date the charging (or action) letter is issued.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The data for this measure is captured through an internal database that stores enforcement matters. The database records the date cases are received, the analyst assigned, the statute of limitations date, and the date each case was closed.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The enforcement matters are entered into the automated log and evaluated to determine whether there is enforcement potential through a civil monetary penalty or otherwise. FinCEN has established time management guidelines to reduce the average processing time for civil penalty cases.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN met its target for the average time to process enforcement matters in one year with an average time of 0.8 year. FinCEN will continue to actively manage casework to meet future targets.

## MEASURE: Cost Per BSA form E-Filed (E)

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	Discontinued
ACTUAL	0.14	0.13	0.16	0.1	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A

**DEFINITION:** This measure tracks the government reoccurring operations and maintenance costs associated with E-Filing against the number of BSA forms E-Filed. As more financial institutions E-File, it is anticipated that the cost per BSA form E-Filed will decrease.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** E-Filing cost records and BSA Direct E-Filing Records.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Results can be verified against E-Filing operations and maintenance cost records and BSA Direct E-Filing records.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, the cost per form e-filed was .10. FinCEN met its target of 0.15. FinCEN discontinued this measure as the E-Filing system is rolling into the BSA IT Mod System. Therefore, the costs for a separate E-Filing system cannot be maintained any longer.

**MEASURE: Median time taken from date of receipt of Financial Institution Hotline Tip SARs to transmittal of the information to law enforcement or the intelligence community (E)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	25	16	15	5	5
ACTUAL	7	3	3	2	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The purpose of the Financial Institution Hotline Tip is to facilitate the transmission of potential terrorism-related activity to law enforcement in a more expeditious manner than through the normal manual or electronic filing of a Suspicious Activity Report. The median time taken to transmit the information from a Financial Institution Hotline Tip SAR will be computed using the Julian date of the Hotline Tip receipt and the transmittal date. Statistical data for fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 is not available as the Julian dates found on SARs was not tracked and converted to calendar dates for comparison with referral dates in the current management information system.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Date of receipt of Hotline Tip and the date of referral in an analytical product, as recorded in the FinCEN Database. Manual records, spreadsheets and/or Access databases will be maintained to record the dates for all Hotline Tips referred.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Verification of receipt and report dates and medians can be accomplished using the FinCEN Database, paper and/or other electronic records developed to record dates.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN surpassed its target of 5 days with a median time of 2 days. FinCEN will continue to process Hotline Tips in an expeditious manner so that it continue to meet targets.

**MEASURE: Number of Largest BSA Report Filers Using E-Filing (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	302	374	454	534	569
ACTUAL	297	386	486	542	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** FinCEN has identified the 650 largest filers of Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) reports and has established the goal of assisting and encouraging members of this group who are not already using the BSA Direct E-filing system to begin E-filing reports. E-filing by this group is seen as a means of achieving FinCEN's long-term goal.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** A list compiled and maintained in the Office of BSA Data Services.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Magnitude of report filing and method of filing can be checked against records at the IRS Detroit Computing Center and automated records from the BSA Direct E-Filing system.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN surpassed its target of 534 with 542 largest BSA report filers using E-Filing. To increase the number of largest BSA report filers using E-filing, FinCEN plans to conduct additional, targeted outreach and marketing of the BSA E-Filing System to meet future targets.

**MEASURE: Number of Users Directly Accessing BSA Data (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	6000	8000	10000	10000	10000
ACTUAL	8402	9649	10072	11527	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of individuals with current passwords who have accessed the Bank Secrecy Act data through the Secure Outreach network in the past 90 days.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The list can be checked through the Profile function at the Detroit Computing Center

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The system generates a list of users.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN surpassed its target of 10,000 with 11,527 users directly accessing BSA data. FinCEN will continue its efforts to support law enforcement related to access to the BSA data.



**MEASURE: Percentage of Bank Examinations Conducted by the Federal Banking Agencies Indicating a Systemic Failure of the Anti-Money Laundering Program Rule (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	Baseline	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.2
<b>ACTUAL</b>	5.2	2.5	2.1	1.6	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percentage of bank examinations that reveal the existence of systemic compliance failure (i.e., demonstrated by cited violations of the anti-money laundering program rule) is a meaningful measure because it provides an intermediate assessment of the effectiveness of the efforts of the Regulatory Policy and Programs Division's three offices in providing policy guidance and taking formal and informal compliance and enforcement actions to increase financial industry compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act. At the present time, the only financial sector from which we are receiving useful data to quantify this measure is the banking sector supervised and examined for Bank Secrecy Act compliance by the Federal Banking Agencies.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Federal Banking Agencies aggregated information provided pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding executed in 2004 with FinCEN.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** This information can be validated from the quarterly aggregate reports provided to FinCEN by each agency pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding of 2004. Under the terms of the MOU, the FBAs have 45 days from the end of a quarter to submit their data to FinCEN. Since quarterly results must be calculated within 30 days of the end of a quarter, we must use data from the prior quarter. Due to this lag in data, the year-end figure is based on the three fiscal year 2009 quarters available at the fiscal year-end.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, the percentage of banking institutions cited for program failures during examinations was significantly below the 5.2 percent indicator level, only 1.6 percent were cited. This is primarily attributable to greater consistency among bank regulators in citing instances of program failures. FinCEN will continue to collaborate with the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council and conduct outreach to the banking industry.

**MEASURE: Percentage of Complex Analytic Work Completed by FinCEN Analysts (Ot)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	38	38	39	39	40
<b>ACTUAL</b>	33	27	44	50	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	N	N	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Comparison of total number of work products generated versus those products that required complex analysis, graphical display of data relationships, analytical findings, comments and recommendations. "Complex" as used in this measure refers to the application of analytic resources to assist law enforcement clients in perfecting investigations that they consider significant due to geographic scope, large data sets, use of multiple or little understood money laundering methodologies or involving financial relationships, products or systems not adequately understood by investigators.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The FinCEN database currently tracks assignments and includes a complexity ranking on each assignment. Management reports can be generated outlining the number of such projects and the number of reports prepared and distributed on an annual basis.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Production levels can be verified by a review of the paper or electronic file copies of analytical reports generated.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN surpassed its target of 39 percent with 50 percent of complex analytical products completed by FinCEN analysts. FinCEN will continue its efforts to reduce the number of non-complex projects undertaken and increase the number of complex cases produced.

MEASURE: Percentage of Customers Satisfied with Direct Access to BSA (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	81	74	74
ACTUAL		81	74	74	
TARGET MET?		Y	N	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure tracks FinCEN's progress toward serving the number of law enforcement and regulatory agency users accessing BSA information. These technologies (WebCBRS and Outreach Secure) allow authorized persons to more readily access BSA information and better enable them to conduct investigations more efficiently and effectively.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Data are captured via a survey.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN met its target with a rating of 74 percent of its customers satisfied with directly accessing the BSA. FinCEN will continue to provide timely and effective support to users of WEBCBRS and secure outreach to help ensure customer satisfaction.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Customers Satisfied with the BSA E-Filing (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	90	92
ACTUAL	94	93	94	96	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure assesses the customer satisfaction with BSA E-Filing. Feedback will be used to improve the system and customize it for user populations. The measure is meaningful because it tracks the satisfaction with technology used to facilitate analysis of BSA information.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Active status user survey</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Survey information is captured in a database.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The fiscal year 2010 target was to maintain at least a 90 percent satisfaction level, and FinCEN exceeded its target with 96 percent. FinCEN attributes this a result of continued outreach, the implementation of a more industry-friendly forms submission software (Adobe), and the receipt/acknowledgements and data validations specific to Suspicious Activity Reports now available to the filing community. FinCEN will continue outreach to E-Filers and ensure the technology supports to the demand to achieve future targets.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Domestic Law Enforcement and Foreign Financial Intelligence Units Finding FinCEN's Analytical Reports Highly Valuable					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	78	79	80	81	80
ACTUAL	82	83	81	80	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The percentage of customers (domestic law enforcement and foreign financial intelligence units) finding FinCEN's analytical reports highly valuable. This is a composite measure compiled from survey results. The survey looks at the impact of FinCEN's analysis products, such as whether the product was used to open a new investigation, whether it generated new leads, or whether it provided information previously unknown.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Annual Surveys</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail and/or telephone surveys of FinCEN's customers in the investigative/intelligence community, financial community and inhouse customers. A comprehensive report and presentation was provided at the conclusion of the survey.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, 80 percent of the respondents rated the analytic products as highly valuable. FinCEN narrowly missed its target of 81 percent. FinCEN attributes this to a need to enhance communication with and understanding of law enforcement partners' needs. FinCEN has developed a strategy to increase communication with law enforcement partners and will continue efforts to ensure its products and services meet those needs.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Federal and State Regulatory Agencies with Memoranda of Understanding/Information Sharing Agreements (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	45	46	50
ACTUAL		41	43	46	
TARGET MET?		Y	N	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This measure tracks the percentage of the examining universe that FinCEN supports and oversees. Oversight is established pursuant to Memoranda of Understanding Agreements established with federal and state regulators. The examining universe is the number of federal and state regulators with constituents subject to BSA rules. This measure is meaningful because it tracks our progress toward improving our ability to consistently examine industry compliance.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Office of Compliance maintained list of Memoranda of Understanding agreements with targeted regulators and the list of the examining universe.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> List can be checked against signed Memoranda of Understanding agreements in files.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In 2010, FinCEN met its target of 46 percent of federal and state regulatory agencies with MOU/information sharing agreements. FinCEN achieved its target by finalizing four additional MOUs with state regulatory agencies. FinCEN will continue collaborating with state insurance agencies and other regulatory agencies to sign additional agreements to meet future targets.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of FinCEN's Compliance MOU Holders Finding FinCEN's Information Exchange Valuable to Improve the BSA Consistency and Compliance of the Financial System (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET		Baseline	66	68	86
ACTUAL		64	82	86	
TARGET MET?		Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This is a composite measure that examines the survey responses of compliance MOU holders. The questions and measure were designed to track the outcome of improved BSA consistency and compliance of the financial system.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Data are captured via survey.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010 FinCEN surpassed its target of 68 percent rating the information exchange valuable with 86 percent. FinCEN attributes a portion of this success to the distribution of analytic information to the MOU holders throughout the fiscal year. To achieve future targets, FinCEN will continue to facilitate routine discussions with the MOU holders.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of FinCEN's Regulatory Resource Center Customers Rating the Guidance Received as Understandable (Oe)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	90	90	90	90	90
ACTUAL	91	94	94	92	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The percentage of financial institution customers who contact the Resource Center and respond to a survey, who find the information/response/guidance received was understandable. Providing guidance that is understandable is a desired result and is critical for financial institutions to establish programs that comply with the BSA.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Resource Center customer records and survey data.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Results and data will be captured and verified by a professional survey consultant.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The fiscal year 2010 goal was to maintain a 90 percent satisfaction level for customers rating the guidance as 'understandable,' and FinCEN surpassed its goal with 92 percent. FinCEN attained this success by responding timely (within 24 hours of the inquiry), providing a high level of service. In order to achieve future targets, FinCEN will continue to make guidance available on the Internet, accept and analyze customer feedback, and conduct surveys to measure customer satisfaction.</p>					

**MEASURE: Percentage of Private Industry or Financial Institution Customers Finding FinCEN's Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) Products Highly Valuable (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	72	74	76	75	78
ACTUAL	71	75	73	82	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	N	Y	

**DEFINITION:** This measure tracks the percentage of customers that find FinCEN's SAR activity review products useful. The measure is a composite measure compiled from survey results. The surveys look at whether regulated industries find the products useful to improving their BSA/anti-money laundering programs and whether the products provide useful guidance on filing requirements.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Annual Surveys

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail and/or telephone surveys of FinCEN's customers in the investigative/intelligence community, financial community and inhouse customers. A comprehensive report and presentation was provided at the conclusion of the survey.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Annually

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, 82 percent of private industry or financial institution customers found FinCEN's SAR Activity Review products highly valuable. This performance exceeded the fiscal year 2010 target of 75 percent. FinCEN was able to achieve this performance by responding to feedback from SAR Activity Review readers, including through the introduction of an annual issue-specific edition of the SAR Activity Review: Trends, Tips, and Issues. To achieve future targets, FinCEN will continue to seek feedback from financial institutions and regulatory and law enforcement partners to identify and implement their suggestions for further enhancing these publications.

**MEASURE: Share of Bank Secrecy Act Filings Submitted Electronically (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	58	63	67	71	73
ACTUAL	59	71	82	83	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The number of Bank Secrecy Act filings submitted via the web-based system, as a percent of the total filings.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Reports are generated weekly by the PACS contractor based on automated tracking

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Checked against reports from the Detroit Computing Center

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN surpassed its target of 71 percent with 83 percent of BSA filings E-Filed. To meet the target FinCEN continued its outreach efforts to those institutions still submitting paper BSA reports.

**MEASURE: The Percent of Countries/Jurisdictions Connected to the Egmont Secure Web with in One Year of Egmont Membership (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	98	98	98	98	98
ACTUAL	98	98	99	99	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The percent of Egmont Financial Intelligence Unit members connected to the Egmont Secure Web. The goal is to maintain a 98 percent user rate. As new members are admitted to Egmont, we will work to connect them to the Egmont Secure Web.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Egmont Member data base and Egmont Secure Web User database.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Compare the list of Egmont Secure Web Users to the list of Egmont members.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** In fiscal year 2010, FinCEN reached a level of 99 percent of countries/jurisdictions connected to the Egmont Secure Web and surpassed its target of 98 percent. To continue to meet this target, FinCEN will work to ensure continued connectivity for countries that have access to the Egmont Secure Web and will connect new Egmont Group members as soon after admission as possible.

**STRATEGIC GOAL:****MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE****STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:** ENABLED AND EFFECTIVE TREASURY DEPARTMENT**OUTCOME:** A CITIZEN-CENTERED, RESULTS-ORIENTED AND STRATEGICALLY ALIGNED ORGANIZATION**Departmental Offices - S & E****MEASURE: Complete Investigations of EEO Complaints within 180 days (%) (0e)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	50	50	50	65	65
<b>ACTUAL</b>	51.6	56	65	86	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The average time it takes to complete investigations of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints.**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The Annual Federal EEO Statistical Report of Discrimination Complaints and the Department's Complaint Tracking System are the primary sources of data.**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Data is reviewed quarterly to ensure accuracy.**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** The Office of Civil Rights and Diversity have been successful in meeting all established goals in fiscal year 2010. We accredit this to Treasury Service Level Standards developed to monitor specific formal complaint processes, including investigations, to ensure TCC staff is efficiently processing cases. Service Level Standards are submitted quarterly to the Office of Civil Rights and Diversity for review. This practice will continue in fiscal year 2011. No change in our established goals for fiscal year 2011-2012 for timely investigations (65 percent).**MEASURE: Injury and Illness Rate Treasurywide-including DO (0e) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	2.6	1.4	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
<b>ACTUAL</b>	1				
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y		N/A	N/A	N/A

**DEFINITION:** The number of reported work-related injuries and illnesses Treasury-wide.**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Safety and Health Information Management System**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Data are collected from the Safety and Health Information Management system**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.

MEASURE: Percent of Complainants Informally Contacting EEO (for the Purposes of Seeking Counseling or Filing a Complaint) Who Participate in the ADR Process (%) (0e)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	30	30	30	35	40
ACTUAL	29	45	35	51	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) contact means an instance where an EEO Counselor or an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Intake Officer performs the counseling duties described in Chapter 2 of MD 110 (Government-wide managing directive on EEO). This is the same information which is reported in Part I, Section D of 462 Report (Government-wide EEO report). Participation means both parties agree to enter the ADR process.					
<b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure					
<b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Treasury's automated Complaint Tracking System.					
<b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Data is periodically reviewed to ensure accuracy.					
<b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable					
<b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly					
<b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The Office of Civil Rights and Diversity have been successful in meeting all established goals in fiscal year 2010. Our bureaus actively promote the benefits of utilizing ADR to resolve disputes and promote the use of conflict resolution through training and special programs (Treasury Dispute Prevention Week and Treasury Shared Neutrals Program). To further the support the use of ADR, Treasury issued an ADR Policy in fiscal year 2010, which requires management participation when ADR has been elected. We will be increasing our goal for ADR participation for fiscal year 2011-2012 (45 percent).					

## Treasury Franchise Fund

MEASURE: Customer Satisfaction Index - Financial Management Administrative Support Services (%) (0e)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	74	80	80	80	80
ACTUAL	0	97	89	81	
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Shared service customers satisfaction level with service offerings, service level competence and responsiveness and overall value.					
<b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure					
<b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Results are submitted by the management of each franchise business and are obtained from internal or external customer satisfaction reviews.					
<b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Customer satisfaction processes and results for the Franchise businesses are reviewed by the Fund's management to ensure objectivity.					
<b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable					
<b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Annually					
<b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Administrative Services established an outcome measure and target of 80 percent to determine performance in satisfying the needs of customer agencies. Annually, The Fund conducts a customer satisfaction survey to assess performance within all service lines. For fiscal year 2010, two thirds of The Fund's customers responded to the survey, and an overall customer satisfaction rating of 81 percent was achieved. In fiscal year 2011, The Fund will conduct an annual survey and will continue to strive to increase customer satisfaction.					

MEASURE: Operating Expenses as a Percentage of Revenue — Consolidated/Integrated Administrative Management (%) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	12	12	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	4.3	17.7			
TARGET MET?	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>DEFINITION:</b> The Franchise Fund will either maintain or decrease their operating (administrative) expenses as a percentage of revenue year to year.					
<b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure					
<b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system. Measure is calculated as Operating Expenses divided by Total Revenue.					
<b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Operating Expenses are part of the financial statements.					
<b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable					
<b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly					
<b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.					

MEASURE: Operating Expenses as a Percentage of Revenue — Financial Systems, Consulting and Training (%) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]						
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	
TARGET	12	12	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued	
ACTUAL	6.7	6.49				
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The Franchise Fund will either maintain or decrease their operating (administrative) expenses as a percentage of revenue year to year.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system. Measure is calculated as Operating Expenses divided by Total Revenue.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Operating Expenses are part of the financial statements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.</p>						

MEASURE: Operating Expenses as a Percentage of Revenue — Financial Management Administrative Support (%) (E)						
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	
TARGET	12	12	12	12	Discontinued	
ACTUAL	15.1	3.6	4.72	6		
TARGET MET?	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The Franchise Fund will either maintain or decrease their operating (administrative) expenses as a percentage of revenue year to year.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system. Measure is calculated as Operating Expenses divided by Total Revenue.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Operating Expenses are part of the financial statements.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The actual fiscal year 10 Operating Expense Percentage for TFF was below the target. In fiscal year 2011 TFF plans to discontinue this measure and create a new measure for operating expense percentage based on a new methodology. During the preparation of the fiscal year 2012 Congressional Justification, the calculation for the operating percentage was reassessed. We now feel that the operating percentage would be more fairly presented expressed as a percentage of total expenses instead of total revenue. This measure will be discontinued.</p>						

## OUTCOME: EXCEPTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

### Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Number of Material Weaknesses (Significant Management Problems Identified by GAO, the IGs and/or the Bureaus) Closed (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]						
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	
TARGET	1	3	0	Discontinued	Discontinued	
ACTUAL	0	2	0			
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Treasury seeks to reduce and eventually eliminate the material weaknesses that currently exist within Treasury, while simultaneously taking actions which will serve to prevent new material weaknesses. Material weaknesses are significant problems with an organization's internal controls, systems' reliability, controls on waste, fraud or abuse, mission performance, and compliance with laws and regulations.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Identified by the Government Accountability Office, Treasury's Inspectors General, and/or Treasury bureaus.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Certification statement issued by head of bureau. Independent review to validate material weaknesses has been corrected.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2010.</p>						

**MEASURE: Percentage of timely completed Planned Corrective Actions (PCAs) (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	85	85	85	87.5	90
ACTUAL	71.7	82.5	85.6	88.4	
TARGET MET?	N	N	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Percentage of total PCAs timely completed to total PCAs due for the quarter. Includes PCAs addressing recommendations from GAO, OIG, TIGTA, and SIGTARP.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The data are captured in the JAMES database of updates provided by PCA owners.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Data will be verified and validated by evaluation performed by DCFO, staff, and checked with bureaus.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** DO met the target of timely completion of PCAs for fiscal year 2010 of 87.5 percent. Throughout fiscal year 2011, DCFO will monitor the bureaus'/offices' progress on the timely completion of PCAs. In addition, DCFO will increase the target completion rate to 90 percent and schedule regular meetings to provide valuable information on various aspects of audit follow-up and the JAMES system to the Audit Follow-up Coordinators. Finally, we will continually provide senior level management with the results of the bureaus'/offices' audit follow-up activity on a regular basis.

**Inspector General for Tax Administration****MEASURE: Percentage of Audit Products Delivered when Promised to Stakeholders (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	Baseline	60	65	65	70
ACTUAL	68	65	81	76	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The likelihood that our products will be used is enhanced if they are delivered when needed to support Congressional and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) decision making. To determine whether our products are timely, TIGTA tracks the percentage of our products that are delivered on or before the day we committed to (Contract date) because it is critical that our work be done on time for it to be used by the IRS or the Congress.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** Information regarding Contract dates and actual delivery dates for audits is maintained on the TCMIS. MIS Coordinators in the Office of Audit's Operating/Business Units monitor overall data accuracy and maintain secure controls over key milestone and "Contract" data entries.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Summary data used for purposes of reporting on this measure are extracted, from the Office of Audit's TeamCentral Management Information System (TCMIS), analyzed and summarized by personnel in our Office of Management and Policy. A qualified staff member independent of the process validates the progress related statistics.  
TCMIS data are reviewed and validated monthly by MIS Coordinators, Audit Managers and Directors.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** For fiscal year 2011, TIGTA OA will continue to monitor the execution of its audit programs to identify additional ways to deliver timely audit products to stakeholders. TIGTA plans for fiscal year 2011 work to match its fiscal year 2010 results. The goal for fiscal year 2011 is targeted for 70 percent.



**MEASURE: Percentage of Recommendations Made that Have Been Implemented (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	Baseline	80	83	83	85
<b>ACTUAL</b>	90	85	91	95	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** The Office of Audit (OA) makes recommendations designed to improve administration of the Federal tax system. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) must implement these recommendations in order for our work to produce financial or non-financial benefits. This measure assesses our effect on improving the IRS's accountability, operations, and services. Because the IRS needs time to act on recommendations, we track the percentage of recommendations that we made four years ago that have since been implemented, rather than the results of our activities, during the fiscal year in which the recommendations are made. This time frame is used because four years is the point at which TIGTA-OA believes that if a recommendation has not been implemented, it is not likely to be.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The IRS records recommendations in the Department's JAMES as they are issued. Summary data regarding the status of the IRS's corrective actions taken in response to our recommendations are provided to the Office of Audit via JAMES reports. Our Office of Management and Policy monitors implementation of recommendations as the IRS submits updated information to the JAMES.

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Through a formal process, each audit team identifies the number of recommendations included in each report and the IRS enters the findings and corresponding recommendations into the Department of the Treasury's (the Department) Joint Audit Management Enterprise System (JAMES). The database is updated frequently. TIGTA's Office of Management and Policy receives summary data and monitors the data regularly to make sure the recommendations reported as implemented have been accurately recorded, as well as to accumulate data in regard to progress in meeting this measure. A qualified staff member independent of the process validates the progress related statistics.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** For fiscal year 2011, TIGTA OA will continue to monitor the percentage of recommendations implemented. Because the IRS is responsible for implementing the recommendations and not TIGTA, the achievement of this goal depends on IRS management. Therefore, only an incremental increase has been established for fiscal year 2011. The goal for fiscal year 2011 is targeted for 85 percent.

**MEASURE: Percentage of Results from Investigative Activities (Oe)**

	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>TARGET</b>	73	76	78	79	80
<b>ACTUAL</b>	81	78	83	87	
<b>TARGET MET?</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**DEFINITION:** Investigative reports resulting in Criminal, Civil or Administrative adjudication or the identification of matters of security or investigative interest.

**INDICATOR TYPE:** Measure

**DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:** The total number of investigative cases closed along with the total number of completed Criminal, Civil and Administrative Actions is extracted from the Performance and Results Information System (PARIS).

**DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:** Reports of Investigation and PARIS are reviewed for consistency by Special Agents in Charge prior to closing the investigation. Additionally, independent reviews are conducted periodically of each field office where a sample of closed investigations are quality reviewed by the Operations Division Inspection Team to ensure accuracy of the PARIS data. Periodic tests of PARIS data are also conducted to ensure accuracy.

**DATA ACCURACY:** Reasonable

**DATA FREQUENCY:** Quarterly

**FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:** For fiscal year 2011, TIGTA OI will continue to measure performance consistency with fiscal year 2010 criteria and adjust its performance measures accordingly. The goal for fiscal year 2011 is targeted for 80 percent.

## Office of Inspector General

MEASURE: Number of Completed Audit Products (Ot)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	56	56	60	62	62
ACTUAL	64	64	68	68	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Audits, attestation engagements, and evaluations: (1) promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Treasury programs and operations; (2) prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in those programs and operations; (3) keep the Secretary and the Congress fully informed; and (4) help the Federal government to be accountable to the public.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> OIG audits, attestation engagements, and evaluations result in sequentially numbered written products.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Official audit files support the performance data.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OIG met the target for this measure in fiscal year 2010. It is anticipated that with the additional staff brought on in fiscal year 2010 and 2011, OIG will continue to meet the audit products completion target.</p>					

MEASURE: Number of Investigations Referred for Criminal Prosecution, Civil Litigation or Corrective Administrative Action. (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2009]					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	105	105	Discontinued	Discontinued	Discontinued
ACTUAL	188	93			
TARGET MET?	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> In order to protect the integrity and efficiency of Treasury programs it is important that findings of criminal or civil misconduct be referred to the Justice Department, state and/or local governments for prosecution and litigation in a timely manner. Criminal and civil convictions have a greater impact and carry a greater deterrent effect when they are prosecuted expeditiously. Some investigations will identify violations of the Ethical Standards of conduct, Federal Acquisition Regulations, or other administrative standards, which do not rise to the level of criminal or civil prosecution. In these cases it is important that OIG findings are reported to the bureau or office in a timely manner to allow them to take administrative action against the individuals engaging in misconduct.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> This data will be retrieved from the Investigations case management system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> All case files from fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2009 will be reviewed to ensure that the case data is correct and supported by documentation.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> This measure was discontinued in fiscal year 2009.</p>					

MEASURE: Percent of Statutory Audits Completed by the Required Date (E)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET	100	100	100	100	100
ACTUAL	100	100	100	50	
TARGET MET?	Y	Y	Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Legislation mandating certain audit work generally prescribes, or authorizes OMB to prescribe, the required completion date for recurring audits and evaluations, such as those for annual audited financial statements. For other types of mandated audit work, such as a Material Loss Review (MLR) of a failed financial institution, the legislation generally prescribes a time frame to issue a report six months for an MLR, as an example) from the date of an event that triggers the audit.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The date OIG issues an audit, attestation engagement, or evaluation report is printed on the cover. The required dates may vary each year and are specified in different legislation.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Official audit files and the dates on the reports themselves support the performance data.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> The increased number of financial institution failures resulted in significant additional workload for OIG beyond what could be accomplished with existing resources at the time. OIG is legislatively required to conduct, and complete within six months, material loss reviews (MLRs) of any Treasury-regulated failed bank meeting defined loss thresholds. OIG recognized that the volume of MLR work would likely prevent meeting the 100 percent target, and accordingly notified Congress. OIG has been actively recruiting additional audit staff, and expects to once again accomplish all statutory audits on time.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage (%) of All Cases Closed During Fiscal Year that were Referred for Criminal/Civil Prosecution or Treasury Administrative Action					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	70	70
ACTUAL			100	93	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> In order to protect the integrity and efficiency of Treasury programs it is important that findings of criminal or civil misconduct be referred to the Justice Department, state and/or local governments for prosecution and litigation in a timely manner. Criminal and civil convictions have a greater impact and carry a greater deterrent effect when they are prosecuted expeditiously. Some investigations will identify violations of the Ethical Standards of conduct, Federal Acquisition Regulations, or other administrative standards, which do not rise to the level of criminal or civil prosecution. In these cases it is important that OIG findings are reported to the bureau or office in a timely manner to allow them to take administrative action against the individuals engaging in misconduct.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> This data will be retrieved from the Investigations case management system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> All case files will be reviewed to ensure that the case data is correct and supported by documentation.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OIG exceeded this target in fiscal year 2010. OIG will likely revise the investigative measures to one more meaningful measure to more accurately measure fiscal year 2011 investigative performance. OIG will continue to investigate cases and work diligently to bring them to an appropriate resolution.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage (%) of All Cases that were Accepted by Prosecutors, Referred for Agency Action, or Closed During the Fiscal Year and were Completed within 18 Months of Case Initiation					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	70	70
ACTUAL			92	66	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> In order to protect the integrity and efficiency of Treasury programs it is important that findings of criminal or civil misconduct be referred to the Justice Department, state and/or local governments for prosecution and litigation in a timely manner. Criminal and civil convictions have a greater impact and carry a greater deterrent effect when they are prosecuted expeditiously. Some investigations will identify violations of the Ethical Standards of conduct, Federal Acquisition Regulations, or other administrative standards, which do not rise to the level of criminal or civil prosecution. In these cases it is important that OIG findings are reported to the bureau or office in a timely manner to allow them to take administrative action against the individuals engaging in misconduct.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> This data will be retrieved from the Investigations case management system.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> All case files will be reviewed to ensure that the case data is correct and supported by documentation.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> OIG missed this target in fiscal year 2010, and has been evaluating the reliability of the measure and whether it is accurate, and meaningful. As stated previously, OIG leadership will likely revise the investigative measures to one more meaningful measure, OIG will continue to aggressively investigate Treasury cases to prevent fraud, waste and abuse in a timely manner.</p>					

## Special IG for TARP

MEASURE: Congressional Requests for Testimony Completed (Ot)(Units)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	4	4
ACTUAL			9	7	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The number of testimonies that SIGTARP provides to Congress.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> Capture - SIGTARP lists all of their testimonies to date on <a href="http://www.sig tarp.gov/reports.shtml">http://www.sig tarp.gov/reports.shtml</a>.</p> <p><b>SOURCE - UNDETERMINED.</b></p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> SIGTARP's staff monitors and records the number of testimonies completed. This data is published on SIGTARP's website and is validated through Congressional records.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> SIGTARP anticipates that Congress will continue to have interest in SIGTARP's work and will continue to requests testimonies.</p>					

MEASURE: Number of Completed Audit Products (Ot)(Units)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	12	12
ACTUAL			3	9	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Completed audit products includes audit reports that promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP).</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> SIGTARP audit reports are posted on <a href="http://www.sig tarp.gov/reports.shtml">http://www.sig tarp.gov/reports.shtml</a>.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Official audit files support the performance data.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010, the Audit Division was not fully staffed and the number of completed audit products tripled. The Audit Division has aggressively recruited and increased their staff as they continue to work on congressional requested audit products. In fiscal year 2011, the Audit Division will begin to issue evaluation products in addition to the audit products.</p>					

MEASURE: Percent of Recommendations Implemented (Oe) (%)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	70	70
ACTUAL			100	43	
TARGET MET?			Y	N	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> SIGTARP makes recommendations to promote the efficiency and effectiveness of TARP management. The Office of Financial Stability (OFS) must implement these recommendations in order for SIGTARP's work to produce financial or non-financial benefits. This measure tracks EESA's implementation of SIGTARP recommendations.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> SIGTARP inputs their recommendations into the Joint Management Enterprise System (JAMES). The Office of Financial Stability inputs the findings and corresponding recommendations into JAMES, and SIGTARP uses the information in JAMES to track whether or not their recommendations have been implemented. The data for this measure is stored in JAMES.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Audit Division staff reviews JAMES data on recommendation status and confirms the status with the audit team. The Audit Division staff monitors the data regularly to make sure the recommendations reported as implemented have been accurately recorded, as well as to accumulate data in regard to progress in meeting this measure. A qualified staff member independent of the process validates the progress related statistics.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> In fiscal year 2010 SIGTARP anticipated a higher implementation rate by OFS, but it was not fully met. OFS is working on implementing the recommendations and there are planned corrective action dates that extend into fiscal year 2011. SIGTARP will continue to make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of TARP and anticipates that OFS will continue to implement the majority of SIGTARP's recommendations. SIGTARP will continue to monitor the implementation of these recommendations and evaluate the length of time for implementation.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Hotline Complaints Referred for Investigation or to OFS within 14 days of Receipt (E) (%)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	60	65
ACTUAL			77	74	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This metric tracks the time taken to resolve citizen complaints to SIGTARP's Investigations Division's hotline.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The data originates from calls, emails, faxes and letters received from citizens and are processed in SIGTARP's Investigations Division's Case Management System.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Undetermined</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> With procedures created and in place, SIGTARP was able to refer 74 percent of Hotline complaints for investigation or to the Office of Financial Stability within 14 days of receipt. SIGTARP anticipates that an increased volume of calls and improved mechanisms to screen the allegations for different indicators of fraud may impact the time taken to process the allegations. Therefore, the percentage may drop slightly. Therefore, SIGTARP projects targets of 65 percent in fiscal year 2011 and 70 percent in fiscal year 2012.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Investigations Accepted by Prosecutors (Oe) (%)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	50	55
ACTUAL			95	100	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This metric measures the percentage of SIGTARP criminal or civil investigations that a federal, state, or local prosecutor has formally accepted to prosecute.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The case agent assigned to the case updates the status of investigations as necessary. The data originates from the assigned case agent and is stored on the Case Management System.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> Currently the information is validated by Investigations Squads supervisors and manually tabulated. ID is in the process of adding this field to the case management system so that it could be calculated automatically.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> According to the Attorney General Guidelines for Statutory Offices of Inspector Generals, Inspector Generals should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that allegations, if proven, would be prosecuted. In fiscal year 2009, SIGTARP's Investigations Division had an acceptance rate of 95 percent. As a start up law enforcement organization, it is difficult to draw a baseline from the first two years as to what this percentage will be in the future. There are a number of conflicting factors that play an important role here, such as prosecutorial thresholds &amp; resources, sensitivity of the case etc. At this time, there is significant interest among prosecutors in Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) related cases, which plays an important factor in acceptance rate. In the future, as other prosecutorial priorities increase in importance, prosecutors will likely devote fewer resources to TARP related cases, and correspondingly, the acceptance rate will likely fall. Going forward, it will be almost impossible to keep a 100 percent acceptance rate, and SIGTARP's Investigations Division expects that the acceptance rate will decline from what was reported in fiscal year 2010. SIGTARP's Investigations Division expects that the acceptance rate will be somewhere near 50-60 per cent.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of Preliminary Investigations Converted to Full Investigations (Oe) (%)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	35	40
ACTUAL			50	80	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This metric measures the percentage of preliminary investigations that are converted to full investigations during the reporting period. A preliminary investigation is a limited investigation during which the investigator gathers fundamental information to determine the need to continue, pursue other remedies, or close the case. A full investigation is where the case agent accumulates all additional evidence needed to successfully complete the investigation.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> When an investigator or supervisor assesses the information contained in an allegation of wrongdoing, a number of factors are considered prior to determining what type of case should be opened. For example, if the allegation includes significant supporting documentation or witness testimony showing illegal activity, then a case, or "full" investigation, would be opened immediately. However, if the allegation has only brief details, a "preliminary" investigation can be opened to provide a mechanism to develop further information regarding the allegation. The data originates with the case agent and the official case file. The data used to track this metric comes from the SIGTARP investigations Division (ID) Case Management System.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> This measure is calculated in the case management system; the system tracks the dates remaining of cases that have not yet been converted as well as historic case conversion data. A report is run to show cases converted.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> It is already apparent that we have a backlog of allegations warranting further investigation that will result in this number dropping over the next year as a number of preliminary cases will sit pending availability of investigator resources. As additional resources are provided this number will improve.</p>					

MEASURE: Percentage of cases that are joint agency/task force investigations (Oe) (%)					
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
TARGET			Baseline	30	35
ACTUAL			60	50	
TARGET MET?			Y	Y	
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This is the overall percentage of cases during the reporting cycle that are joint with other law enforcement agencies.</p> <p><b>INDICATOR TYPE:</b> Measure</p> <p><b>DATA CAPTURE AND SOURCE:</b> The Data originates from the assigned Case Agent and is stored on the SIGTARP ID Case Management System.</p> <p><b>DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION:</b> This data is entered by the case agent and verified by the case supervisor. At the headquarters level SIGTARP Investigations staff validates the data with other Law Enforcement headquarters contacts as well as through weekly reports by the Investigative Squad's assigned Investigations Counsel.</p> <p><b>DATA ACCURACY:</b> Reasonable</p> <p><b>DATA FREQUENCY:</b> Quarterly</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS/EXPLANATION FOR SHORTFALL:</b> Given the high profile of many of the cases SIGTARP's Investigations Division initially opened, SIGTARP partnered with many other law enforcement agencies and had 50 percent of cases as joint agency/ task force investigations in fiscal year 2010.</p>					