

**Supplemental Appendix**  
to the  
**Fiscal Year 2014**  
**Annual Performance Report**

*CPSC Stands for Safety*



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**CONSUMER PRODUCT  
SAFETY COMMISSION**

**November 2015**

**An electronic version of this document is available at:**  
**<http://www.CPSC.gov/Performance-and-Budget/>**

# Supplemental Appendix to the FY 2014 Annual Performance Report

## FY 2014 Budget Key Performance Measure Details

<b>1</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK1.2.1		International				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 1: Leadership in Safety						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	1.2: Create and strengthen partnerships with stakeholders aimed at improving product safety throughout the supply chain.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Increase training aimed at improving consumer product safety						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Number of training or outreach seminars for foreign manufacturers conducted by CPSC staff						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	Number of training events conducted by CPSC staff for foreign manufacturers on selected consumer product safety topics						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	The CPSC conducts training and outreach seminars for foreign manufacturers of imported consumer products to help them comply with U.S. safety requirements. This approach is intended to reduce the need for subsequent remedial action or recalls.						
	<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>
3		3	8	12	3	34	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>							
EXIP (formerly known as EXGO) International Training Log							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
As each training event is accomplished, entries will be made in a spreadsheet noting the date, type of event, number of attendees, staffing required, and location. Count the number of training or outreach events conducted for foreign manufacturers.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Surveys conducted by the host at the end of the training indicate value and relevance for the participants and help improve the quality of future training. However, the consequential behavior of any single participant is beyond our ability to measure.							

<b>2</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK1.2.2		International			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 1: Leadership in Safety					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	1.2: Create and strengthen partnerships with stakeholders aimed at improving product safety throughout the supply chain.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Increase training aimed at improving consumer product safety					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Number of staff exchanges with foreign counterparts undertaken as part of the Extended Training Exchange Program					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	Number of staff exchanges with foreign consumer product safety regulatory agencies undertaken as part of CPSC's extended Training Exchange Program					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	Foreign regulators are key stakeholders because they regulate manufacturers in their jurisdictions. Exchange programs with foreign officials contribute to improved product safety. To the extent that unsafe products are not manufactured anywhere in the world, they will not find their way into the hands of U.S. consumers.					
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	2	2	3	2	No
<b>Data Source</b>						
EXIP (formerly known as EXGO) annual report on exchange program accomplishments						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Each exchange counts as one unit. Count the number of inbound and outbound foreign exchanges.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Planned exchange programs are based on International's annual business plans. At the conclusion of each exchange, trained officials share firsthand knowledge on similarities and differences among our respective organizations via webinars. These planned programs with foreign officials for the fiscal year may change as policies and circumstances change. The consequential behavior of a foreign regulator after an exchange is beyond our ability to measure.						

3

<b>Control ID</b>	2014BK1.2.3						<b>Program</b>	Executive
<b>Strategic Goal</b>								
<i>Goal 1: Leadership in Safety</i>								
<b>Strategic Objective</b>								
<i>1.2: Create and strengthen partnerships with stakeholders aimed at improving product safety throughout the supply chain.</i>								
<b>Goal Statement</b>								
<i>Create and strengthen collaborations aimed at improving consumer product safety</i>								
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>								
<i>Number of new collaborations undertaken with domestic nongovernment organizations such as trade associations, universities, or federations</i>								
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>								
<i>A new collaboration is counted when a working relationship has been established with domestic nongovernment organizations, such as a trade association, university, federation or other organization involved in consumer product safety activities. This can be in the form of public/private partnerships.</i>								
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>								
<i>Increased collaboration with domestic nongovernment organizations, such as trade associations, universities, federations, or other organizations that are involved in consumer product safety activities, will contribute to improvements in product quality, safety design, and overall consumer safety.</i>								
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>		
--	--	--	2	3	4	Yes		
<b>Data Source</b>								
<i>Deputy Executive Director for Safety Operations' list of those with whom CPSC has established working relationships, which are supported by trip reports and relevant SBO documentation.</i>								
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>								
<i>Count of the number of new organizations listed in the OEX file "Stakeholder List" associated with the fiscal year.</i>								
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>								
<i>The extent of and definition of what constitutes a collaboration or working relationship with an organization vary, and each organization is counted as one. In FY 2015, this measure will now include existing, established relationships, as well as new collaborations so that collaborations developed in FY 2014 can continue to be monitored.</i>								

4

<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
2014BK1.4.1		International				
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
Goal 1: Leadership in Safety						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
1.4: Work towards harmonizing global consumer product standards or developing similar mechanisms to enhance product safety.						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
Increase engagement of foreign counterparts in alignment discussions for consumer product safety standards						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
Number of products on which CPSC had consultations with foreign counterparts						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
The number of consumer products that are the subject of discussions about potential alignment of safety requirements among CPSC and other jurisdictions						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
The CPSC conducts discussions with foreign consumer product regulatory agencies regarding potential alignment of safety requirements for specific consumer products as part of the CPSC's strategy to work toward common approaches to high levels of consumer product safety, globally. These activities also demonstrate the CPSC's leadership role.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	3	3	4	3	No
<b>Data Source</b>						
EXIP (formerly known as EXGO) annual reports						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Count the number of products on which we engage in alignment discussions with foreign counterparts as reflected in EXIP's annual reports.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
There is no tracking system to record the number of products due to the low numbers. Discussions about specific products are kept in emails or meeting notes. EXIP is neither in control of the number of products, nor in control of the products to be discussed. This measure has been discontinued for FY 2015.						

5

<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
2014BK1.6.1		Personnel				
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
<i>Goal 1: Leadership in Safety</i>						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
<i>1.6: Attract, retain, and collaborate with leading experts to address consumer product hazards.</i>						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
<i>Recruit, retain, and develop a high-performing workforce</i>						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
<i>Employee retention rate</i>						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
<i>Number of new, permanent employees who are still employed by the agency 2 years after being hired, divided by total number of employees who were hired 2 years ago</i>						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
<i>This is a direct measure of workforce retention, which contributes to achieving the goal of having a high-performing workforce. Research shows that employees who are retained for at least 2 years have completed agency orientation and basic training, fully understand the agency environment, and are vested, engaged employees.</i>						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
85.7%	84.9%	85%	84.7%	85%	81%	No
<b>Data Source</b>						
<i>Employment records</i>						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
<i>Reports on permanent hires and separations are from the Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS). The new hire employee retention rate for the current fiscal year is computed as follows: total number of new, permanent hires in FY(YY-2), minus departures by this cohort from the agency, divided by total number of new, permanent hires in FY(YY-2), where YY is the current fiscal year.</i>						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
<i>This measure has been modified in FY 2015 to exclude departures that are involuntary. When the number of new hires declines, any departure has a greater impact on the retention percentage from one year to another.</i>						

6

<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
2014BK1.6.2				Personnel		
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
Goal 1: Leadership in Safety						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
1.6: Attract, retain, and collaborate with leading experts to address consumer product hazards.						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
Recruit, retain, and develop a high performing workforce						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
Average hiring time (recruitment time using U.S. Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) End-to-End hiring process) (days)						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
"Hiring time" is defined by OPM in its End-to-End Hiring Plan as the time (in calendar days) from the date a manager identifies the need for a new hire (as indicated by submission of an SF-52 classified position description and necessary information to begin the recruitment process) to the employee's first day on the job.						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
Average hiring time is a measure of how quickly the agency recruits its workforce, which contributes to achieving the goal of having a high-performing workforce.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
92	75	75	73	80	78	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
Career Connection, FPPS						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
EXRM E2E Spreadsheet, which pulls data from Career Connection and FPPS, computes the performance measure. Sum of hiring times for all new employees brought on board in a fiscal year, divided by number of new employees brought on board in a fiscal year.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Possibility of error relating to manual entry.						



7

<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
2014BK1.6.3				Personnel		
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
<i>Goal 1: Leadership in Safety</i>						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
<i>1.6: Attract, retain, and collaborate with leading experts to address consumer product hazards.</i>						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
<i>Recruit, retain, and develop a high-performing workforce</i>						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
<i>Training participation rate</i>						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
<i>Number of employees who attend at least one discretionary training during the fiscal year, divided by total number of employees on board at the end of the fiscal year</i>						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
<i>The training participation rate is a measure of the goal of developing a high-performing workforce.</i>						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	71.7%	73.6%	83%	85%	93%	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
<i>Training records from TMS, which includes online courses, on-site courses, and off-site courses.</i>						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
<i>Pull data from TMS records for employees who have one or more trainings (excluding mandatory trainings). Calculate the number of employees in TMS as of fiscal year-end whose attendance at one or more trainings is reflected in TMS divided by the total number of employees as of fiscal year-end.</i>						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
<i>None</i>						

8

<b>Control ID</b>	2014BK2.1.1						<b>Program</b>	Hazard					
<b>Strategic Goal</b>													
Goal 2: Commitment to Prevention													
<b>Strategic Objective</b>													
2.1: Minimize hazardous defects early in the manufacturing process through increased participation in voluntary standards activities.													
<b>Goal Statement</b>													
Increase technical support or monitoring for voluntary standards activities													
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>													
Number of voluntary standards activities supported or monitored by CPSC staff													
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>													
CPSC staff provides technical support or monitors voluntary safety standards activities, which are tracked in the Voluntary Standards Tracking and Access Report (V-STAR).													
<p>A voluntary standard is a prescribed set of rules, conditions, or requirements relating to the safety of consumer products found in the home, schools, and/or recreation areas, which, by itself, imposes no obligation regarding use. In the case of CPSC staff support, a voluntary consumer product safety standard is generally developed using ASTM International (ASTM), the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), or Underwriters Laboratories Inc. (UL) procedures. These voluntary standards may be incorporated, in whole or in part, into CPSC rules, such as in the case of durable nursery products, as set forth in the Danny Keysar Child Product Safety Notification Act.</p> <p>CPSC staff support may include, among other things, any one or more of the following: providing injury data and hazard analyses, encouraging the development of a voluntary safety standard, identifying specific risks of injury, performing research, developing health science data, performing laboratory technical assistance, and taking other actions that the Commission, in a particular situation, feels appropriate. A listing of these activities can be found at 16 CFR §1031.7.</p>													
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>													
The CPSC works to minimize hazardous defects through increased participation in voluntary standards activities. The CPSC's statutory authority requires the agency to rely on voluntary standards rather than promulgate mandatory standards, if compliance with a voluntary standard would eliminate or adequately reduce the risk of injury identified and it is likely that there will be substantial compliance with the voluntary standards.													
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>							
61	60	70	74	83	83	Yes							
<b>Data Source</b>													
Voluntary Standards Tracking and Access Report (V-STAR)													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
The data are collected biannually by the Voluntary Standards Coordinator from the responsible individuals participating in the standards work. It is a simple count of standards activities as communicated to the Voluntary Standards Coordinator.													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
This measure was modified for FY 2015 to capture voluntary standards activities in which CPSC staff participates "actively"; and the list of voluntary standards is based on congressionally mandated rulemakings, Commission-directed rulemakings, Commission-directed action on petitions, and specific hazards identified during risk-based decision making that needs to be addressed through the voluntary standards process. The measure of "active" participation is subjective. As a result, the level of participation may vary among the activities counted in this measure.													

<b>9</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>										
	2014BK2.1.2		Hazard										
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>												
	<i>Goal 2: Commitment to Prevention</i>												
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>												
	<i>2.1: Minimize hazardous defects early in the manufacturing process through increased participation in voluntary standards activities.</i>												
	<b>Goal Statement</b>												
	<i>Increase collaboration on nanotechnology issues affecting consumer products</i>												
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>												
	<i>Number of collaborations established or maintained with other organizations to work on nanotechnology research or issues affecting consumer products</i>												
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>												
	<i>Collaborations are the number of signed collaborative agreements established in the reporting period to work on nanotechnology research or issues affecting consumer products. Collaborative agreements include inter-agency agreements (IAGs) established with one or more federal agencies and/or contracts with nonfederal or nongovernmental organizations.</i>												
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>												
	<i>Due to the complexity of nanotechnology, GAO and other entities have advised federal agencies working on nanotechnology to collaborate and monitor progress. The CPSC's collaboration with other organizations on nanotechnology research and issues affecting consumer products is expected to contribute to the responsible development of consumer products containing nanomaterials.</i>												
	<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>
4		8		8		4		5		6		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>													
<i>The CPSC nanotechnology team will maintain a list of CPSC's collaborative agreements and EXFM will continue to hold the official records for the IAGs and/or funding documents.</i>													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
<i>Count number of collaborative agreements signed during the period.</i>													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
<i>Although this measure is effective at measuring collaboration, it is only an indirect indicator of the overall strategic objective of minimizing hazardous defects earlier in the process.</i>													

<b>10</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>										
	2014BK2.1.3		Hazard										
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>												
	<i>Goal 2: Commitment to Prevention</i>												
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>												
	<i>2.1: Minimize hazardous defects early in the manufacturing process through increased participation in voluntary standards activities.</i>												
	<b>Goal Statement</b>												
	<i>Increase collaboration on nanotechnology issues affecting consumer products</i>												
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>												
	<i>Number of reports produced on the results of collaboration on nanotechnology issues affecting consumer products</i>												
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>												
	<i>Nanotechnology reports can focus on detection, development of methods to quantify releases of, and/or determination of potential human exposure to specific nanomaterials in consumer products. A collaboration may result in more than one report. This measure tracks both interim and final reports, manuscripts, or formal presentations at scientific meetings. Final reports, which are often peer reviewed and/or published, are issued at the conclusion of a collaborative activity. Interim reports, which contain substantive data sufficient for presentation at a scientific meeting, are produced before the conclusion of the collaborative activity.</i>												
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>												
	<i>The purpose of the CPSC's collaborative efforts on nanotechnology issues is to produce reports and manuscripts that provide data on nanomaterials used in or released from consumer products. The data should be made available, when appropriate, to assist stakeholders in addressing nanomaterial safety and ultimately should contribute to improved safety of nanomaterial use in consumer products.</i>												
	<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>
1		1		9		11		5		11		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>													
<i>CPSC Nanotechnology Team Intranet Site</i>													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
<i>Count of the number of reports and manuscripts collected and posted to nanotechnology team site.</i>													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
<i>Results from these studies demonstrate that although testing for consumer exposure to nanomaterials is challenging, small gains have been made in developing robust test methods for measuring consumer exposure to nanomaterials. It is believed that the pace of test methods' development has not kept up with the pace of the marketplace where nanomaterials are used in consumer products.</i>													

<b>11</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK2.2.1		Hazard			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 2: Commitment to Prevention					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	2.2: Improve the safety of consumer products by issuing mandatory standards, where necessary and consistent with statutory authority, in response to identified product hazards.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Prepare rulemaking candidates for Commission consideration, as required					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Number of candidates for rulemaking prepared for Commission consideration					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	The number of rulemaking briefing packages submitted by CPSC staff for the Commission's consideration					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	Safety standards address hazards associated with the use of consumer products. Consumer products that have been designed and manufactured to mandatory safety standards help prevent future hazards from occurring.					
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
26	22	28	14	19	10	No
<b>Data Source</b>						
Postings on <a href="http://www.CPSC.gov">www.CPSC.gov</a> at <a href="http://cpsc.gov/Newsroom/FOIA/Commission-Briefing-Packages/">http://cpsc.gov/Newsroom/FOIA/Commission-Briefing-Packages/</a> .						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Count the number of rulemaking briefing packages (ANPR, NPR, and final rule) that are posted on <a href="http://www.CPSC.gov">www.CPSC.gov</a> .						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
The accuracy of the data is dependent on (i) the comprehensiveness of the postings on the applicable website location, and (ii) the accuracy of the count of "rulemaking" briefing packages (as opposed to a count of all briefing packages. If rulemaking packages are not posted to the applicable website, or if the count includes non-rulemaking briefing packages, for instance, the final total could be inaccurate.						

<b>12</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK2.3.1		Executive				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 2: Commitment to Prevention						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	2.3: Facilitate the development of safer products by training industry stakeholders on the CPSC regulatory requirements and hazard identification best practices.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Improve availability of training and guidance for industry stakeholders (domestic and foreign)						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Number of domestic training activities made available to industry stakeholders						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	Industry stakeholders are domestic and foreign manufacturers of consumer products. A training activity is described as an in-person training, onsite session, webinar, or live or archived webcast to groups that is offered by CPSC staff. It excludes individual communication.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	Increasing the number of training activities made available to industry stakeholders on CPSC regulatory requirements and hazard identification best practices will ultimately facilitate development of safer products.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>	
--	--	--	14	7	23	Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>							
Small Business Ombudsman Outreach, Presentation, & Training Log in Excel							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
A spreadsheet record is kept to track the number of trainings to external stakeholders on CPSC regulatory requirements and hazard identification best practices. Count the number of training activities.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Manual tracking of training may involve error.							

<b>13</b>	<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
	2014BK3.1.1				Hazard		
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	3.1: Improve the quality and comprehensiveness of crucial product hazard data.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Ensure range and quality of consumer product-related incident data						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS) member hospitals evaluated at least once a year						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	Number of NEISS hospitals with at least one evaluation visit in a fiscal year, divided by the total number of NEISS hospitals in that fiscal year						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	Evaluation visits are conducted at most NEISS hospitals every year to provide CPSC staff the opportunity to review hospital records and to ensure that hospital coders are capturing and correctly coding reportable cases, thus improving the comprehensiveness and quality of data.						
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
100%	100%	98%	99%	98%	100%	Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>							
NEISS Administrative Records System (NARS)							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
Data from each hospital visit is captured in NARS. Calculate percentage of NEISS hospitals with at least one evaluation visit in the fiscal year based on the total number of all the NEISS hospitals in that fiscal year. The percentage is calculated once at the end of the fiscal year.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
None							

<b>14</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK3.1.2		Hazard				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	3.1: Improve the quality and comprehensiveness of crucial product hazard data.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Ensure range and quality of consumer product-related incident data						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of consumer product-related injury cases correctly captured at NEISS hospitals						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	A weighted average of the percentage of consumer product-related injury cases correctly captured at a sample of hospitals participating in the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS) (where the percentage at each sampled hospital is calculated as: the number of product-related injury cases captured by the NEISS coder, divided by the number of product-related cases captured by a CPSC auditor).						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	Evaluation visits are conducted at NEISS hospitals to determine the percentage of reported consumer product-related cases captured correctly by hospital coders, indicating the quality of consumer product-related incident data from the hospitals.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
90%		94%	92%	92%	90%	91%	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>							
NEISS Administrative Records System (NARS)							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
Calculate one percentage (p) across all the NEISS hospitals that were evaluated during the fiscal year as: $p = (\sum i(Ni*(ni(coder))/ (si)) / \sum i(Ni*(ni(cpssc))/ (si)))$ where Ni is the annual number of emergency department treated cases at the ith NEISS hospital; (si) is the number of cases in sample drawn by the CPSC auditor at the ith NEISS hospital and ni(coder) and ni(cpssc) are as defined below.							
During a hospital audit, CPSC staff samples between 200 and 300 emergency department records and determines the number of product-related cases in the sample. These cases are then compared to the number of product-related cases in the sample, as captured by the NEISS coder. The hospital's capture metric is estimated as:							
$(ni(coder)) / (ni(cpssc))$							
where ni(coder) is the number of product-related cases in the sample of cases (si), as determined by the coder for the ith NEISS hospital; and ni(cpssc) is the number of product-related cases in the sample si, as determined by the CPSC auditor. The performance metric is then estimated across audited NEISS hospitals as a weighted estimate of the individual hospital metrics.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Results represent an estimate as described above.							



<b>15</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>										
	2014BK3.2.1		Hazard										
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>												
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification												
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>												
	3.2: Reduce the time it takes to identify hazard trends by improving the collection and assessment of hazard data.												
	<b>Goal Statement</b>												
	Reduce time to identify consumer product hazard trends by improving the collection and assessment of hazard data												
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>												
	Time from incident received to integrated team adjudication of incident report (business days)												
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>												
	The average time it takes from receipt of an incident report to review and determine whether the incident report is actionable (adjudication). This is computed as the sum of the number of business days between receipt in CPSC's Consumer Product Risk Management System (CPSPRM) and adjudication for all incident reports, divided by the total number of incident reports received in CPSRMS during the fiscal year.												
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>												
	Timely review of incoming incident reports is critical to identification of emerging hazards associated with the use of consumer products. The CPSC measures the average number of business days from receipt of an incident report to determination of whether the incident report is actionable.												
	<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>
--		--		--		6.5		10		3.4		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>													
Date of incident receipt are automatically generated by CPSRMS and date of staff's determination regarding whether action is required are entered into CPSRMS by the integrated project team.													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
Sum of (terminal status date minus start date) in CPSRMS, with correction for weekends and days the government is closed, across incident reports received during a specified time interval, divided by the number of incident reports received during the time interval.													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
None													

<b>16</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>											
	2014BK3.2.2		Hazard											
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>													
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification													
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>													
	3.2: Reduce the time it takes to identify hazard trends by improving the collection and assessment of hazard data.													
	<b>Goal Statement</b>													
	Improve sample processing throughout the CPSC													
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>													
	Percentage of priority import regulated samples (excluding fireworks) tested within 30 days of collection													
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>													
	Priority imports are samples collected at the ports of entry by CPSC import surveillance and field staff working in concert with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) staff. Such products include children’s products, toys, household chemical products, cigarette lighters, mattresses, children’s sleepwear, and general wearing apparel. A regulated product is one that is covered by a federal rule that CPSC administers. Number of priority import regulated samples (excluding fireworks) that have been tested within 30 calendar days of collection, divided by the total number of priority import regulated samples (excluding fireworks) collected.													
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>													
	This performance measure tracks the timeliness with which CPSC staff processes imported non-fireworks samples, from initial collection at U.S. ports, through processing and testing of samples, until the NPTEC report is available for case compliance staff action. Processing and testing samples is critical to the compliance and hazard identification process.													
	<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>	
	--		--		85%		92%		85%		98.8%		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>														
Sample Tracking database, Test reporting databases, Integrated Field System (IFS), Product Testing Database (PRODTEST), and LSC FHSA Access Database														
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>														
As samples are collected by port and field staff and tested at the lab, staffs enter the collection dates and testing dates, respectively, into IFS. The denominator includes all samples (excluding fireworks) collected during the reporting period. The numerator includes those samples (excluding fireworks) from the denominator that was tested within 30 calendar days of the date of collection.														
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>														
Manual process may involve error.														

<b>17</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK3.2.3		Hazard				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	3.2: Reduce the time it takes to identify hazard trends by improving the collection and assessment of hazard data.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Improve sample processing throughout the CPSC						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of priority import fireworks samples tested within 60 days of collection						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	Priority import fireworks are samples collected at the ports of entry by CPSC import surveillance and field staff working in concert with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) staff. Fireworks are covered through CPSC's administration of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act. Number of priority import fireworks samples that have been tested within 60 calendar days of collection divided by the total number of priority import fireworks samples collected.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	This performance measure tracks the timeliness with which CPSC staff processes imported fireworks samples, from initial collection at U.S. ports, through processing and testing of samples until the NPTEC report is available for case compliance staff action. Processing and testing fireworks samples is critical to the compliance and hazard identification process.						
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
	93%	92%	99.7%	100%	90%	100%	Yes
	<b>Data Source</b>						
Fireworks report in Integrated Field System (IFS), which also pulls report dates out of the Product Testing Database (PRODTEST) Fireworks database.							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
As samples are collected by port and field staff and then tested at the lab, staffs enter the collection dates and testing dates, respectively, into IFS. The denominator includes all firework samples collected during the reporting period. The numerator includes those firework samples from the denominator that were tested within 60 calendar days of the date of collection.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Manual process may involve error.							

<b>18</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK3.4.1		Import			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	3.4: Expand import surveillance efforts to reduce entry of unsafe products at U.S. ports.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Improved surveillance at ports					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Number of import examinations					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	Number of examinations conducted by CPSC staff on imported consumer products to verify compliance with CPSC rules, regulations, and bans					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	The total number of import examinations performed by CPSC staff is a measure of surveillance at U.S. ports to reduce entry of unsafe consumer products.					
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>
7,011	9,923	18,131	26,523	22,000	28,007	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
Import Exam Logbook						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Beginning in FY2013, with the integration of the Import Exam Logbook into the RAM application, data feed received from CBP is utilized when completing an exam logbook entry. This reduces the need to re-key data. All import examinations performed by CPSC staff are recorded in the Import Exam Logbook. The computation is captured in an Excel file.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
There may be a lag in the reporting of data. Year-end results may be impacted because of real-time updates.						

<b>19</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK3.4.2		Import			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	3.4: Expand import surveillance efforts to reduce entry of unsafe products at U.S. ports.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Improve import surveillance targeting effectiveness					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Sample yield per 100 import entries examined as identified through the Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) pilot system					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	Import entry examinations and sample collection are performed at ports where a compliance investigator is co-located or at locations to which a Field Product Safety Investigator travels. Total number of resulting samples, divided by total number of import entries examined, multiplied by 100.					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	This measure is an indicator of the effectiveness of import surveillance targeting efforts using the RAM pilot surveillance system. If an entry is examined and suspected of containing a hazard, a sample is taken. The pilot system, which involves risk analysis, is expected to result in more violative samples being collected per entry examined, which, in turn, measures the effectiveness of the targeting system.					
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	26	28.8	26	34.2	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
ITDS/RAM, Import Exam Logbook, and Integrated Field System (IFS)						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
EXIS runs data quality comparison routines between the logbook and IFS to compare the two databases where they merge. Step 1) Determine the distinct list of entries targeted using the RAM during the identified period. Step 2) Determine the number exams in the logbook corresponding to the entries. Step 3) Determine the number of distinct samples collected using the Import Exam Logbook as identified by entry number. Step 4) Divide the number of samples by number of entries and multiply by 100.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
There may be a lag in the reporting of data. Year-end results may be impacted because of real-time updates.						

<b>20</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK3.4.3		Import			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	3.4: Expand import surveillance efforts to reduce entry of unsafe products at U.S. ports.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Facilitate legitimate trade					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Percentage of import shipments processed through the Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) pilot system that are cleared within one business day					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	Import shipments processed through the RAM are received at all ports and are scored electronically by the rules engine automatically into the ITDS/RAM pilot system. Number of shipments (entry lines) cleared within 1 business day, divided by the total number of shipments (entry lines) processed through the RAM pilot system					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	The percentage of import shipments that are cleared within 1 business day is a measure of how successful the CPSC is at expeditiously processing compliant imports of consumer products and facilitating legitimate trade.					
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	--	99.5%	99%	99.7%	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
ITDS/RAM						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
The status of each entry acted upon by CPSC is recorded in the pilot system by investigators based on the scored risk (i.e., "MAY PROCEED" or "CBP HOLD REQUEST"). Shipments with a status of "MAY PROCEED," or shipments that remain "Scored," are considered cleared by CPSC. "Scored" shipments are cleared within 1 business day because CPSC staff took no action to stop the cargo from entering commerce. The percentage will be calculated by the number of shipments (entry lines) during the applicable time period cleared within 1 business day, divided by the total number of shipments (entry lines) as reflected in the pilot system.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
There may be a lag in the reporting of data. Year-end results may be impacted because of real-time updates.						

<b>21</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK3.4.4		Import				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	3.4: Expand import surveillance efforts to reduce entry of unsafe products at U.S. ports.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Improve working effectiveness with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to harness existing federal port resources in the interdiction of noncompliant consumer product imports						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of CPSC import entry hold requests acted on by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	Number of CPSC entry hold requests acted on by CBP, divided by number of CPSC entry hold requests made to CBP.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	The percentage of CPSC import entry hold requests on which CBP acts reflects CBP cooperation with the CPSC's targeting of specific import entries likely to contain noncompliant products. The percentage is expected to increase with implementation of the RAM.						
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	--	86%	86%	87.2%	Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>							
ITDS/RAM							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
Local operations and situational targeting do not track hold requests. National operations currently do not differentiate between hold rejections and invoice reviews. Hold Acceptance Volume for the period, divided by Hold Requested Volume for the period, multiplied by 100, is currently tracked in the ITDS/RAM.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
There may be a lag in the reporting of data. Year-end results may be impacted because of real-time updates. Local operations and situational targeting are entries identified through CBP activities for examination. Based on limitations in the workflow of the pilot system, those entries do not have a preceding request from CPSC staff and are not counted. As for National Operations, there is a minor clarification of items counted in the measure; there were instances when a CPSC investigator performed an invoice review and determined that there should no longer be a hold. Invoice reviews could not be captured in workflow in FY 2014 as no option existed to select. The option has been added to workflow, effective FY 2015. Additionally, the CPSC cannot compel CBP to execute a hold request.							

<b>22</b>	<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
	2014BK3.4.5				Import		
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	3.4: Expand import surveillance efforts to reduce entry of unsafe products at U.S. ports.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Protect U.S. intellectual property, consistent with CPSC's mission						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Establish an ITDS/RAM rule set to target intellectual property violations where a health and safety hazard is suspected in consumer product imports						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	The ITDS/RAM targeting rule set will be expanded to include rules to identify intellectual property violations to support U.S. domestic competitiveness.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	By expanding the ITDS/RAM rule set, which targets suspected noncompliant consumer products, to include Intellectual Property Rights targeting rules, the CPSC will contribute to protecting U.S. intellectual property, consistent with the CPSC's safety mission and in support of U.S. domestic competitiveness.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>	
--	--	--	--	Rule set established	Rule Set Completed	Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>							
ITDS/RAM and CBP Risk Data							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
Count the milestone of establishing a rule set to identify intellectual property rights violations in consumer products, where a health and safety hazard is suspected in consumer product imports.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
The rule set provides the agency with a mechanism to identify potential safety violations that are connected to intellectual property violations. The rule set will not necessarily identify all violations of this type for agency or CBP action.							



<b>23</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK3.5.1		Compliance			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	3.5: Scan the marketplace regularly to determine whether previously identified significant hazards exist in similar products.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Increase market surveillance throughout the consumer product supply chain.					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Total number of products screened by CPSC field staff					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	A product is counted as "screened" when it has been examined by field staff. This measure includes imported consumer products screened by CPSC field staff, but does not include additional imports screened by CPSC Import Surveillance staff.					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	The CPSC tracks the total number of product units screened to measure the extent of CPSC field staff surveillance activities at traditional retail and secondhand stores, over the Internet, and at ports of entry to verify compliance with CPSC rules, regulations, and bans.					
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	--	240,847	225,000	250,767	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
Integrated Field System (IFS)						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Pull data from IFS on traditional retail store, secondhand store, Internet, and import assignments that were completed within the fiscal year. Count of the total number of consumer products screened by field staff as identified in the assignments.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.						

24

<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
2014BK3.5.2				Compliance		
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
3.5: Scan the marketplace regularly to determine whether previously identified significant hazards exist in similar products.						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
Improve surveillance of the Internet marketplace for hazardous consumer products.						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
Number of consumer products screened by CPSC field staff through Internet surveillance activities						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
A product is counted as "screened" when it has been examined by a field staff. This performance measure includes both new and used/resale products sold over the Internet.						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
The CPSC tracks number of products screened over the Internet to measure the extent of CPSC field staff surveillance of Internet sales of consumer products to verify compliance with CPSC rules, regulations, and bans.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	--	24,920	23,000	21,284	No
<b>Data Source</b>						
Integrated Field System (IFS)						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Pull data from IFS on Internet assignments that were completed within the fiscal year. Count of the total number of consumer products screened by CPSC field staff as identified in the assignments.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.						

<b>25</b>	<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK3.5.3				Hazard				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>								
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification								
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>								
	3.5: Scan the marketplace regularly to determine whether previously identified significant hazards exist in similar products.								
	<b>Goal Statement</b>								
	Complete annual statistical reports characterizing injuries and fatalities associated with specific consumer product categories or hazards								
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>								
	Number of annual reports completed on consumer product-related fatalities, injuries, and/or losses for specific hazards								
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>								
	The number of milestone statistical reports produced for specified product-related hazards or categories are defined as part of the budget development process. These reports characterize the number of reported fatalities and estimated injuries and trends.								
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>								
	This key measure is an element of the CPSC's strategy for hazard identification by scanning the marketplace to determine whether previously identified significant hazards exist in similar products. Annual reports presenting statistics on the numbers of reported deaths and estimates of emergency department-treated, product-related injuries for specific product-related hazards or categories allow for trend assessments and inform management decisions and information and education campaigns.								
<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
13		14		11		11	10	10	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>									
Report postings for AED review (Form 122) on SharePoint									
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>									
Staff prepares reports on consumer product-related fatalities, injuries, and/or losses' on an annual basis. Count of the number of reports posted for AED review (Form 122) on SharePoint during the fiscal year.									
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>									
None									

<b>26</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>										
	2014BK3.6.1		Compliance										
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>												
	Goal 3: Rigorous Hazard Identification												
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>												
	3.6: Increase surveillance of used and resale consumer products to identify and remove recalled products and substantial product hazards.												
	<b>Goal Statement</b>												
	Increase surveillance of the marketplace for hazardous used or resale consumer products.												
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>												
	Number of used/resale consumer products screened by CPSC field staff												
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>												
	A product is counted as "screened" when it has been examined by field staff. This performance measure counts the number of used/resale products screened by CPSC field staff through surveillance activities at secondhand stores.												
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>												
	The CPSC tracks the number of used consumer products screened to measure the extent of secondhand products on the market that are not in compliance with CPSC rules, regulations, and bans. This performance measure tracks the results of this effort, which includes education of the secondhand/used consumer product retail industry on the importance of ensuring that previously recalled or banned products are not being reintroduced into the consumer market.												
<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>	
--		--		--		180,808		170,000		209,662		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>													
Integrated Field System (IFS)													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
Pull data from IFS on secondhand store assignments that were completed within the fiscal year. Count of the number of used/resale products screened at secondhand stores.													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.													

<b>27</b>	<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
	2014BK4.1.1				Compliance		
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 4: Decisive Response						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	4.1: Expand the CPSC's ability to conduct a full range of inspections to monitor for noncompliant and defective products.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Increase market surveillance throughout the consumer product supply chain.						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Number of establishment inspections conducted by CPSC field staff						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	The total number of establishment inspections includes inspections of importers, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, conducted by CPSC field staff. Each inspection would be documented as a separate assignment in IFS.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	The number of establishment inspections conducted is a measure of CPSC surveillance of the domestic consumer product supply chain to verify firms' compliance with CPSC rules, regulations, and bans. Establishment inspections are one of the key enforcement tools used by the CPSC to ensure industry is manufacturing, importing, and distributing consumer products that meet federal regulations. Inspections are also the primary method the CPSC uses to conduct defect investigations involving products that may pose an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death to consumers.						
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
616	1,116	1,184	3,680	3,000	3,672	Met	
<b>Data Source</b>							
Integrated Field System (IFS)							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
Pull data from IFS on establishment inspections that were completed within the fiscal year. Count the total number of establishment inspections.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.							

<b>28</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK4.1.2		Compliance				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 4: Decisive Response						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	4.1: Expand the CPSC's ability to conduct a full range of inspections to monitor for noncompliant and defective products.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Increase market surveillance throughout the consumer product supply chain.						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of products screened by CPSC field staff resulting in violations						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	A product is counted as "screened" when it has been examined by field staff. The number of products screened by CPSC field staff resulting in identification of a violation, divided by the total number of products screened.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	This measures CPSC success in identifying previously recalled or banned products being offered for sale throughout the domestic consumer product supply chain, so that such sales can be stopped through appropriate compliance activities.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>	
--	--	--	6.9%	6%	6%	Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>							
Integrated Field System (IFS)							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
The total number of products screened is obtained by adding up all traditional retail store, secondhand store, Internet, and import assignments that were completed within the fiscal year. The number of violations is obtained from the Status field in the Comply table in IFS. The number of products screened that resulted in identification of a violation during the period, divided by the total number of products screened by CPSC field staff during the period.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.							

<b>29</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>										
	2014BK4.1.3		Hazard										
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>												
	Goal 4: Decisive Response												
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>												
	4.1: Expand the CPSC's ability to conduct a full range of inspections to monitor for noncompliant and defective products.												
	<b>Goal Statement</b>												
	Maintain and enhance capabilities for increased sample processing at the NPTEC by Laboratory Sciences												
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>												
	Total number of items/component parts from samples tested at National Product Testing and Evaluation Center (NPTEC) for specific standards and regulations												
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>												
	The total number of items and component parts from samples that are tested to various standards at the CPSC's NPTEC by Laboratory Sciences (LS) staff during the reporting period												
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>												
	LS staff at the CPSC's NPTEC evaluates domestic and imported product samples collected by CPSC staff, testing them to various standards and identifying noncompliant and defective products. This performance indicator tracks NPTEC's ability to evaluate a wide range and large quantity of products, which is an important part of the CPSC's enforcement strategy.												
	<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>
30,845		32,705		40,066		37,063		36,000		37,028		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>													
Collected through various product testing databases within LSC, LSE, and LSM, such as PRODTEST, Fireworks, CHEM, FLAMM, the PSA database, sample tracking, IFS, and staff lab notebooks that document the total number of components tested within a sample.													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
Samples received at CPSC's NPTEC by LS staff are tested to various standards. This includes all imported and domestic samples collected by the CPSC. For some samples, multiple component parts of multiple items are tested for each of multiple standards or regulations. For example, a single toy sample may include a "Medical Set" toy that contains toy versions of a stethoscope, blood pressure cuff, and/or syringe. For each sample, several stethoscopes may be tested for lead in each of several component parts, for phthalates in other component parts, and for small parts after use and abuse testing. Additional tests may be conducted on the other items in the toy medical set, including blood pressure cuffs and syringes. The numbers of different tests for various standards will be tallied to determine the total number of component parts and items tested for various standards and regulations. Staff inputs information into databases listed under "Data Source" during or after product testing is completed, using their lab notebooks and test data reporting forms.													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
Any testing for different standards/regulations is counted. There will be multiple counts for one component part that may undergo tests for different standards/regulations, or different component parts that may undergo one type of test. This measure has been discontinued for FY 2015.													

<b>30</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK4.3.1		Compliance			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 4: Decisive Response					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	4.3: Increase the efficiency and speed of recalls of noncompliant and defective products.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Improve timeliness of investigating potential unregulated hazards and negotiating corrective actions.					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Percentage of all cases for which the preliminary determination is made within 85 business days of the case opening					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	For cases where a Preliminary Determination (PD) is made within the fiscal year, the percentage of cases where the PD date is within 85 business days of the Case Creation date. A Case Creation date is a system generated date when a case is entered into DCM Section 15 or Legacy Section 15.					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	This performance measure is an indicator of the timeliness of CPSC case work (excludes Fast-Track cases). Making preliminary determinations more quickly contributes to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant and defective products.					
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>
--	--	--	84%	70%	60.6%	No
<b>Data Source</b>						
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15 feed data into the Data Repository (DR). Pull data from the DR into spreadsheet of all cases where the PD date is within the fiscal year. Calculate the number of business days between the Case Creation date and the PD date for each case. Calculate the total number of cases where the PD date is made within 85 business days of the Case Creation date, divided by the total number cases where the PD date is within the fiscal year.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.						



<b>31</b>	<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>		
	2014BK4.3.2				Compliance		
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 4: Decisive Response						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	4.3: Increase the efficiency and speed of recalls of noncompliant and defective products.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Improve timeliness of investigating potential unregulated hazards and negotiating corrective actions.						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of cases for which the corrective action is accepted within 60 business days of the preliminary determination						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	For cases where a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is made within the fiscal year, the percentage of cases where the CAP date is within 60 business days of the Preliminary Determination (PD) date.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	This performance measure tracks the timeliness of the CPSC's negotiations of Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) with companies (excludes Fast-Track cases). More timely negotiations of CAPs contribute to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant and defective products.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>	
96%	95%	98%	88%	80%	80.9%	Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>							
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15 feed data into the Data Repository (DR). Pull data from the DR into spreadsheet of all cases where the CAP date is within the fiscal year. Calculate the number of business days between the PD date and CAP date for each case. Calculate the total number of cases where the CAP date is made within 60 business days of the PD date, divided by the total number of cases where the CAP date is within the fiscal year.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.							

32

<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
2014BK4.3.3		Compliance				
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
Goal 4: Decisive Response						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
4.3: Increase the efficiency and speed of recalls of noncompliant and defective products.						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
Improve timeliness of notifying firms of violative products.						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
Percentage of cases in which the firm is notified of a violation in a timely manner						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
The number of cases for which a firm was first notified of a violation within the fiscal year and was notified within 30 business days of the date a violation was determined, divided by the number of cases for which a firm was first notified of a violation within the fiscal year.						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
This performance measure is an indicator of the timeliness of CPSC notice to firms of violations. "Timely" is defined as notification occurring within 30 business days after the violation was determined.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	--	94%	90%	97.1%	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
Integrated Field System (IFS)						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Pull data from Comply table into spreadsheet for calculations. Violative cases where the firm was notified within 30 calendar days, divided by the total number of violative cases where the firm was notified within the fiscal year. The date of violation is the compliance decision date. The firm is initially notified via phone or email and written confirmation is obtained and the date is entered into IFS under Notify date. However, if written confirmation is not obtained, the Letter of Advice (LOA) date will serve as the first form of notification.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.						

<b>33</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>																	
	2014BK4.3.4		Compliance																	
<b>Strategic Goal</b>																				
Goal 4: Decisive Response																				
<b>Strategic Objective</b>																				
4.3: Increase the efficiency and speed of recalls of noncompliant and defective products.																				
<b>Goal Statement</b>																				
Reduce time to initiate Fast-Track recalls.																				
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>																				
Percentage of Fast-Track cases with corrective actions initiated within 20 business days																				
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>																				
For cases where a stop sale occurred within the fiscal year, the percentage of cases where the Stop Sale date is within 20 business day of the Case Creation date.																				
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>																				
Industry has an opportunity to participate in a streamlined recall process through the Fast-Track Product Recall Program, which can remove potentially dangerous products from the marketplace more quickly and save the company and the CPSC time and resources. To potentially take advantage of the Fast-Track program, a firm must, among other steps, commit to implementing a sufficient consumer-level voluntary recall within 20 business days of the case opening. The percentage of Fast-Track cases opened that result in a CAP within 20 business days of the case opening is a measure of the timeliness with which these expedited cases move from report to resolution. Increased timeliness of processing these cases contributes to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant and defective consumer products.																				
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 14.28%;">2010 Actual</th> <th style="width: 14.28%;">2011 Actual</th> <th style="width: 14.28%;">2012 Actual</th> <th style="width: 14.28%;">2013 Actual</th> <th style="width: 14.28%;">2014 Target</th> <th style="width: 14.28%;">2014 Actual</th> <th style="width: 14.28%;">Target Met?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">95%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">95%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">99%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">98%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">90%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Actual	2013 Actual	2014 Target	2014 Actual	Target Met?	95%	95%	99%	98%	90%	100%	Yes
2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Actual	2013 Actual	2014 Target	2014 Actual	Target Met?														
95%	95%	99%	98%	90%	100%	Yes														
<b>Data Source</b>																				
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15																				
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>																				
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15 feed data into the Data Repository (DR). Pull data from the DR into spreadsheet of all cases where the Stop Sale date is within the fiscal year. Calculate the number of business days between the Case Creation date and the Stop Sale date for each case. Calculate the total number of case where the Stop Sale date is made within 20 business days of the Case Creation date, divided by the total number cases where the Stop Sale date is within the fiscal year.																				
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>																				
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.																				

<b>34</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK4.4.1		Communications				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 4: Decisive Response						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	4.4: Reduce the time it takes to inform consumers and other stakeholders of newly identified hazards and the appropriate actions to take.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Timely release of press releases announcing product recalls						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Average number of business days from an established first draft of recall press release to the date the press release is issued						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	The aggregate number of business days from the date of the first draft to the date of issuance for each recall press release issued during the fiscal year, divided by the total number of such recall press releases issued during the fiscal year						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	This performance measure monitors progress toward reducing the time it takes to inform consumers and stakeholders of product-specific hazards and the actions consumers should take to receive a free remedy. Reducing the average time it takes CPSC to issue press releases announcing product recalls will get product hazard information to consumers more quickly and reduce the risk of harm.						
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--	--	--	27.5	22	25.3*	No	
<b>Data Source</b>							
News Release Update (Tracking) Log, Compliance database							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
Data on the weekly status of recall announcements is tracked and transferred to a Performance Log that compiles recall from the previous week and calculates the average number of days for all releases, Fast-Track, and Non-Fast-Track.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
There are a number of external factors that CPSC cannot control in the recall process. These factors, to the extent possible, have accounted for modifications made to the data capture and calculation method.							
* Note: The average number of business days between establishment of first draft and issuance of recall press release for the most timely 90 percent of all recall press releases is 20 in FY 2014. The agency intends to use this refined performance measure in FY 2015.							

<b>35</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
	2014BK4.5.1		Compliance				
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
	Goal 4: Decisive Response						
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
	4.5: Hold violators accountable for hazardous consumer products on the market by utilizing enforcement authorities.						
	<b>Goal Statement</b>						
	Improve timeliness of referral to the CPSC's Office of General Counsel for review of firm's timely reporting pursuant to Section 15(b).						
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
	Percentage of compliance defect investigation cases referred within 10 business days to Office of the General Counsel (OGC) for review of firms' timely reporting pursuant to Section 15(b)						
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
	For cases that were referred to the OGC within the fiscal year for timeliness review, the percentage of cases where the referral date is within 10 business days of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) date. The CAP date is the date that terms are agreed to with firm on a recall.						
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
	Under the Consumer Product Safety Act, stakeholders have statutory reporting obligations that include when a product they produce or distribute contains a defect that presents or could present a significant risk of injury. CPSC Compliance Officers, during the investigation of those reports, as well as during investigations initiated by staff where there is no report, review the firm's report or failure to report. When a CAP is negotiated and accepted, Compliance Officers formally refer the case to the OGC, when there is reason to believe that a stakeholder has failed to report in a timely manner. Compliance Officers refer a CDI case to the OGC so that OGC can review the file and determine whether the firm reported under Section 15(b), as required. Referring cases to the OGC for follow-up review in a timely manner contributes to the CPSC's ability to hold violators accountable for hazardous consumer products in the market.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
--		--	--	57%	75%	63.3%	No
<b>Data Source</b>							
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15							
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>							
DCM Section 15 and Legacy Section 15 feed data into the DR. Pull data from the DR into spreadsheet of all timeliness cases where the Refer to Legal date is within the fiscal year. Calculate the number of business days between the CAP date and the Refer to Legal date for each case. Calculate the total number of cases where the Refer to Legal date is made within 10 business days of the CAP date, divided by the total number cases where the Refer to Legal date is within the fiscal year.							
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>							
Data are regularly reviewed during various stages of the case; however, results may differ slightly due to any updates, edits, or corrections to case data that occurs after fiscal year end run.							

<b>36</b>	<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>			
	2014BK5.2.1		Communications			
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>					
	Goal 5: Raising Awareness					
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>					
	5.2: Provide stakeholders with easily accessible, timely, and useful safety information on consumer product hazards.					
	<b>Goal Statement</b>					
	Increase access to timely, useful safety information on consumer product hazards					
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>					
	Number of public information campaigns conducted by CPSC on targeted consumer product safety hazards					
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>					
	Number of public information campaigns conducted by the CPSC on high-concern product safety hazards. Awareness is raised on these issues with either a singular effort or a campaign involving partnerships. "Campaign" refers to multiple communications products distributed to various audiences using an array of media on a single issue. Collaborations at this level involve no-cost, coordinated efforts with other agencies, nonprofit organizations, and/or associations to increase awareness and impressions.					
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>					
	CPSC conducts public information campaigns on high-concern consumer product safety issues. A campaign, which may be conducted by CPSC alone, or may involve partnerships, consists of multiple communications products on a single issue that are distributed to audiences using an assortment of traditional and new media.					
	<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>
23	24	23	24	24	24	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
Targeted hazards addressed using a variety of communications products, events and activities that raise awareness of the hazard.						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Communications products, events and activities are planned and produced, and media impressions are counted for all campaigns.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Consistent success in meeting this measure year after year; however, it does not measure the effectiveness of the campaigns. Due to occasional changes in the designation of "high-concern" product safety hazards, this measure may not be comparable from year-to-year.						

<b>37</b>	<b>Control ID</b>				<b>Program</b>								
	2014BK5.2.2				Communications								
	<b>Strategic Goal</b>												
	Goal 5: Raising Awareness												
	<b>Strategic Objective</b>												
	5.2: Provide stakeholders with easily accessible, timely, and useful safety information on consumer product hazards.												
	<b>Goal Statement</b>												
	Increase access to timely, useful safety information on consumer product hazards												
	<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>												
	Number of impressions of CPSC safety messages received by consumers on targeted consumer product safety hazards (in millions)												
	<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>												
	The number of impressions is an estimate of the number of times the public is exposed to a particular CPSC safety message. This is tracked for TV viewers, newspaper readers, online and social media viewers, as well as radio listeners, billboards, and other media. CPSC safety messages are statements in traditional and new media about CPSC product safety efforts.												
	<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>												
	This performance indicator tracks the number of impressions received by consumers of CPSC safety messages. The number of impressions is an estimate of the number of times people have been exposed to particular safety messages from CPSC. There is a direct relationship between the number of times people are exposed to a safety message and the level of awareness of the message in the general population. The number of impressions may provide a benchmark of the extent of consumer awareness.												
<b>2010 Actual</b>		<b>2011 Actual</b>		<b>2012 Actual</b>		<b>2013 Actual</b>		<b>2014 Target</b>		<b>2014 Actual</b>		<b>Target Met?</b>	
3,903		1,929		4,209		4,628		3,215		9,361		Yes	
<b>Data Source</b>													
A variety of contracted and respected media measurement tools are used by OCM to compile impressions on specified CPSC messages.													
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>													
Data provided by contracted media monitoring companies that subscribe to media measurement tools are used by a broad spectrum of companies, such as advertisers, agencies, and research firms that need reliable audience data. Sum the number of views, reads, and listens of CPSC communications related to consumer product hazards of high-concern during the fiscal year.													
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>													
Impressions are reasonable estimates of the size of a medium's audience when the message was delivered, but not necessarily an indicator of how effective the message was at influencing audience behavior. Compiling total impressions from messages that cross multiple categories (e.g., imported toy, Safe to Sleep, fire hazard) results in impression numbers that exceeded the potential audience reached with the single message.													

38

<b>Control ID</b>		<b>Program</b>				
2014BK5.3.1		Communications				
<b>Strategic Goal</b>						
Goal 5: Raising Awareness						
<b>Strategic Objective</b>						
5.3: Deploy targeted outreach campaigns for priority hazards and vulnerable communities.						
<b>Goal Statement</b>						
Improve targeted outreach campaigns conducted for priority hazards and/or vulnerable population groups						
<b>Performance Measure Statement</b>						
Number of impressions of CPSC safety messages received by consumers on priority hazards in vulnerable communities (in millions)						
<b>Definition of Performance Measure</b>						
There are four “priority hazards” that the agency is working to address in vulnerable communities: pool and spa safety, safe sleep, TV/furniture tip overs, and poison prevention. “Vulnerable communities” include minority and underrepresented population groups, such as low-income and limited English speaking audiences, and “vulnerable groups,” such as children.						
<b>Rationale for Performance Measure</b>						
The CPSC’s communications strategy includes a focus on deploying targeted outreach campaigns that aim to prevent deaths and injuries from hazards that disproportionately impact vulnerable communities.						
<b>2010 Actual</b>	<b>2011 Actual</b>	<b>2012 Actual</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>	<b>2014 Target</b>	<b>2014 Actual</b>	<b>Target Met?</b>
206	751	437	1,395	425	2,408	Yes
<b>Data Source</b>						
A variety of media measurement tools are available that media monitoring companies under contract can use to compile impressions on specified CPSC messages.						
<b>Data Collection Method and Computation</b>						
Contracted media monitoring companies subscribe to media measurement tools used by a broad spectrum of companies such as advertisers, agencies and research firms that need reliable audience data. The data collected and tallied pertains to activities carried out by the agency’s Community Outreach Team that generated media coverage.						
<b>Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results</b>						
Impressions are reasonable estimates of the size of a medium’s audience when the message was delivered, but not necessarily an indicator of how effective the message was at influencing audience behavior.						