

U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission

Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Performance Report



February 12, 2018

CPSC Stands for Safety



An electronic version of this document is available at:
www.cpsc.gov/about-cpsc/agency-reports/performance-and-budget

About this Report

This document is the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission's (CPSC's) FY 2017 Annual Performance Report (APR). It is submitted in conjunction with the CPSC's FY 2019 Performance Budget Request (PBR) to Congress. An electronic version of this report is available on the agency's website at: www.cpsc.gov/about-cpsc/agency-reports/performance-and-budget.

The FY 2017 APR satisfies the annual performance reporting requirements of the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRAMA), as well as the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-11 (*Preparation, Submission, and Execution of the Budget*).

The FY 2017 APR provides information on results achieved by CPSC programs during FY 2017 and progress made toward performance targets established for key performance measures. The performance measures indicate progress toward Strategic Goals and Strategic Objectives contained in the CPSC's 2016–2020 Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Commission in April 2016 and implemented in October 2016. Highlights of performance, as well as challenges, are presented.

Overview of the Agency

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) is an independent federal regulatory agency, created in 1972 by the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA). In addition to the CPSA, as amended by the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA), and Public Law No. 112-28, the CPSC also administers other laws, such as the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Poison Prevention Packaging Act, the Refrigerator Safety Act, the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act, the Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act, the Drywall Safety Act of 2012, and the Child Nicotine Poisoning Prevention Act.

The CPSC has jurisdiction over more than 10,000 types of consumer products used in and around the home, in recreation, and in schools, from children's toys to portable gas generators and toasters. Although the CPSC's regulatory purview is quite broad, a number of product categories fall outside the CPSC's jurisdiction.¹

¹ Product categories, such as automobiles and boats; alcohol, tobacco, and firearms; foods, drugs, cosmetics, and medical devices; and pesticides, are regulated by other federal agencies.

Message from the Acting Chairman



The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission's FY 2017 Annual Performance Report (APR) is a comprehensive report on performance results achieved by our programs during the FY 2017 reporting period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017. The agency's mission is to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products. I am pleased to have the opportunity to report these results as well as staff's accomplishments in FY 2017.

I can provide reasonable assurance that the performance data contained in this report are accurate and reliable. In FY 2017, the CPSC conducted a review to verify and validate the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of performance information. That review found that FY 2017 reported data for the performance measures were reasonably complete, accurate, and reliable.

I look forward to continuing to work with my fellow Commissioners and the CPSC staff in setting agency priorities and achieving meaningful results in the year ahead.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Ann Marie Buerkle". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

Ann Marie Buerkle
Acting Chairman
February 12, 2018

Table of Contents

Agency and Mission Information

CPSC Organizational Structure.....	1
2016–2020 Strategic Plan Summary.....	2

Performance Results

Performance Summary: An Overview.....	4
CPSC Key Performance Measures: FY 2017 Results Summary.....	5
Performance Summary by Strategic Goal	
Strategic Goal 1: Workforce	7
Strategic Goal 2: Prevention	9
Strategic Goal 3: Response	12
Strategic Goal 4: Communication	14

Other Information

Agency Priorities and Management Challenges.....	16
Cross-Agency Collaborations	17
Evaluation and Research.....	19

Appendices

Appendix A: CPSC Performance: Data Limitations, Verification & Validation.....	21
Appendix B: Changes to FY 2017 Performance Measures.....	22
Appendix C: Detailed Information on Performance Measures	23
Appendix D: Acronyms.....	54

CPSC Organizational Structure

The CPSC is a bipartisan commission that consists of five members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman is the principal executive officer of the Commission, which convenes at meetings that are open to the public. The following depicts the CPSC's organizational structure during FY 2017:



*Commissioner
Joseph P. Mohorovic²*



*Commissioner
Robert S. Adler*




*Acting Chairman
Ann Marie Buerkle*



*Commissioner
Elliot F. Kaye*



*Commissioner
Marietta S. Robinson*



² Joseph P. Mohorovic resigned from the CPSC, effective October 20, 2017.

2016–2020 Strategic Plan Summary

Below is a summary of the agency's 2016–2020 Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Commission in April 2016.³ The 2016–2020 Strategic Plan lays out the CPSC's approach to achieving the mission of keeping consumers safe, with the overarching vision of a nation free from unreasonable risks of injury and death from consumer products. Each of the four Strategic Goals is supported by Strategic Objectives. A suite of performance measures with annual targets is used to monitor progress toward the Strategic Objectives and Strategic Goals.



³ This FY 2017 APR is aligned to the CPSC's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan, which was in effect for fiscal year 2017. At the close of FY 2017, the CPSC approved an updated 2018-2022 Strategic Plan to conform to the timeline required by the GPRAMA. The CPSC's FY 2019 Annual Performance Plan (APP), which is included in the FY 2019 PBR and is being issued concurrently with the FY 2017 APR, is aligned to the updated 2018-2022 Strategic Plan.

This page intentionally left blank.

Performance Summary: An Overview

During FY 2017, the CPSC tracked 29 performance measures. Of those 29 performance measures, 18 had established performance targets for FY 2017. The CPSC met performance targets for all 18 performance measures (100 percent). Overall, these results indicate progress toward achieving the CPSC's Strategic Goals. The remaining 11 performance measures were categorized as "baseline." These 11 performance measures did not have FY 2017 performance targets, either because the measures were new, or they were significantly revised. The CPSC collected baseline data for these 11 performance measures during FY 2017, and the data will be used to set performance target levels for a future cycle.

The FY 2017 results for the key performance measures are organized by Strategic Goal (Figure 2) and by CPSC organization (Figure 3).

Figure 1: A snapshot of the CPSC's FY 2017 Key Performance Measures




Figure 2 (below): Summary of FY 2017 Results

Key Performance Measures by Strategic Goal





Figure 3 (right): Summary of FY 2017 Results

Key Performance Measures by Organization



CPSC Key Performance Measures: FY 2017 Results Summary

Strategic Goal 1: Workforce

Cultivate the most effective consumer product safety workforce

2016–2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals					2017 Target	
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
SO 1.1 Enhance effective strategic human capital planning and alignment	2017KM1.1.01 Human Capital Strategic Plan completed	--	--	--	--	1	1	✓
SO 1.2 Foster a culture of continuous development	2017KM1.2.01 Percentage of employees satisfied with opportunities to improve their skills (as reported in the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey)	--	--	--	--	72.5%	71%	✓
SO 1.3 Attract and recruit a talented and diverse workforce	2017KM1.3.01 Percentage of hiring managers trained on recruitment	--	--	--	--	56.1%	50%	✓
SO 1.4 Increase employee engagement	2017KM1.4.01 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey Employee Engagement Index Score	--	--	66%	70%	73%	70%	✓

Strategic Goal 2: Prevention

Prevent hazardous products from reaching consumers

2016–2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals					2017 Target	
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
SO 2.1 Improve identification and assessment of hazards to consumers	2017KM2.1.01 Percentage of consumer product-related incident reports warranting follow-up actions	--	--	--	--	25%	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM2.1.02 Number of hazard characterization annual reports completed on consumer product-related fatalities, injuries, and/or losses for specific hazards	11	10	10	11	11	11	✓
	2017KM2.1.03 Percentage of consumer product-related injury cases correctly captured at NEISS hospitals	92%	91%	91.6%	91%	92.4%	90%	✓
	2017KM2.1.04 Number of collaborations established or maintained with other organizations to work on nanotechnology research or issues affecting consumer products	--	--	--	--	7	5	✓
SO 2.2 Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace	2017KM2.2.01 Number of voluntary standards activities in which CPSC staff actively participates	--	--	81	71	76	76 ⁴	✓
	2017KM2.2.02 Number of candidates for rulemaking prepared for Commission consideration	14	10	20	10	18 ⁵	17 ⁴	✓
	2017KM2.2.03 Violation rate of targeted repeat offenders	--	--	--	--	17.3%	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM2.2.04 Percentage of foreign-based industry representatives indicating increased understanding after CPSC training	--	--	--	--	95%	90%	✓
	2017KM2.2.05 Percentage of foreign regulatory agency representatives indicating increased understanding of CPSC procedures after CPSC training	--	--	--	--	99.6%	90%	✓
	2017KM2.2.06 Percentage of inbound exchange fellows indicating increased understanding of CPSC best practices after CPSC training	--	--	--	--	100%	100%	✓

⁴ The CPSC's FY 2017 Mid-Year Review (approved June 2017) included revisions to FY 2017 targets that were listed in the FY 2017 Operating Plan (approved October 2016) for the following performance measures: 2017KM2.2.01—from 75 to 76; 2017KM2.2.02—from 23 to 17; and 2017KM2.3.04—from 40,000 to 35,000.

⁵ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM2.2.02 in this report is 18, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 17 that was reported in the FY 2017 Agency Financial Report (AFR) (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to a final completed list of rulemaking packages prepared.

Strategic Goal 2: Prevention (continued)

2016–2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals					2017 Target	
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
SO 2.3 Increase capability to identify and stop imported hazardous consumer products	2017KM2.3.01 Percentage of consumer product imports, identified as high-risk, examined at import	--	--	--	--	88.5% ⁶	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM2.3.02 Percentage of import shipments processed through the Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) pilot system that are cleared within one business day	99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	99.8%	99.8%	99%	✓
	2017KM2.3.03 Percentage of consumer product import entries that are risk-scored by the CPSC	--	--	--	--	4.2%	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM2.3.04 Number of import examinations completed	26,523	28,007	35,122	36,523	38,726	35,000 ⁴	✓

Strategic Goal 3: Response

Respond quickly to address hazardous consumer products both in the marketplace and with consumers

2016–2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals					2017 Target	
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
SO 3.1 Rapidly identify hazardous consumer products for enforcement action	2017KM3.1.01 Percentage of cases for which a preliminary determination is made within 85 business days of the case opening	--	--	--	--	74%	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM3.1.02 Percentage of cases for which a compliance determination of a regulatory violation is made within 35 business days of sample collection	--	--	--	--	87%	Baseline	N/A
SO 3.2 Minimize further exposure to hazardous consumer products	2017KM3.2.01 Percentage of cases for which a corrective action is accepted within 60 business days of preliminary determination	--	--	--	--	52%	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM3.2.02 Percentage of cases for which a firm is first notified of a regulatory violation within 40 business days from sample collection	--	--	--	--	86%	Baseline	N/A
	2017KM3.2.03 Percentage of Fast-Track cases with corrective actions initiated within 20 business days	98%	100%	97.3%	99.1%	98% ⁷	90%	✓
SO 3.3 Improve consumer response to consumer product recalls	2017KM3.3.01 Recall effectiveness rate for all consumer product recalls during this fiscal year	--	--	--	--	41%	Baseline	N/A

Strategic Goal 4: Communication

Communicate useful information quickly and effectively to better inform decisions

2016–2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals					2017 Target	
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
SO 4.1 Improve usefulness and availability of consumer product safety information	2017KM4.1.01 Percentage of positive responses about usefulness of information received from CPSC communication channels	--	--	--	--	92.3% ⁸	Baseline	N/A
SO 4.2 Increase dissemination of useful consumer product safety information	2017KM4.2.01 Number of impressions of CPSC safety messages (millions)	--	--	--	--	6,314.8	5,800	✓
	2017KM4.2.02 Average number of business days between establishment of first draft and issuance of recall press release for the most timely 90% of recall press releases	--	--	16	17.8	17.5	18	✓
	2017KM4.2.03 Number of CPSC social media safety messages with which stakeholders engage	--	--	--	--	285,061	Baseline	N/A
SO 4.3 Increase and enhance collaboration with stakeholders	2017KM4.3.01 Number of collaboration activities initiated with stakeholder groups	--	--	--	--	28 ⁹	25	✓

⁶ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM2.3.01 in this report is 88.5%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 87.9% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to additional data on FY 2017 import examinations that became available after publication of the FY 2017 AFR.

⁷ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM3.2.03 in this report is 98%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 97% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). A change to the computation method for the measure had been prematurely implemented for FY 2017 4th quarter data. The data for the full fiscal year 2017 were re-computed using a consistent method. (The new computation method, recommended by the Office of Inspector General, will be implemented for FY 2018 data.)

⁸ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM4.1.01 in this report is 92.3%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 90.7% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to correction of the method used to compute the overall average.

⁹ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM4.3.01 in this report is 28, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 33 that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to clarification of the types of collaboration activities that should be included (collaborations that did not involve communicating product safety information were excluded).

Performance Summary by Strategic Goal

Strategic Goal 1: Workforce

Cultivate the most effective consumer product safety workforce

Challenges

Having a highly trained, diverse, and engaged workforce is critical to meeting the dynamic challenges of the consumer product safety landscape and to achieving the CPSC's life-saving mission. Agency personnel's knowledge about product safety, commitment to the agency's mission, and "can-do" attitude make achieving the CPSC's mission possible. The CPSC formulated the 2016–2020 Strategic Plan to address the following key workforce challenges:

- Having a workforce with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet new, innovative, and emerging product safety challenges;
- Aligning personnel resources to agency priorities;
- Maintaining a global presence to address global marketplace issues;
- Increasing employee engagement; and
- Strengthening knowledge transfer through succession planning.




Figure 4: A snapshot of Strategic Goal 1 performance measures (4 total)

Strategies

The CPSC's approach to cultivating an effective workforce involves enhancing human capital planning and alignment, increasing opportunities for professional development, and improving recruitment strategies to attract talented, diverse, and committed personnel. The strategy also emphasizes increasing employee engagement by promoting and rewarding personnel innovation and creativity, increasing managers' commitment to fostering employee engagement in the workplace, and promoting a healthy work-life balance.

Table 1

2016 -2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals / Trend line					2017 Target	
SO 1.1 Enhance effective strategic human capital planning and alignment								
2017KM1.1.01 Human Capital Strategic Plan completed		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	1	1	✓
SO 1.2 Foster a culture of continuous development								
2017KM1.2.01 Percentage of employees satisfied with opportunities to improve their skills (as reported in the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey)		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	72.5%	71%	✓
SO 1.3 Attract and recruit a talented and diverse workforce								
2017KM1.3.01 Percentage of hiring managers trained on recruitment		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	56.1%	50%	✓
SO 1.4 Increase employee engagement								
2017KM1.4.01 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey Employee Engagement Index Score		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	66%	70%	73%	70%	✓

FY 2017 Results

The CPSC met or exceeded FY 2017 targets for all four key performance measures for Strategic Goal 1. Selected FY 2017 achievements under Strategic Goal 1 include:

- Completed development of the Human Capital Strategic Plan;
- Increased the CPSC's Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) Employee Engagement Index (EEI) score to 73 percent, a 3 percent increase from the prior fiscal year; and
- Trained more than 56 percent of managers on the recruitment process to attract and recruit a talented, diverse, and highly-effective workforce.

Additional analysis and explanation for each performance measure is included in Appendix C.

Strategic Goal 2: Prevention

Prevent hazardous products from reaching consumers

Challenges

The CPSC is charged with protecting the public from unreasonable risks of injury and death from a vast array of consumer products supplied through expanding global markets. Efforts to increase manufacturing of safe consumer products, combined with improved mechanisms to identify hazardous products before they enter the marketplace, are the most effective ways to prevent hazardous products from reaching consumers. The CPSC formulated the Strategic Plan to address the following key challenges to preventing consumer product-related injuries, including:

- Providing surveillance for the myriad of consumer products imported and domestically manufactured under the CPSC's jurisdiction;
- Advancing data analysis and research capability to identify existing and potential emerging consumer product hazards, particularly those linked to rapid advances in technology, such as the use of nanoparticles;
- Addressing changes in traditional manufacturing methods, such as additive manufacturing using 3-D printers, and e-commerce sales and distribution options;
- Helping develop voluntary standards and adopting mandatory regulations to address existing product hazards and potential product hazards resulting from new technologies; and
- Identifying, researching, and informing the public about chemical or chronic hazards in consumer products.





Figure 5: A snapshot of Strategic Goal 2 performance measures (14 total)

Strategies

The CPSC endeavors to prevent injury or harm to consumers resulting from consumer products by: (1) working at the national and international level to help ensure that hazards are appropriately addressed by voluntary standards or mandatory regulations; (2) providing technical information to industry to support voluntary standards development; and (3) allocating inspection, surveillance, and enforcement resources effectively to identify and remove hazardous products from the marketplace.

Table 2

2016-2020 Strategic Plan		Actuals / Trend line					2017 Target	
Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)								
SO 2.1 Improve identification and assessment of hazards to consumers								
2017KM2.1.01 Percentage of consumer product-related incident reports warranting follow-up actions	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	25%	Baseline	N/A	
2017KM2.1.02 Number of hazard characterization annual reports completed on consumer product-related fatalities, injuries, and/or losses for specific hazards	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	11	10	10	11	11	11	✔	
								

2016-2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals / Trend line					2017 Target	
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
2017KM2.1.03 Percentage of consumer product-related injury cases correctly captured at NEISS hospitals		92%	91%	91.6%	91%	92.4%	90%	✓
2017KM2.1.04 Number of collaborations established or maintained with other organizations to work on nanotechnology research or issues affecting consumer products		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	7	5	✓
SO 2.2 Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace								
2017KM2.2.01 Number of voluntary standards activities in which CPSC staff actively participates		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	81	71	76	76 ¹⁰	✓
2017KM2.2.02 Number of candidates for rulemaking prepared for Commission consideration		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		14	10	20	10	18 ¹¹	17 ¹⁰	✓
2017KM2.2.03 Violation rate of targeted repeat offenders		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	17.3%	Baseline	N/A
2017KM2.2.04 Percentage of foreign-based industry representatives indicating increased understanding after CPSC training		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	95%	90%	✓
2017KM2.2.05 Percentage of foreign regulatory agency representatives indicating increased understanding of CPSC procedures after CPSC training		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	99.6%	90%	✓
2017KM2.2.06 Percentage of inbound exchange fellows indicating increased understanding of CPSC best practices after CPSC training		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	100%	100%	✓
SO 2.3 Increase capability to identify and stop imported hazardous consumer products								
2017KM2.3.01 Percentage of consumer product imports, identified as high-risk, examined at import		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	88.5% ¹²	Baseline	N/A
2017KM2.3.02 Percentage of import shipments processed through the Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) pilot system that are cleared within one business day		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	99.8%	99.8%	99%	✓
2017KM2.3.03 Percentage of consumer product import entries that are risk-scored by the CPSC		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		--	--	--	--	4.2%	Baseline	N/A
2017KM2.3.04 Number of import examinations completed		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?
		26,523	28,007	35,122	36,523	38,726	35,000 ¹⁰	✓

¹⁰ The CPSC's FY 2017 Mid-Year Review (approved June 2017) included revisions to FY 2017 targets that were listed in the FY 2017 Operating Plan (approved October 2016) for the following performance measures: 2017KM2.2.01—from 75 to 76; 2017KM2.2.02—from 23 to 17; and 2017KM2.3.04—from 40,000 to 35,000.

¹¹ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM2.2.02 in this report is 18, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 17 that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to a final completed list of rulemaking packages prepared.

¹² The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM2.3.01 in this report is 88.5%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 87.9% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to additional data on FY 2017 import examinations that became available after publication of the FY 2017 AFR.

FY 2017 Results

For FY 2017, the CPSC tracked 14 key performance measures under Strategic Goal 2. Of those 14 performance measures, 10 had established targets for FY 2017. The CPSC met or exceeded the FY 2017 targets for all 10 of those performance measures. The remaining four measures were designated as “baseline” and did not have FY 2017 performance targets. The CPSC collected baseline data for those four measures during FY 2017, and the data will be used to set performance target levels in future years. Selected FY 2017 achievements under Strategic Goal 2 include:

- Screened more than 38,500 different imported consumer products at U.S. ports of entry;
- Collaborated with manufacturers and other stakeholders to improve high-energy battery safety. The CPSC conducted a successful battery seminar in Shenzhen, China, attended by 125 representatives of the leading lithium-ion battery makers. The CPSC also collaborated on safety information and standards with the Battery Safety Council, the Lithium Battery Interagency Coordination Group, industry organizations, and voluntary standards developers;
- Actively participated in 76 voluntary standard activities, collaborating with industry leaders, consumer advocates, and other stakeholders to improve consensus voluntary standards across a wide range of consumer products; and
- Delivered training on U.S. children’s products testing requirements to 230 representatives from conformity assessment laboratories in China.

Additional analysis and explanation for each performance measure is included in Appendix C.

Strategic Goal 3: Response

Respond quickly to address hazardous consumer products both in the marketplace and with consumers

Challenges

The CPSC learns about potential consumer product hazards from many sources, including incident reports, consumer complaints, the agency's Hotline (1-800-638-2772), www.SaferProducts.gov, Internet reports, and company reports. Additionally, field personnel investigate reports of incidents and injuries; conduct inspections of manufacturers, importers, and retailers; and identify potential regulatory violations and product hazards. When potential product defects are identified, the CPSC must act quickly to address the most hazardous consumer products that have made their way into the marketplace or into the hands of consumers. The CPSC formulated the Strategic Plan to address the following key response challenges:

- Following trends in retailing and e-commerce, such as the prevalence of online sellers or other direct manufacturer-to-consumer marketing, as well as sales through third party platform providers;
- Working within a global supply chain, which creates complex monitoring challenges;
- Collecting, integrating, and analyzing data to identify high-risk hazards for appropriate action; and
- Improving the monitoring and effectiveness of consumer product recalls.




Figure 6: A snapshot of Strategic Goal 3 performance measures (6 total)

Strategies

The CPSC's strategy is to improve the effectiveness of the procedures used to process and analyze incoming product hazard-related data, and align resources so that the agency can act quickly to remove potentially hazardous products from the marketplace. The strategy also involves improving the recall monitoring process and working with industry to increase consumer awareness of product recalls as they occur. To achieve this strategic goal, the CPSC is working toward improving consumer response to consumer product recalls. The CPSC works with consumers, recalling firms, retailers, and other interested parties to reach consumers affected by recalls. The

agency is working to improve the effectiveness of product recalls by expanding the CPSC's use of social media, urging recalling firms to use social media to broaden the notice of recalls, and conducting consumer focus group research on why and when consumers respond to recalls, as well as other techniques.



Table 3

2016 - 2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals / Trend line					2017 Target	
SO 3.1 Rapidly identify hazardous consumer products for enforcement action								
2017KM3.1.01 Percentage of cases for which a preliminary determination is made within 85 business days of the case opening	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	74%	Baseline	N/A	
2017KM3.1.02 Percentage of cases for which a compliance determination of a regulatory violation is made within 35 business days of sample collection	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	87%	Baseline	N/A	
SO 3.2 Minimize further exposure to hazardous consumer products								
2017KM3.2.01 Percentage of cases for which a corrective action is accepted within 60 business days of preliminary determination	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	52%	Baseline	N/A	
2017KM3.2.02 Percentage of cases for which a firm is first notified of a regulatory violation within 40 business days from sample collection	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	86%	Baseline	N/A	
2017KM3.2.03 Percentage of Fast-Track cases with corrective actions initiated within 20 business days	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	98%	100%	97.3%	99.1%	98% ¹³	90%	✔	
SO 3.3 Improve consumer response to consumer product recalls								
2017KM3.3.01 Recall effectiveness rate for all consumer product recalls during this fiscal year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	41%	Baseline	N/A	

FY 2017 Results

For FY 2017, the CPSC tracked six key performance measures under Strategic Goal 3. Of those six performance measures, one had an established performance target for FY 2017. The CPSC exceeded the FY 2017 target for that performance measure. The remaining five measures were designated as "baseline" and did not have FY 2017 performance targets. The CPSC collected baseline data for those five measures during FY 2017, and the data will be used to set performance target levels in future years. Selected FY 2017 achievements under Strategic Goal 3 include:

- Conducted a Recall Effectiveness Workshop in July 2017. The goal of the workshop was to engage CPSC stakeholders to explore ideas for improving the effectiveness of recalls and to develop measures that the CPSC and stakeholders can use to make future recalls more effective;
- Completed 3,004 establishment inspections of firms for compliance with the CPSC's laws and regulations;
- Sent 1,935 notices of noncompliance, and negotiated 375 corrective action plans (CAPs) to address hazardous consumer products; and
- Conducted 381 recalls, involving approximately 41 million units. All 381 recalls were voluntary.

Additional analysis and explanation for each performance measure is included in Appendix C.

¹³The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM3.2.03 in this report is 98%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 97% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). A change to the computation method for the measure had been prematurely implemented for FY 2017 4th quarter data. The data for the full fiscal year 2017 were re-computed using a consistent method. (The new computation method will be implemented for FY 2018 data.)

Strategic Goal 4: Communication

Communicate useful information quickly and effectively to better inform decisions

Challenges

Consumers, safety advocates, industry, and government regulators need high-quality information about consumer product safety. Consumers need safety information to make more informed decisions for themselves and their families. Safety advocates rely on accurate data to shape their policy recommendations. Industry needs information to stay in compliance with safety requirements. Foreign regulators and state and local government agencies also need high-quality information to establish new safety requirements that advance consumer safety. These diverse audiences have varied information needs and respond to different methods of communication. The CPSC formulated the Strategic Plan to address the following key communication challenges:

- Updating knowledge management strategies and adopting advanced communication tools and channels to improve consistency, reliability, accessibility, and timeliness of information provided to stakeholders and within the CPSC;
- Improving CPSC messaging and outreach to affected populations, including underserved, low-income, and minority communities and families; and
- Strengthening the CPSC's collaboration with all stakeholders to improve communication.




Figure 7: A snapshot of Strategic Goal 4 performance measures (5 total)

communication tools. Dissemination of more useful and timely consumer product safety information will result in a stronger agency brand, the ability to communicate in mobile environments, and the ability to explore micro-targeting to reach the most at-risk populations. An additional element of the CPSC's strategy involves strengthening collaborations with stakeholder groups, including other government agencies and nonprofit organizations.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4.1

Improve usefulness and availability of consumer product safety information

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4.2

Increase dissemination of useful consumer product safety information

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4.3

Increase and enhance collaboration with stakeholders

Strategies

The CPSC uses a wide array of communication channels and strategies to provide timely, targeted information about consumer product safety to the public, industry, and other stakeholders. The agency disseminates safety messages through workshops and training sessions; listserv messages; press releases; public service announcements and video news releases; newspaper, radio, and TV interviews; and increasingly, social media, including Facebook, Twitter, and blogs. The CPSC's strategy includes improving the usefulness and availability of safety messages by collecting and analyzing data, as well as designing and applying new, innovative

Table 4

2016-2020 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective (SO) / Key Performance Measure (KM)		Actuals / Trend line					2017 Target	
SO 4.1 Improve usefulness and availability of consumer product safety information								
2017KM4.1.01 Percentage of positive responses about usefulness of information received from CPSC communication channels	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	92.3% ¹⁴	Baseline	N/A	
SO 4.2 Increase dissemination of useful consumer product safety information								
2017KM4.2.01 Number of impressions of CPSC safety messages (millions)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	6,314.8	5,800	✓	
2017KM4.2.02 Average number of business days between establishment of first draft and issuance of recall press release for the most timely 90% of recall press releases	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	16	17.8	17.5	18	✓	
2017KM4.2.03 Number of CPSC social media safety messages with which stakeholders engage	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	285,061	Baseline	N/A	
SO 4.3 Increase and enhance collaboration with stakeholders								
2017KM4.3.01 Number of collaboration activities initiated with stakeholder groups	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 Target	Target met?	
	--	--	--	--	28 ¹⁵	25	✓	

FY 2017 Results

For FY 2017, the CPSC tracked five key performance measures under Strategic Goal 4. For the three performance measures that had established performance targets for FY 2017, the CPSC met or exceeded the FY 2017 targets. The remaining two key measures were designated as "baseline" and did not have FY 2017 performance targets. The CPSC collected baseline data for those two measures during FY 2017, and the data will be used to set performance target levels in future years. Selected FY 2017 achievements under Strategic Goal 4 include:

- Promoted CPSC safety campaigns by focusing on priority hazards in vulnerable communities, which resulted in more than 3 billion impressions of CPSC safety messages, including about 144 million impressions for the CPSC's Safe to Sleep® program; about 1 billion impressions for the CPSC's Anchor It! furniture and television tip-over prevention campaign; more than 1.8 billion impressions for the pool drowning and drain entrapment prevention program; and approximately 175 million impressions for minority outreach;
- Increased Web traffic with more than 11,500 views in FY 2017 of the "Regulatory Robot," an interactive resource to help small businesses identify important product safety requirements;
- Increased the number of members of the Neighborhood Safety Network (NSN) from approximately 3,000 in 2009 to 8,000 in FY 2017. The NSN is a grassroots outreach program that provides timely information to member organizations and individuals, who in turn, share CPSC safety messages with underserved consumers who might not otherwise hear of, or receive, information from the CPSC; and
- Received more than 76,000 calls to the CPSC Hotline (1-800-638-2772), where consumers can contact the agency directly with product safety hazard information or concerns. The CPSC distributed more than 1 million safety publications to consumers.

Additional analysis and explanation for each performance measure is included in Appendix C.

¹⁴ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM4.1.01 in this report is 92.3%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 90.7% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to correction of the method used to compute the overall average.

¹⁵ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM4.3.01 in this report is 28, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 33 that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to clarification of the types of collaboration activities that should be included (collaborations that did not involve communicating product safety information were excluded).

Agency Priorities & Management Challenges

Agency Priority: Focus on Risk

The CPSC will focus its resources on the highest priority consumer product safety risks. This will be accomplished by using data to guide decisions and policy, relying on and adequately funding the voluntary standards process, prioritizing standard-setting activities and revisiting the efficacy of existing regulations, when necessary.

Agency Priority: Import Surveillance

The CPSC will continue to support import surveillance by incrementally developing the Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) system to identify and stop noncompliant imported products from entering the U.S. marketplace and potentially avoiding cumbersome recalls. This will be accomplished by allocating full-time personnel to conduct inspections and clear compliant cargo quickly at only the highest-volume ports of entry, and using domestic Compliance Investigators to provide interim coverage at lower-volume ports on an as-needed basis.

Agency Priority: Collaboration, Education, and Outreach

The CPSC will emphasize outreach and education by engaging all stakeholders through forums and workshops. This will be accomplished by continuing to emphasize and expand the work of the agency's Small Business Ombudsman (SBO), proactively engaging industry and international stakeholders at all levels, and providing information and education to consumers so that they can make informed decisions.

Agency Priority: Data-Driven

The CPSC will expand the sources and types of data analysis used to identify hazards and inform compliance decisions. This will be accomplished by augmenting analytical and trend-assessment protocols, thereby expanding the CPSC's capabilities in identifying emerging hazards and reinforcing the data-driven nature of the agency's work.

Management Challenges

Management challenges identified by the CPSC's Inspector General are detailed on pp. 56–61 of the *FY 2017 Agency Financial Report* (AFR), which can be found at: www.cpsc.gov/about-cpsc/agency-reports/performance-and-budget.

Cross-Agency Collaborations

Collaboration with CDC on Data Collection Through NEISS

Overview: The CPSC collects information about consumer product-related injuries treated in hospital emergency rooms. This unique system provides statistically valid national estimates of product-related injuries from a probability sample of hospital emergency rooms. National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS) data are available to anyone with an Internet connection at: www.cpsc.gov/en/research--statistics/NEISS-injury-data.

CDC: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides funding to the CPSC to support the collection through NEISS of additional, CDC-defined data on non-consumer product-related injuries. These comprehensive data on all trauma-related injuries (not just consumer product-related injuries) make up the nonfatal injury data component of the CDC's Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS),TM an interactive, online database used by researchers, public health professionals, and the public.

Uses of NEISS Data: NEISS data are a critically important component of the CPSC's data-driven approach to identifying emerging trends and consumer product hazards. Additionally, NEISS data are used by other government agencies, consumer advocacy organizations, and medical journals. Examples include:

- The U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) and CDC's use of NEISS as a source of data on injuries related to domestic violence, sexual violence, and/or child abuse;
- The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs' use of NEISS data to help inform decisions for its Pharmacy Benefits Management (PBM) Services;
- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) use of NEISS data to help improve transportation safety;
- The Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) use of NEISS data to help improve workplace safety and inform rulemaking; and

- The National Fire Protection Association's (NFPA) use of NEISS data to help inform development of consensus fire codes.

Collaboration with CBP on Import Surveillance

The CPSC has collaborated successfully with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to improve surveillance and screening of imported consumer products. The CPSIA directed the CPSC to create a Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) to identify products imported into the United States that are most likely to violate consumer product safety statutes and regulations or that contain a defect that constitutes a substantial product hazard. The CPSC uses a RAM system, which integrates data collected by CBP with data used in CPSC systems to identify high-risk imports that might violate a CPSC statute or regulation.

eFiling Pilot: The agency collaborated with CBP to complete the pilot phase of an electronic filing project in FY 2017. The 6-month pilot phase, which ended in December 2016, also involved the CPSC working closely with a small set of volunteer importers to test processes for handling electronic filing data that could potentially enhance the agency's targeting of hazardous consumer product imports. In July 2017, the CPSC initiated the next phase of the "eFiling" project, which will analyze certificates of compliance collected as part of routine import operations.

Collaboration with NIST, NNCO, and NIOSH on Nanotechnology

Nanotechnology research and development (R&D) is rapidly being commercialized into consumer products, including products for children. Global trading partners are investing in the manufacturing infrastructure to produce and export these new products to the United States. To help advance nanotechnology R&D, the CPSC continued collaborative work during FY 2017 through established Interagency Agreements (IAAs) with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office (NNCO), and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

- **CPSC's Collaboration with NIST:** NIST is collaborating with the CPSC to evaluate methods for assessing the release of nanomaterials in dust samples collected from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Healthy Home Survey and releases from consumer products, as well as validate test methods for nanomaterials.
- **CPSC's Collaboration with NNCO:** In FY 2015, the CPSC sponsored the National Nanotechnology Initiative's (NNI) Quantifying Exposure to Engineered Nanomaterials (QEEN) Manufactured Products Workshop. In FY 2017, the CPSC established an agreement with NNCO, a National Science Foundation (NSF) office that serves as the coordination office for the White House-led NNI. The purpose is to conduct a workshop to highlight the science and measurement challenges associated with assessing the potential release of engineered nanomaterials (ENMs) from manufactured products. The primary focus of the workshop will be to determine the state of the science and the tools and methods available to characterize and quantify the presence of nanomaterials in products, the potential for their release, and the potential for population exposure.
- **CPSC's Collaboration with NIOSH:** NIOSH, in a collaboration with the CPSC, recently conducted Phase 1 of a study to research the following aspects of nanoparticles: particle generation, characterization, and fractionation; *in vitro* dosimetric determination; *in vitro* toxicity investigation in multiple cell lines; and *in vivo* evaluation of Positive Expiratory Pressure- (PEP) induced cardiovascular effects via inhalation. In FY 2017, NIOSH conducted a follow-up, Phase 2 study to investigate environmental health and safety implications from engineered nanomaterials released from nano-enabled products (NEPs) during consumer use in targeted study areas.

Collaboration with Federal Agencies on Shared Services

Current Shared Services: The CPSC supports and has designed its operating model around the use of shared services to lower costs, improve service delivery, and benefit from economies of scale not necessarily available to a small agency. The CPSC already leverages shared services for the following:

- **Financial Management System and Operations:** Financial Accounting System (Oracle) and Accounting Services are provided by the Enterprise Service Center (ESC), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).
- **Payroll:** Payroll and related human resource (HR) system services are provided through the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI).
- **Acquisition:** Supplementary procurement operating capacity is provided by the Program Support Center (PSC) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).
- **www.GrantSolutions.gov:** Data capture and workflow capabilities are provided through the Grants Center of Excellence (COE) of HHS to support the CPSC's Virginia Graeme Baker (VGB) Act grant program.
- **Information Systems Security Line of Business (ISSLoB) Services:** ISSLoB services are leveraged as part of continued implementation of OMB's 2005 ISSLoB initiative from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), which is one of OMB's designated Shared Services Centers (SSC).
- **Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Requirements:** Continuous Monitoring Assessment (CMA) services are leveraged from ESC for the CPSC's information systems, as part of compliance with FISMA.
- **eRulemaking:** Shared services are leveraged from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for maintenance and operation of the Federal Docket Management System (FDMA), which is a centralized docket management system that provides federal agencies and citizens the opportunity to search, view, download, and submit comments on federal notices and rules.

Evaluation and Research

Key Performance Measures

The CPSC has identified a core set of 29 key performance measures that describe progress in implementing the 2016–2020 Strategic Plan. The key performance measures are tools for monitoring and reporting progress toward the agency's strategic goals and strategic objectives, and the key performance measures facilitate using evidence in agency management and resource decisions. The key performance measures are supplemented by additional operating performance measures, which track lower-level project and program outcomes and outputs, and are used for internal management and decision-making. Additional internal milestones are set and monitored to track implementation progress.

Strategic Data Review Meetings

The CPSC implements a number of different mechanisms to review financial and performance data and manage programs during the fiscal year. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) produces a monthly status report for senior managers' use, which summarizes the status of the agency's financial resources and human capital. Financial data presented in the report include the current fiscal year's annual funding level, cumulative allowances, cumulative funds obligated, and expended obligations, as well as information on onboard staffing levels. Another helpful agency practice has been conducting a Mid-Year review process, during which the operating budget and program plans are examined for potential adjustments, based on new information or emerging priorities of the agency.

The agency also conducts periodic Strategic Data Reviews (SDRs). The SDRs are strategic, data-driven planning and performance progress reviews attended by the CPSC's senior managers. SDRs provide a forum for managers to focus on annual planning to achieve performance goals and strategic objectives, as well as to refresh program priorities and funding requirements. Forward-looking planning decisions are informed by assessment of progress toward performance

measure targets and achievement of agency performance goals and strategic objectives, as well as review of relevant evaluation information. Managers discuss constraints or problems, and they identify any needed modifications to programs going forward. Program risks are also discussed, and mitigation strategies are developed.

Evaluation and Research

The CPSC conducts research and evaluation to make informed management decisions, drive improvements in program delivery and effectiveness, and update future strategies and program formulation. The CPSC's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducts audits, evaluations, reviews, and investigations relating to the agency's programs and operations. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) also conducts performance audits and analyses, and makes recommendations to help improve the CPSC's practices, policies, and programs. In addition, the CPSC performs targeted reviews of internal controls to determine if processes should be modified to strengthen and improve operations. Finally, the CPSC reviews or evaluates specific programs, as needed, and conducts research on the effectiveness of strategies and programs supporting the strategic goals in the Strategic Plan. When appropriate, the CPSC conducts research on how consumers actually use or interact with specific products, to understand exposure to safety hazards. Information from these research efforts, which can include consumer surveys, contributes to work on development of product safety standards. A recent example is a nationally representative survey that is under way to learn more about young children's potential exposure to chemical and mechanical safety hazards on playgrounds that have surfacing material made from recycled tires. Another national survey is being conducted on consumer usage patterns and the functionality of installed smoke and carbon monoxide (CO) alarms in households. A pilot project completed in FY 2017 to collect specific CPSC information to enhance the agency's import targeting, is another example of

the CPSC's evaluation efforts. During the pilot, the CPSC worked closely with volunteer importers and the CBP to develop and test processes and procedures for handling electronic filing data that could potentially enhance the CPSC's targeting of hazardous consumer product imports. In July 2017, the CPSC initiated the next phase of the "eFiling" project, which will involve assessing whether data contained on certificates of compliance, which are collected as part of normal import operations, would be useful for targeting efforts if they were made available before importation. The CPSC is committed to using the findings from research and evaluation to improve programs and strategies, and make progress toward strategic goals and strategic objectives.

Importance of Data and Evidence in Determining Program Priorities

The CPSC is a data-driven agency. The agency regularly collects and analyzes a wide range of data from multiple sources that is relevant to its mission. The CPSC uses that information to shape program strategies and select priorities. For example, the CPSC systematically reviews and analyzes data on injury and death incidents related to consumer products to develop the CPSC's hazard-mitigation strategies. The CPSC receives data from NEISS, death certificates, Medical Examiner and Coroners Alert Project (MECAP) reports, incident reports, and www.SaferProducts.gov.

Appendix A

CPSC Performance: Data Limitations, Verification & Validation

Verification & Validation of Performance Data

The CPSC requires accurate data to assess agency progress toward its strategic and performance goals, and to make good management decisions. The CPSC's approach to verification and validation (V&V) of performance data, intended to improve the accuracy and reliability of reported performance data, is based upon the following:

- (1) The agency develops performance measures through its strategic planning and annual performance planning processes.
- (2) The CPSC's component organizations follow a standard reporting procedure to document detailed information for each performance measure in an internal agency database. The information includes, but is not limited to:
 - the performance measure definition
 - the rationale for the performance measure
 - the source of the data
 - the data collection and computation methods
 - data limitations
- (3) The CPSC's component organizations calculate and report data for the performance measures on a quarterly basis to the Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation (EXFM). At the agency's SDR meetings, which have been held twice a year, senior management analyzes and discusses data for performance measures and progress toward meeting the strategic goals and objectives. The annual performance results are reviewed by EXFM and approved by management before being published in agency documents, including the APR.
- (4) The CPSC continues to implement a V&V process, using established operating procedures, with the intent of assessing each key performance measure within a 2-year cycle. In addition, program officials conduct annual self-assessments of the completeness,

consistency, timeliness, quality, and limitations of performance data for key performance measures for which they are responsible. EXFM selected 14 FY 2017 key performance measures from across the agency's component organizations for an independent assessment of the quality of performance data. EXFM's V&V assessments of performance measures are intended to meet GPRAMA requirements regarding the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of performance data, and ultimately, improve the quality of agency performance information. Detailed information on each of the FY 2017 key performance measures can be found in Appendix C, pp. 23–53.

- (5) Managers of major organizational units within the CPSC submit annual statements of assurance on the operating effectiveness of general and program-level internal controls for their areas of responsibility. Those statements of assurance identify any known deficiencies or weaknesses in program-level internal controls where they exist, including any issues with the quality of program performance data. Additionally, program managers responsible for reporting key measures certify that procedures for ensuring performance data quality and accuracy have been followed, and that the reported results in the APR are reasonably complete, accurate, and reliable.

Data Limitations

Although the agency does have reasonably reliable processes, procedures, and systems for collecting accurate data for key performance measures, there are inherent limitations to the accuracy and reliability of reported performance information. Appendix C of this report describes the known data limitations, where applicable, for each key performance measure.

Appendix B

Changes to FY 2017 Performance Measures

OMB Circular A-11 guidance directs agencies to include in the FY 2017 APR a summary of any changes to FY 2017 key performance measures that may have occurred since the publication of the FY 2017 PBR (published February 2015).

The FY 2017 performance measures that were included in the CPSC's FY 2017 PBR aligned with the CPSC's 2011–2016 Strategic Plan. The FY 2017 performance measures that are reported in this document align with the CPSC's 2016–2020 Strategic Plan and have replaced the performance measures included in the FY 2017 PBR.

Appendix C

Detailed Information on Performance Measures

This section presents detailed information on the 29 key performance measures. The CPSC's FY 2017 Operating Plan, as amended by the Mid-Year Review in June 2017, includes FY 2017 performance measures and annual targets, used for tracking progress toward achieving the strategic goals and strategic objectives from the agency's 2016–2020 Strategic Plan.

Navigation: The performance measures are organized by Strategic Goal. For each performance measure, this appendix shows key information from the data fields listed in the CPSC's centralized Performance Management Database (PMD). Each quarter, the CPSC's component organizations are responsible for reporting actual progress for each performance measure in the PMD. Following are the data fields listed in this appendix for each performance measure:

Name of Data Field	Description
Control ID	A unique identifier assigned to each performance measure.
Program	The CPSC's component organization that is responsible for the performance measure.
Strategic Goal	The strategic goal from the CPSC's 2016–2020 Strategic Plan associated with the performance measure.
Strategic Objective	The strategic objective from the CPSC's 2016–2020 Strategic Plan associated with the performance measure.
Performance Measure Statement:	A measurable value that indicates the state or level of the targeted result.
Definition of Performance Measure	A clear description of the indicator, with enough specificity that different individuals can collect and report the same information for the measure.
Rationale for Performance Measure	A description of why the performance measure was selected; how it tracks progress toward the associated strategic objective; and how the information will be useful for management.
2013–2017 Actuals; Target met?	FY 2017 target and historical actual values for the performance measure and indication of whether the FY 2017 target was met.

Name of Data Field	Description
Analysis	<p>This field may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation of how progress toward meeting the annual target for this performance measure contributes to progress toward meeting the strategic objective; • Annual Target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ If the FY 2017 target was met, a description of the key elements that contributed to success in meeting the target ◦ If the FY 2017 target was not met, a description of the issues/obstacles that impeded success in meeting the target ◦ If data for FY 2017 result are not available, the reason(s) for the unavailability, and the expected date that the data will become available; and • Discussion of the trend result: positive, negative, or steady; expectations for trend over time.
Plan(s) for Improving Performance	<p>If applicable, a description of action(s) to be implemented to improve performance and achieve the result in future years.</p>
Data Source	<p>Identification of data source(s) with enough specificity, so that the same source(s) can be used for the performance measure over time.</p>
Data Collection Method and Computation	<p>Detailed description of the collection and computation method, so that it can be replicated consistently over time, and by different personnel.</p>
Data Limitations & Implications of the Reported Results	<p>Identification of any known data limitations, including a description of the limitations, the impact limitations may have on measuring progress toward the annual target and/or the related performance goal, and the actions that will be taken to correct the limitations.</p>

Control ID				Program		
2017KM1.1.01				Human Resources		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 1: Workforce						
Strategic Objective						
1.1: Enhance effective strategic human capital planning and alignment						
Performance Measure Statement						
Human Capital Strategic Plan completed						
Definition of Performance Measure						
Complete a Human Capital Strategic plan that aligns with the CPSC's Strategic Plan						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
A detailed Human Capital Strategic plan will help ensure the agency is aligning its human capital resources with the agency's strategic plan.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	1	1	✓
Analysis						
The Human Capital Strategic Plan was completed and posted to CPSC's internal document-sharing system during FY 2017. The Human Capital Strategic Plan meets all of the OPM requirements and provides a direct link to the CPSC's Strategic Plan. The CPSC's Office of Human Resources Management (EXRM) newsletter featured the rollout to employees in early FY 2018 (November 2017). Workforce reports to support goals have been distributed to senior managers each quarter and in an annual report.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
With completion of the Human Capital Strategic Plan during FY 2017, implementation of the Plan will start in FY 2018. Progress on goals, as outlined in the Plan, will be monitored, and new FY 2018 workforce data will be used for making adjustments to the Plan.						
Data Source						
Human Resources' spreadsheet for tracking progress toward completion of the CPSC's Human Capital Strategic Plan						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Manual entries were made to the spreadsheet to track progress toward Plan completion						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
No known data limitations						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM1.2.01				Human Resources		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 1: Workforce						
Strategic Objective						
1.2: Foster a culture of continuous development						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of employees satisfied with opportunities to improve their skills (as reported in the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey)						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage of positive responses for Question 1 – “I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.” – from the annual FEVS administered by OPM is computed as follows: The number of employees who responded “satisfied” or “highly satisfied,” divided by the number of employees who responded to the question.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
FEVS results for Question 1 are an indicator of how well the agency fosters a culture of continuous development by providing opportunities and encouraging professional development.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	72.5%	71%	✓
Analysis						
<p>The FY 2017 result (positive responses for Question 1) was 72%, compared to the FY 2015 result of 64.8%. The FY 2017 result was based on the FY 2017 82% survey response rate of CPSC employees to the FEVS. The improved FY 2017 result was largely attributed to the following efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Expanded developmental opportunities available at the agency level—provided 60 opportunities;Piloted Individual Development Plans (IDPs) to more than 20% of workforce; andPiloted an Agency Coaching Program.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The agency will continue in accordance with FY 2017 efforts. .						
Data Source						
Annual FEVS results from OPM						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The link to the FEVS is sent out via email each year to all permanent employees (as of October 1 of the preceding year). Positive responses are calculated by OPM. Positive responses include both the highly satisfied and satisfied employee response for Question 1.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
CPSC employee responses to the FEVS are the source of data for this measure. As such, the data quality for this performance measure depends on the quality of survey responses, as well as the survey response rate (the FY 2017 response rate was 82%).						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM1.3.01			Human Resources			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 1: Workforce						
Strategic Objective						
1.3: Attract and recruit a talented and diverse workforce						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of hiring managers trained on recruitment						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The CPSC provided recruitment training (segments on targeted assessments and recruitments) to all selecting officials at CPSC (all supervisors, managers and executives) during FY 2017. The performance measure tracked the percentage of CPSC selecting officials who completed the training segments during the fiscal year (the number of CPSC selecting officials who completed the training segments during the fiscal year divided by the total number of CPSC selecting officials).						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
CPSC selecting officials received training in assessment tools and targeted recruitment to ensure that they have the tools necessary to recruit a talented and diverse workforce. To recruit the best talent, hiring managers need to focus on the vacancy announcement and assessment to get the best applicants for selection. This comprehensive training provided selecting officials with the tools to develop assessments that will ensure that the most talented applicants are considered.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	56.1%	50%	✓
Analysis						
FY 2017 was the first year in which the CPSC tracked the percentage of hiring managers who were trained on recruitment. The FY 2017 result was 56.1%, exceeding the annual target of 50%.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Additional training sessions will be offered in FY 2018. In FY 2018, we will also measure hiring manager satisfaction to ensure that the training results in higher satisfaction with the applicant lists.						
Data Source						
Tracking spreadsheet						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The CPSC used sign-in sheets, provided at each training session, to update the tracking spreadsheet, as well as the selecting officials' learning histroy. The spreadsheet lists all selecting officials who have completed training on Targeted Assessment and Recruitment Training.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The measure only reports whether the managers were trained. The measure does not capture whether the training is effectively implemented by the managers to improve the quality of recruiting. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM1.4.01			Human Resources			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 1: Workfroce						
Strategic Objective						
1.4: Increase employee engagement						
Performance Measure Statement						
Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey Employee Engagement Index Score						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The FEVS Employee Engagement Index (EEI) score, developed and computed by OPM, is a measure of work environment conditions that are conducive to employee engagement. The index is made up of three subfactors: (1) Leaders Lead, (2) Supervisors, and (3) Intrinsic Work Experience. Each subfactor reflects a different aspect of an engaging work environment. The EEI includes results for 15 different questions from the FEVS, which together, are designed to measure overall employee engagement.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
According to OPM's definition, "employee engagement" is described as the employee's sense of purpose. It is evident in their display of dedication, persistence, and effort in their work, or overall commitment to their organization and its mission. An agency that engages its employees ensures a work environment where each employee contributes to the success of the agency while reaching his or her full potential. Engaged employees contribute significantly to the success of the CPSC and the federal government as a whole.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	66%	70%	73%	70%	✓
Analysis						
Continued implementation of Employment Engagement Initiative efforts in FY 2016 and FY 2017 consisted of four focus areas: (1) training, (2) awards, (3) diversity and inclusion, and (4) communication. Achievements from the efforts included: a sponsorship program for new employees; implementation of an Innovation Award; New IQ employee training; and IDPs for employees. The CPSC's EEI score increased from 66% in FY 2015, to 73% in FY 2017. The agency's Global Satisfaction Index also increased from 64% in FY 2015, to 70% in FY 2017.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Continue with EEI through new initiative efforts, as identified in the FY 2017 FEVS analysis.						
Data Source						
FEVS						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Data are collected through OPM's annual FEVS link sent out via email to all permanent CPSC employees. The EEI score is based on data from responses to 15 different questions on the FEVS survey instrument.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
CPSC employee responses to the FEVS are the source of data for this measure. As such, the data quality for this performance measure depends upon the quality of survey responses, as well as the survey response rate.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM2.1.01				Hazard Identification		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.1: Improve identification and assessment of hazards to consumers						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of consumer product-related incident reports warranting follow-up actions						
Definition of Performance Measure						
Respective Integrated Product Teams (IPTs) receive incident reports through the Consumer Product Safety Risk Management System (CPSRMS) and determine whether follow-up actions, such as in-depth investigations or enforcement actions, are warranted.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Improved quality and specificity of hazard information included in incident reports makes them more informative and useful. The percentage of incident reports that warrant follow-up actions provides an indication of the extent to which incident reports contain improved information.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	25%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
This key measure was designated as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC will work to reduce the number of incomplete reports before they reach the IPTs, because having more comprehensive reports will help expedite the next action step, if any.						
Data Source						
CPSRMS						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Incident reports received through CPSRMS are queried using statistical computer software to calculate the proportions of each disposition assigned. Incident reports with the status of either, “Compliance Action,” (CA) or “Possible Further Action,” are tallied and then divided by the total number of incident reports with any status.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Incidents are reported to the agency by the public, manufacturers, retailers, or other stakeholders. Accordingly, the reports received vary widely in completeness and overall quality, and this affects the usefulness of some of the data.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM2.1.02				Hazard Identification		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.1: Improve identification and assessment of hazards to consumers						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of hazard characterization annual reports completed on consumer product-related fatalities, injuries, and/or losses for specific hazards						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of milestone hazard characterization statistical reports produced for specified product-related hazards or categories. These reports characterize the number of reported fatalities and estimated injuries and trends.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
This key measure tracks an element of the CPSC’s strategy for improved hazard identification, which involves 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.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
11	10	10	11	11	11	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC met its FY 2017 target of 11 annual reports. These reports are comprised of components of the rigorous identification of hazards. The reports inform the agency and external stakeholders on the numbers or types of consumer product-related injuries or fatalities.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC plans for a set of 11 milestone reports for FY 2018.						
Data Source						
Report postings for Assistant Executive Director (AED) review (Form 122) on CPSC’s internal administrative system.						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The agency prepares reports on consumer product-related fatalities, injuries, and/or losses for specific hazards annually. The data are a count of the number of hazard characterization reports posted for AED review (Form 122) on CPSC’s internal document-sharing system during the fiscal year.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC’s Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM2.1.03			Hazard Identification			
Strategic Goal						
Goal : Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.1: Improve identification and assessment of hazards to consumers						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of consumer product-related injury cases correctly captured at NEISS hospitals						
Definition of Performance Measure						
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.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
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.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
92%	91%	91.6%	91%	92.4%	90%	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC exceeded the FY 2017 target of 90% with an estimated 92.4% (using a 95% confidence interval: 90.6%–94.2%) of reportable cases captured correctly in the NEISS by the hospital coders in FY 2017.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Annual NEISS on-site evaluations will continue in FY 2018.						
Data Source						
NEISS Administrative Records System (NARS)						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
<p>Audit results from each NEISS hospital visit are captured in NARS. Calculate one percentage (p) across all the NEISS hospitals that were evaluated during the fiscal year as:</p> $p = \frac{\sum_i (N_i \cdot (n_i(\text{coder}) / (s_i)))}{\sum_i (N_i \cdot (n_i(\text{cpsc}) / (s_i)))}$ <p>where N_i is the annual number of emergency department treated cases at the ith NEISS hospital, s_i is the number of cases in sample drawn by the CPSC auditor at the ith NEISS hospital, and $n_i(\text{coder})$ and $n_i(\text{cpsc})$ are as defined below.</p> <p>During a hospital audit, between 200 and 300 emergency department records are sampled, and the number of product-related cases in the sample are determined. 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:</p> $(n_i(\text{coder}) / (n_i(\text{cpsc})))$ <p>where $n_i(\text{coder})$ is the number of product-related cases in the sample of cases (s_i) as determined by the coder for the ith NEISS hospital; and $n_i(\text{cpsc})$ is the number of product-related cases in the sample (s_i), 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.</p>						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Findings and guidance for improving the capture rate are provided to the NEISS coder. If capture rates are lower than expected, a second audit may be performed during the year. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM2.1.04			Hazard Identification			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.1: Improve identification and assessment of hazards to consumers						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of collaborations established or maintained with other organizations to work on nanotechnology research or issues affecting consumer products						
Definition of Performance Measure						
A collaboration is a contract, interagency agreement (IAA), or other formal documented agreement with another entity to obtain data for CPSC about nanomaterials in consumer products.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Increasing CPSC collaboration with other entities conducting research and obtaining information about nanomaterials in consumer products will leverage available CPSC funding to fill data gaps and to develop tools, which will allow CPSC to assess the risk to consumers of nanomaterials and help CPSC prioritize activities to prevent, reduce, or eliminate the risk of injury or death.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	7	5	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC exceeded the FY 2017 target of five collaborations by establishing seven research collaborations on the environmental health and safety of nanomaterials. This will increase knowledge of the potential exposure to consumers from products that contain nanomaterials and explore methods to measure their release from consumer products.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
In FY 2018, the CPSC has fewer resources for nanomaterial efforts and will continue to focus on environmental health and safety issues through collaborations with other federal agencies.						
Data Source						
Procurement Information System for Management (PRISM) – IAAs and contracts for nanotechnology						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Count of the number of PRISM nanotechnology initiatives						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID	Program					
2017KM2.2.01	Hazard Identification					
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.2: Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of voluntary standards activities in which CPSC staff actively participates						
Definition of Performance Measure						
<p>The CPSC provides technical support and monitors voluntary safety standards activities, which are tracked in the Voluntary Standards Tracking Activity Report (V-STAR).</p> <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 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 rules for durable infant and toddler products, as set forth in the Danny Keysar Child Product Safety Notification Act.</p> <p>Active participation by CPSC extends beyond attending meetings, and it 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, providing information on a proposed rulemaking, and taking other actions that the Commission, in a particular situation, determines may be appropriate. A list of these activities can be found at: 16 CFR §1031.7.</p>						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
<p>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 standard.</p>						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	81	71	76	76 ¹⁶	✓
Analysis						
<p>The CPSC met its target by covering 76 products or product areas associated with voluntary standards work. Out of the 76 products or product areas, there were 21 new, revised, or reaffirmed (re-approval of the existing standard without any changes) voluntary safety standards in FY 2017. Detailed activities covering these products and product areas are available in the FY 2017 annual V-STAR at: www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/VoluntaryStandardsActivitiesFY2017AnnualReport.pdf.</p>						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
<p>The CPSC's participation in voluntary standards activity is an ongoing process that depends on the activities of the voluntary standards committees and the Commission's priorities.</p>						
Data Source						
<p>CPSC Voluntary Standards' (VS) database, where calendar notices and VS documents are stored.</p>						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
<p>It is a simple count of products that have had voluntary standards activities. Each product that has at least one activity is counted as one. These activities are also tracked in the bi-annual Voluntary Standards Tracking Activity Report (V-STAR).</p>						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
<p>The level of CPSC participation in developing voluntary standards varies from product to product. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.</p>						

¹⁶ The FY 2017 target for 2017KM2.2.01 was listed as 75 in the FY 2017 Operating Plan (approved October 2016). Through the CPSC's FY 2017 Mid-Year Review (approved June 2017), the FY 2017 target was revised from 75 to 76.

Control ID				Program		
2017KM2.2.02				Hazard Identification		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.2: Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of candidates for rulemaking prepared for Commission consideration						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of rulemaking briefing packages submitted by CPSC staff for the Commission's consideration						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
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.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
14	10	20	10	18 ¹⁷	17 ¹⁸	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC met the FY 2017 target by completing all rulemaking packages in the FY 2017 Operating Plan (as amended at Mid-Year), with the exception of Furniture Tip-Over–Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) and Magnet Sets–Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR), and the addition of Common Rule–Final Rule (FR), FOIA–FR, and Garage Door Operator–Direct Final Rule (DFR). There were multiple complex rulemaking packages, including Phthalates–FR, Table Saws–NPR, and Portable Generators–NPR.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
EXHR will continue to work on helping ASTM finalize standards on a timely basis and continue to focus on project planning and management.						
Data Source						
Postings on the CPSC's website: www.cpsc.gov/newsroom/FOIA/commission-briefing-packages .						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Count the number of rulemaking briefing packages (ANPR, DFR, NPR, and FR) posted to www.cpsc.gov .						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
This measure reflects the number of rulemaking candidates prepared for the Commission, and not necessarily whether they have been approved by the Commission. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation found the FY 2017 result need to be corrected to 18 from 17, which was previously reported in the FY 2017 AFR (see details in the Analysis section above).						

¹⁷ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM2.2.02 in this report is 18, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 17 that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to a corrected list of rulemaking packages prepared.

¹⁸ The FY 2017 target for 2017KM2.2.02 was listed as 23 in the FY 2017 Operating Plan (approved October 2016). Through the CPSC's FY 2017 Mid-Year Review (approved June 2017), the FY 2017 target was revised from 23 to 17.

Control ID			Program			
2017KM2.2.03			Import Surveillance			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.2: Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace						
Performance Measure Statement						
Violation rate of targeted repeat offenders						
Definition of Performance Measure						
For targeted repeat offenders, a distinct count of shipments containing a substantive violation is divided by a distinct count of entries examined.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Import Surveillance targets for violative shipments, then it examines and collects products that fail field testing. Repeat offenders continue to import violative products and ongoing surveillance can prevent violative products from reaching the marketplace.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	17.3%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
This key measure was designated as “baseline” in FY 2017. In FY 2019, this measure will be replaced with a new key measure (2019KM2.2.07): Percentage of firms that are engaged with a timely establishment inspection after being identified as a repeat offender.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Although baseline data showing the violation rate of repeat offenders was calculated in FY 2017, the results indicated that measuring the timeliness of inspections conducted on those firms would be a better measure for the strategic objective. This measure will be replaced with a new key measure (2019KM2.2.07): Percentage of firms that are engaged with a timely establishment inspection after being identified as a repeat offender. The timeliness of CPSC inspections of targeted repeat offenders will contribute to preventing violative product from repeat offenders from reaching the marketplace by leading firms towards compliance through engagement.						
Data Source						
IFS and ITDS/RAM Exam Logbook						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Count the number of substantive violations from repeated offenders and divide by the number of shipments examined.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Shipments must be recorded in the Exam Logbook to be included in the denominator (number of shipments examined).						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM2.2.04				International Programs		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.2: Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of foreign-based industry representatives indicating increased understanding after CPSC training						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage is computed as: the number of industry representatives who indicated increased understanding in response to the relevant survey question after receiving training, divided by the number of industry representatives who responded to the survey question. (Based on representatives who respond to post-training paper or electronic surveys distributed immediately after the conclusion of the training event.)						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Training participants are asked whether the information presented by CPSC has increased their understanding of U.S. product safety requirements. This is a proxy measure of the effectiveness of CPSC training.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	95%	90%	✓
Analysis						
The FY 2017 result was 95%, exceeding the annual target of 90%.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC will take steps to improve the completeness and accuracy of data and refine the record-keeping and documentation system in FY 2018.						
Data Source						
Office of International Programs (EXIP) Foreign Meeting and Training Log; completed questionnaires from training sessions.						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Whenever practical, the CPSC surveys audiences after the training, most often on paper, and sometimes electronically. The CPSC tabulates survey results, and the resulting cumulative percentage is computed.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation found that FY 2017 data were not complete because no data were collected for events held during the first quarter of FY 2017. Because procedures for coding and recording data have not been fully documented, the validity and accuracy of the reported FY 2017 result could not be completely verified. Available questionnaire data from a subset of training events were reviewed and appear to support a cumulative percentage of positive survey responses above 90%. The CPSC will take steps to improve data completeness, refine the record-keeping and documentation system, and improve the validity and accuracy of reported results for FY 2018.						

Control IDs				Program		
2017KM2.2.05				International Programs		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.2: Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of foreign regulatory agency representatives indicating increased understanding of CPSC procedures after CPSC training						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage is computed as: the number of foreign regulatory agency representatives who indicated increased understanding on the relevant survey question after receiving training, divided by the number of agency representatives who responded to the survey question. (Based on representatives who respond to post-training paper or electronic surveys distributed immediately after the conclusion of the training event.)						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Determine whether the CPSC's training improved relevant knowledge of participants.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	99.6%	90%	✓
Analysis						
The FY 2017 result was 99.6%, exceeding the annual target of 90%.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC will take steps to improve the completeness and accuracy of data and refine the record-keeping and documentation system in FY 2018.						
Data Source						
EXIP Foreign Meeting and Training Log; completed questionnaires from training sessions.						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Whenever practical, the CPSC surveys audiences after the training, most often on paper, and sometimes electronically. The CPSC tabulates survey results, and the resulting cumulative percentage is computed.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
FY 2017 data were not complete because no data were collected for events held during the first quarter of FY 2017. The CPSC will take steps to improve data completeness, refine the record-keeping and documentation system, and improve the validity and accuracy of reported results for FY 2018. Data will be limited by which events present a practical opportunity for distributing the survey, and how many in the audience respond to the questionnaire, when requested.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM2.2.06			International Programs			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.2: Lead efforts to improve the safety of consumer products before they reach the marketplace						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of inbound exchange fellows indicating increased understanding of CPSC best practices after CPSC training						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage is computed as the number of inbound exchange fellows indicating increased understanding of CPSC best practices after CPSC training, divided by the number of inbound exchange fellows. Inbound fellows are asked in writing whether they obtained increased understanding from training.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
One objective of the exchange program is to exchange knowledge. The performance measure is an indicator of whether inbound exchange fellows obtained increased understanding from participating in CPSC training.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	100%	100%	✓
Analysis						
There was only one inbound exchange fellow in FY 2017, and that fellow responded positively about increased understanding from participating in CPSC training.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The agency will continue to support inbound exchange fellows to facilitate increased understanding of CPSC best practices in FY 2018. In FY 2019, given the small number of inbound fellows per year, this information will continue to be tracked, but will no longer be reported as a key performance measure.						
Data Source						
Questionnaire provided to inbound fellow						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The response to the question on the questionnaire is analyzed.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
None						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM2.3.01				Import Surveillance		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.3.: Increase capability to identify and stop imported hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of consumer product imports, identified as high-risk, examined at import						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage of examined entries identified through CPSC's Targeting program is computed as the number of targeted entries with logbook exams, divided by the number of targeted entries from CPSC's Targeting program entered into the International Trade Data System (ITDS)/RAM Inbox.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Targeting identifies characteristics in import shipments that have elevated inherent product risk.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	88.5% ¹⁹	Baseline	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as "baseline" in FY 2017. The CPSC will set a target in a future reporting cycle.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The agency will continue to prioritize examining high-risk shipments. The CPSC expects to continue this level of performance, although if anticipated reduction in staffing levels materializes, the agency would expect future targets to be reduced.						
Data Source						
ITDS/RAM Inbox and Exam Logbook						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Count of targeted entries with logbook exams, divided by count of targeted entries from CPSC's Targeting program entered into ITDS/RAM Inbox.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Examinations data depend on recording by different personnel at different locations. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

¹⁹ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM2.3.01 in this report is 88.5%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 87.9% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to additional data on FY 2017 import examinations that became available after publication of the FY 2017 AFR.

Control ID			Program			
2017KM2.3.02			Import Surveillance			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.3: Increase capability to identify and stop imported hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of import shipments processed through the Risk Assessment Methodology (RAM) pilot system that are cleared within one business day						
Definition of Performance Measure						
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						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
The percentage of import shipments the CPSC clears 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.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
99.5%	99.7%	99.6%	99.8%	99.8%	99%	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC exceeded the FY 2017 target of 99 percent; the actual result was 99.8 percent of import shipments cleared within 1 business day. This indicates that the CPSC’s import surveillance work is conducted efficiently and compliant imports are released quickly.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The agency will use a similar approach to maintain past performance in future years.						
Data Source						
ITDS/RAM Inbox						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The status of each entry the CPSC acted on is recorded in the ITDS/RAM system (i.e., "May Proceed," or "CBP Hold Request"). The CPSC considers shipments with a status of “May Proceed,” or shipments that remain “Scored” as “cleared.” "Scored" shipments are cleared within 1 business day because no action was taken by the CPSC to stop the cargo from entering commerce. The percentage will be calculated by the number of shipments (entry lines) cleared within 1 business day, divided by the total number of shipments (entry lines) processed through the RAM system.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
No known data limitations						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM2.3.03				Import Surveillance		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.3: Increase capability to identify and stop imported hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of consumer product import entries that are risk-scored by the CPSC						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage is computed as the number of import entry lines scored by system rules in the ITDS/RAM pilot system, divided by the number of entry summary lines received.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
The ITDS/RAM pilot system considers a risk-advised subset of all products under CPSC's jurisdiction. The measure indicates progress towards a full production system that considers 100% of products under CPSC's jurisdiction.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	4.2%	Baseline	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle. The baseline data indicate that 4.2% of products under CPSC’s jurisdiction were considered through the ITDS/RAM system in FY 2017.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC considers addressable consumer product shipments that are risk-scored in the RAM. Entries risk-scored in the RAM are determined by the number of high-risk product areas under CPSC’s jurisdiction, as well as design limitations of the RAM system. The CPSC expects to maintain the same level of performance for this measure in FY 2018.						
Data Source						
ITDS/RAM Inbox metrics and entry summary						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Import entry lines scored/entry summary lines received						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The CPSC receives data from CTAC, and interruptions in metrics may affect totals. Interruptions are rare and are readily identifiable and accountable. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC’s Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM2.3.04			Import Surveillance			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 2: Prevention						
Strategic Objective						
2.3: Increase capability to identify and stop imported hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of import examinations completed						
Definition of Performance Measure						
Number of examinations conducted by the CPSC on imported consumer products to verify compliance with CPSC rules, regulations, and bans. Each exam is for one product.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
The total number of import examinations CPSC performs is a measure of surveillance at U.S. ports to reduce entry of unsafe consumer products.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
26,523	28,007	35,122	36,523	38,726	35,000 ²⁰	✓
Analysis						
In FY 2017, the CPSC screened 38,726 imported products, exceeding the annual target of 35,000 screenings.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The measure reflects CPSC's ability to examine shipments. The current level of performance depends upon maintaining sufficient import surveillance personnel to examine shipments.						
Data Source						
Import Exam Logbook						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The CPSC records all import examinations it performs in the Import Exam Logbook. A sum of the number of products with exam dates within each fiscal year is the measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The Office of Import Surveillance (EXIS) conducts data quality checks to ensure import exams are recorded in the Import Exam Logbook; EXIS is developing additional data-quality checks to ensure completeness and accuracy of the data.						

²⁰ The FY 2017 target for 2017KM2.3.04 was listed as 40,000 in the FY 2017 Operating Plan (approved October 2016). Through the CPSC's FY 2017 Mid-Year Review (approved June 2017), the FY 2017 target was revised from 40,000 to 35,000.

Control ID				Program		
2017KM3.1.01				Compliance & Field		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 3: Response						
Strategic Objective						
3.1: Rapidly identify hazardous consumer products for enforcement action						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of cases for which a preliminary determination is made within 85 business days of the case opening						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of cases for which a preliminary determination (PD) has been made within the fiscal year and it was made within 85 business days of the case opening date, divided by the number of cases for which a PD has been made within the fiscal year. PD is the determination made by a panel of managers regarding whether there is enough evidence to determine a pattern of defect, whether a potential hazard exists, and whether corrective action is recommended. A case opening is when a case is entered into Dynamic Case Management (DCM) System, which then generates a Case Creation date. This measure excludes Fast-Track cases.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
This performance measure is an indicator of the timeliness of CPSC case work. Making PDs more quickly contributes to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant and defective products.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	74%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
This key measure was designated as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Performance will likely decline due to fewer personnel working on compliance activities in FY 2018.						
Data Source						
CPSC’s DCM system						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Data were collected from DCM on all CA-initiated cases and non-Fast-Track Reported (RP) cases that went to PD involving products under hazard categories A, B, or C. These classification categories are based on the severity of the most likely injury resulting from the hazard, and the likelihood that such injury will occur. The number of business days was calculated between the Case Creation Date and the PD Date. See also <i>Definition of Performance Measure</i> field above for the computation of this measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
All cases are reviewed by the team lead to ensure accuracy of available information. DCM has built-in validation checks. However, results may differ slightly due to updates, edits, or corrections to case data that may occur after the team lead completes fiscal year-end run of data and reports the results.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM3.1.02				Compliance & Field		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 3: Response						
Strategic Objective						
3.1: Rapidly identify hazardous consumer products for enforcement action						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of cases for which a compliance determination of a regulatory violation is made within 35 business days of sample collection						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of cases for which a sample is determined to have a regulatory violation within the fiscal year and the determination was made within 35 business days of the date of the sample collection, divided by the number of cases for which a sample is determined to have a regulatory violation within the fiscal year. Samples collected in the field and at the ports are sent to the CPSC's National Product Testing and Evaluation Center (NPTEC) for analysis; and often, CPSC technical experts conduct additional technical analysis to determine whether a product violates CPSC standards.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
This performance measure is an indicator of the timeliness of CPSC regulatory case work. Making determinations of a regulatory violation more quickly contributes to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant products.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	87%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as "baseline" in FY 2017. The CPSC will set a target in a future reporting cycle.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Performance will likely decline due to fewer personnel working on import surveillance activities in FY 2018. The CPSC will continue to work actively in process control and toward efficient processing.						
Data Source						
CPSC's Integrated Field System (IFS)						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
IFS tracks the date of sample collection and the date of regulatory violation determination. The CPSC collected data from ad hoc reports in IFS. See also <i>Definition of Performance Measure</i> field above for the computation of this measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The team lead reviews all cases to ensure accuracy of available information. The team lead conducts additional data checks to ensure that the counts are accurate; however, results may differ slightly, due to updates, edits, or corrections to case data that may occur after the team lead completes the fiscal year-end run of data and reports the results.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM3.2.01			Compliance & Field			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 3: Response						
Strategic Objective						
3.2: Minimize further exposure to hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of cases for which a corrective action is accepted within 60 business days of preliminary determination						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of cases for which a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was accepted within the fiscal year, and it was accepted within 60 business days of the PD date, divided by the number of cases for which a CAP has been accepted within the fiscal year where a PD is made. PD is the determination made by a panel of managers about whether there is enough evidence to determine a pattern of defect, whether a potential hazard exists, and whether corrective action is recommended. This measure excludes Fast-Track cases.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
This performance measure tracks the timeliness of the CPSC’s negotiation of CAPs with companies. More timely negotiation of CAPs contribute to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant and defective products.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	52%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
This key measure was designated as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle. CAP acceptance took longer than initially planned because focusing on A, B, or C hazard cases may have created more in-depth work, which would then require more processing time.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Given the longer-than-anticipated timeframes for CAP acceptance observed in FY 2017, as described above, in FY 2018, this measure will track CAP acceptance within 90 business days of PD.						
Data Source						
DCM						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The CPSC collected data from DCM on all Compliance Action- (CA) initiated cases and non-Fast-Track Reported (RP) cases where a CAP was accepted. The number of business days was calculated between the Case Creation Date and the PD Date. See also <i>Definition of Performance Measure</i> field above for the computation of this measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The team lead reviews all cases to ensure accuracy of available information. DCM has built-in validation checks. However, results may differ slightly, due to updates, edits, or corrections to case data that may occur after the team lead completes the fiscal year-end run of data and reports the results.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM3.2.02			Compliance & Field			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 3: Response						
Strategic Objective						
3.2: Minimize further exposure to hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of cases for which a firm is first notified of a regulatory violation within 40 business days from sample collection						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of cases for which a firm was first notified of a violation within the fiscal year and was notified within 40 business days of the date a sample was collected, divided by the number of cases for which a firm was first notified of a violation within the fiscal year. The firm is initially notified of a violation 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.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
This performance measure is an indicator of the timeliness of CPSC’s notice to firms of violations from sample collection.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	86%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as “baseline” in FY 2017. The CPSC will set a target in a future reporting cycle.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Performance will likely decline due to fewer personnel working on import surveillance activities in FY 2018. The CPSC will continue to contact firms as quickly as possible after a violation determination.						
Data Source						
IFS						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
IFS tracks the date of sample collection and the date of company notification. An <i>ad hoc</i> report in the system runs the computation. See also <i>Definition of Performance Measure</i> field above for the computation of this measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The team lead reviews all cases to ensure accuracy of available information. The team lead conducts additional data checks to ensure that the counts are accurate; however, results may differ slightly, due to updates, edits, or corrections to case data that may occur after the team lead completes the fiscal year-end run of data and reports the results. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC’s Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM3.2.03				Compliance & Field		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 3: Response						
Strategic Objective						
3.2: Minimize further exposure to hazardous consumer products						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of Fast-Track cases with corrective actions initiated within 20 business days						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of Fast-Track cases within the fiscal year for which a firm had a Stop Sale date within 20 business days of the case opening, divided by the total number of Fast-Track cases with a Stop Sale date within the fiscal year. A Case Opening is when a case is entered into the DCM System, which then generates a Case Creation date. A Stop Sale date is the date when notice was given to stop sale or distribution of affected products.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Industry can participate in a streamlined recall process through the Fast-Track Product Recall Program, which is designed to 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. Increased timeliness of processing these cases contributes to the efficiency and speed of recalls for noncompliant and defective consumer products.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
98%	100%	97.3%	99.1%	98% ²¹	90%	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC exceeded the FY 2017 target of 90%; the actual result was 98%, but slightly below the FY 2016 result of 99.1%. Clear understanding of the Fast-Track program and expectations for participation in the program contributed to its success.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
Timeliness of processing these cases is monitored constantly to ensure that the target is met or exceeded.						
Data Source						
DCM						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
The CPSC collected data from DCM on all Fast-Track reported cases where the firm stopped sale. See also <i>Definition of Performance Measure</i> field above for the computation of this measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The team lead reviews all cases to ensure accuracy of available information. DCM has built-in validation checks. However, results may differ slightly due to updates, edits, or corrections to case data that may occur after the team lead completes the fiscal year-end run of data and reports the results. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation found that the FY 2017 result needed to be corrected to 98% from 97% (as was previously reported in the FY 2017 AFR). The reason for the discrepancy was that the computation method for the measure was modified prematurely, part-way through FY 2017 because of an audit recommendation by the Office of the Inspector General. The corrected value for FY 2017 was re-computed without using the modification. The CPSC will implement the recommended modification to the computation method in FY 2018.						

²¹ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM3.2.03 in this report is 98%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 97% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). A change to the computation method for the measure had been prematurely implemented for FY 2017 4th quarter data. The data for the full fiscal year 2017 were re-computed using a consistent method. (The new computation method, recommended by the Office of Inspector General, will be implemented for FY 2018 data.)

Control ID			Program			
2017KM3.3.01			Compliance & Field			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 3: Response						
Strategic Objective						
3.3: Improve consumer response to consumer product recalls						
Performance Measure Statement						
Recall effectiveness rate for all consumer product recalls during this fiscal year						
Definition of Performance Measure						
Total number recalled products within the fiscal year that were corrected, divided by the total number of products recalled within the fiscal year. The CPSC deems a case to be closed when the last action is taken via reports of significant improvement and collection of recall products, a decision is made not to do a recall, or for other reasons or unique circumstances.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
The performance measure is intended to improve understanding of the overall effectiveness of product recalls at all levels, including products at the manufacturer, distributor, retailer, and consumer levels. Typically, recalls of consumer products are conducted voluntarily by firms that work with the CPSC to develop a CAP that will protect the public from potentially unsafe products. Recalls include a notice to the public and some remedial measures, such as a repair, a replacement of the product, or a refund to the purchaser.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	41%	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle. The quarterly recall effectiveness rate ranges between 19% and 64%, with an annual average rate of 41%. The volatile rates are affected by several factors; for example, human behavior, price point of the recalled product, whether the recall announcement was received by consumers, and a myriad of other factors. To obtain more data, in FY 2017, the CPSC implemented a new system where recalling firms can submit monthly progress reports online concerning the recall participation after the public recall announcement. The CPSC also held a Workshop on Recall Effectiveness to engage stakeholders to explore ideas for improving the effectiveness of recalls, and also to develop proactive measures that the CPSC, as well as stakeholders, can take to improve the implementation of recalls, ranging from public announcements to product correction.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC set the target for this measure in FY 2018 at 25%. Results for this measure have a high variation rate, due to differences in consumer response. Factors contributing to variation include human behavior, price point of the product, depth and reach of the announcement, and type of recall, among other factors. The Strategic Plan specifically outlines strategies to improve recall effectiveness in future years.						
Data Source						
DCM and IFS						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Recall information is gathered from recalling firm reports. Data from this source are entered into DCM. The data evaluated for this effort were DCM-closed cases for FY 2017. See also <i>Definition of Performance Measure</i> field above for the computation of this measure.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Consumers may take action resulting from a recall, but CPSC may be unaware (e.g., the consumer disposed of the product, rather than return it). Accordingly, the measured rate may be understated. In addition, recalling firms are responsible for reporting recall information on the total number of units involved, and how many corrections have occurred during a specific period. The team lead reviews all cases to ensure accuracy of available information. DCM has built-in validation checks. However, results may differ slightly, due to updates, edits, or corrections to case data that may occur after the team lead completes the fiscal year-end run of data and reports the results. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure, conducted by the CPSC’s Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation, confirmed the reported FY 2017 result to be reasonably accurate and reliable.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM4.1.01				Communications		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 4: Communication						
Strategic Objective						
4.1: Improve usefulness and availability of consumer product safety information						
Performance Measure Statement						
Percentage of positive responses about usefulness of information received from CPSC communication channels						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The percentage is computed as the number of positive responses (scores of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) to the relevant survey question, divided by the total number of responses to the question. The relevant survey question is Question #1: "How useful was the information we presented today?"						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Measures responses directly from an audience that has listened to a CPSC safety presentation.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	92.3% ²²	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle. It was the first year the CPSC formally tracked responses to CPSC’s outreach presentations. The CPSC’s Office of Communications (OCM) and SBO participated and reported results. The responses helped inform presenters about whether their information was useful to the audience. SBO used an electronic survey software to administer its survey to the audience because SBO presentations were mostly done via webinars, and the audience was already online. OCM used paper questionnaires because most OCM delivered most presentations in person.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
SBO’s use of electronic survey software proved efficient and useful. OCM may try this method in FY 2018, to see if it works for live presentations. In the future, the CPSC will use the correct method for computing the aggregated percentage for the measure.						
Data Source						
"How are we doing?" Questionnaire						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
All positive responses—4s or 5s on a 5-point scale—are tallied, divided by the total number of completed questionnaires.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
The CPSC counts only completed questionnaires for this measure. A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC’s Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation found that the FY 2017 result needed to be corrected to 92.3% from 90.7%, which was previously reported in the FY 2017 AFR. The corrected 92.3% is calculated by correcting the method used to compute the overall average percentage for all events.						

²² The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM4.1.01 in this report is 92.3%, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 90.7% that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to correction of the method used to compute the overall average.

Control ID				Program		
2017KM4.2.01				Communications		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 4: Communication						
Strategic Objective						
4.2: Increase dissemination of useful consumer product safety information						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of impressions of CPSC safety messages (millions)						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The number of impressions is an estimate of the number of people who have been exposed to CPSC consumer product safety message on targeted and priority consumer product safety hazards, excluding recalls. This includes people who have seen or heard messages delivered via TV, radio, newspaper, online and social media, billboards, and public events.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
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 consumer product safety messages from the 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 provides an estimate of the extent of consumer awareness.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	6,314.8	5,800	✓
Analysis						
In FY 2017, there were 6.3 billion impressions of targeted CPSC safety messages to targeted audiences on priority and targeted hazards, exceeding the target of 5.8 billion impressions.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC reduced the target for FY 2018 to 4.43 billion impressions. The Communications team is reducing reliance on impression data and moving to measure social media engagement, which is a better gauge of direct consumer response to CPSC messaging.						
Data Source						
Contracted media monitoring companies						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
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. The sum is the number of estimated viewers of CPSC safety messages related to consumer product hazards during the fiscal year.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Impressions are reasonable estimates of the potential size of the audience to which the message was delivered, but impressions are not necessarily an indicator of how effective the message was at influencing audience behavior.						

Control ID			Program			
2017KM4.2.02			Communications			
Strategic Goal						
Goal 4: Communication						
Strategic Objective						
4.2: Increase dissemination of useful consumer product safety information						
Performance Measure Statement						
Average number of business days between establishment of first draft and issuance of recall press release for the most timely 90% of recall press releases						
Definition of Performance Measure						
The total number of business days between establishment of first draft and issuance of recall press release for the most timely 90% of all recall press releases, divided by the total number of those recall press releases.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
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 the CPSC to issue press releases announcing product recalls will get product hazard information to consumers more quickly and reduce the risk of harm.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	16	17.8	17.5	18	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC took an average of 17.5 business days to issue a recall press release, slightly faster than the FY 2017 target of 18 business days.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The performance for this target highly depends on companies' timely responses as recall releases are negotiated. The target for FY 2018 is 18.5 business days because timely responses lagged in the second half of FY 2017 when the FY 2018 target was being finalized.						
Data Source						
CPSC News Release Performance (Tracking) Log						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Data on recall announcements are tracked and transferred to a performance log that compiles OCM's dates for First Draft and Date Issued for a recall, and the average number of business days for all releases (Fast-Track and Non-Fast-Track) are calculated.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
There is high variability in the determination of the First Draft date, due to logistical challenges that recalling firms may face before announcing the recall.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM4.2.03				Communications		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 4: Communication						
Strategic Objective						
4.2: Increase dissemination of useful consumer product safety information						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of CPSC social media safety messages with which stakeholders engage						
Definition of Performance Measure						
Number of stakeholder engagements with CPSC safety messages on Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and Google+, as measured by social media monitoring service						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
Engagement measures consumers who are sharing, forwarding, and/or retweeting CPSC safety messages.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	285,061	Baseline	N/A
Analysis						
The CPSC designated this key measure as “baseline” in FY 2017. A target will be set in a future reporting cycle.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
The CPSC will continue to design and develop new online and social media communication to disseminate through social media and drive more engagement with CPSC messages.						
Data Source						
Contracted social media monitoring companies						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Data are provided by contracted media monitoring companies that subscribe to media measurement tools used by a broad spectrum of companies, such as advertisers, agencies and research firms that need reliable audience data. All engagement data are added together in a spreadsheet.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
Units of social media engagement vary among the different media platforms. The reported result is a mixture of these engagement units.						

Control ID				Program		
2017KM4.3.01				Communications		
Strategic Goal						
Goal 4: Communication						
Strategic Objective						
4.3: Increase and enhance collaboration with stakeholders						
Performance Measure Statement						
Number of collaboration activities initiated with stakeholder groups						
Definition of Performance Measure						
Collaborations with stakeholders, including activities involving a Memorandum of Understanding or an Interagency Agreement, as well as special working groups with other agencies or groups, to communicate safety issues. An example could be a working group on lithium-ion battery safety. Includes CPSC offices and outside group/agency collaborators.						
Rationale for Performance Measure						
This is an effort to keep track of collaborations with stakeholders throughout the agency, with the goal of streamlining activities and increasing awareness of activities within the agency.						
2013 Actual	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Actual	2017 Actual	2017 Target	Target Met?
--	--	--	--	28 ²³	25	✓
Analysis						
The CPSC had 28 collaborations with stakeholders in FY 2017, exceeding the target of 25. Examples include collaborations with fire service organizations, interagency working groups, <i>Pool Safely</i> partners, and Anchor It! advocates to collaborate with and communicate product safety information.						
Plan(s) for Improving Performance						
This is the first year the CPSC formally tracked stakeholder collaborations, and the collaborative work of a few organizations within the CPSC was included in the data for this performance measure. As we continue to increase and enhance collaborations with stakeholders, we will expand to include data for more organizations from within the CPSC.						
Data Source						
Data are entered to a shared spreadsheet monitored by the Communications team.						
Data Collection Method and Computation						
Data on collaboration activities are kept in a spreadsheet.						
Data Limitations and Implications of the Reported Results						
A separate assessment of the accuracy and quality of the data for this performance measure conducted by the CPSC's Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation found that the FY 2017 result needed to be corrected to 28 from 33, which was previously reported in the FY 2017 AFR. Collaborations that did not communicate product safety information are now excluded.						

²³ The FY 2017 actual for 2017KM4.3.01 in this report is 28, compared to the FY 2017 actual of 33 that was reported in the FY 2017 AFR (published November 15, 2017). The difference is due to the exclusion of collaborations that did not communicate product safety information.

Appendix D: Acronyms

AED	Assistant Executive Director
AFR	Agency Financial Report
ANPR	Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
APR	Annual Performance Report
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CA	Compliance Action
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CBP	U.S. Customs and Border Protection
CDC	U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CPSA	Consumer Product Safety Act
CPSC	U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
CPSIA	Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act
CPSRMS	Consumer Product Safety Risk Assessment Management System
DCM	Dynamic Case Management System
DFR	Direct Final Rule
E EI	Employee Engagement Index
ESC	Enterprise Services Center
EXFM	Office of Financial Management, Planning and Evaluation
EXHR	Office of Hazard Identification
EXIP	Office of International Programs
FEVS	Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey
FR	Final Rule
FY	Fiscal Year
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act of 1993
GPRAMA	GPRA Modernization Act of 2010
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
IAA	Interagency Agreement
IDP	Individual Development Plan
IFS	Integrated Field System
ISSLoB	Information Systems Security Line of Business
ITDS	International Trade Data System
NARS	NEISS Administrative Records System
NEISS	National Electronic Injury Surveillance System
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NNCO	National Nanotechnology Coordination Office
NNI	National Nanotechnology Initiative
NPR	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
OCM	Office of Communications
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPM	U.S. Office of Personnel Management
PBR	Performance Budget Request
PD	Preliminary Determination
PMD	Performance Management Database
R&D	Research & Development
RAM	Risk Assessment Methodology
SBO	Small Business Ombudsman
SDR	Strategic Data Review
V-STAR	Voluntary Standards Tracking and Access Report

U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
Bethesda, MD 20814