UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
WASHINGTON, DC

FSIS DIRECTIVE	1320.4	5/13/10

OFFICE OF FIELD OPERATIONS (OFO) ASSURANCENET DATA MONITORING RESPONSIBILITIES

I. PURPOSE

This directive integrates AssuranceNet enhancements implemented since March of 2008 and provides updated specific instructions to OFO managers at Agency headquarters (HQ) and at the district offices (DOs) on reviewing, monitoring, analyzing, and responding to AssuranceNet results. (**NOTE**: The instructions in this directive do not apply to non-supervisory in-plant inspection program personnel.) In addition, this directive provides:

A. Clarification that AssuranceNet reports and analyses are appropriate for viewing organizational performance at the district and circuit levels.

B. OFO manager requirements for documenting organizational performance findings and any required followup.

II. (RESERVED)

III. (RESERVED)

IV. REFERENCES

AssuranceNet User Guide
PBIS User Guide

V. ABBREVIATIONS

The following appear in their shortened form in this directive:

AA	Assistant Administrator
DA	District Analyst
DAA	Deputy Assistant Administrator
DAIG	Data Analysis and Integration Group

DISTRIBUTION:
Electronic

OPI:
OFO – Regulatory Operations

DM	District Manager
DO	District Office
EARO	Executive Associate for Regulatory Operations
FLS	Frontline Supervisor
HQ	Headquarters
IPPS	In-Plant Performance System
OFO	Office of Field Operations
PBIS	Performance Based Inspection System
STAR	Supervisory Tool for Assessment Results

VI. POLICY

It is FSIS policy that each level of OFO management conducts systematic analyses in their areas of responsibility using AssuranceNet data and results to identify where organizational performance is not meeting established performance measures, or where performance indicates a vulnerability to failure in achieving Agency objectives and mandates.

VII. DEFINITIONS

A. **Circuit Level**. A defined geographic area for which FLSs oversee inspection activities performed by public health veterinarians, supervisory consumer safety inspectors, and food inspectors.

C. **District Level**. A defined geographic area covering one or more states that oversee inspection activities performed at the circuit level.

D. **Establishment Level**. A specific establishment in a circuit of a district.

E. **National Level**. The level at which inspection activities are carried out within the district and managed by the OFO AA, DAA, and EARO.

VIII. BACKGROUND

A. AssuranceNet is a Web-based system that OFO uses to monitor organizational performance at the circuit, district, and national levels for mission critical and key administrative functions and activities.

B. The purpose of reviewing AssuranceNet data and assessing actual organizational performance levels against the targets on the performance measures is to make sure OFO managers are actively focusing on the key food safety, food defense, and management activities represented by the performance measures.

C. The focus of AssuranceNet data should not be on the numbers themselves, but on the activities they represent. To the extent that OFO managers and supervisors have control over the source data used in the AssuranceNet calculations on these performance measures, they are expected to ensure the integrity of the data being used by the system. The performance measures are a means to an end, not the end itself. OFO managers are expected to focus on the meaning of the data and to react to it appropriately rather than focusing on controlling the data so that targets are met consistently.

IX. ESTABLISHMENT LEVEL DATA

A. AssuranceNet data are broken down to the establishment level for certain activities. However, that is not to imply that the performance measure targets apply at the establishment level. (**NOTE**: Individual establishments are monitored through supervisory oversight using other systems and reporting tools.)

B. Establishment level data has value and meaning in assessing circuit performance when a circuit is not meeting a performance measure or is barely meeting a performance target. The OFO manager reviews establishment level data to determine where there are outliers that would warrant further investigation. (**NOTE**: FLSs are not required to address why establishment level performance does not meet the circuit, district, or national performance measures as there is no expectation that performance at the establishment level meets the performance measure targets.)

X. REVIEWING AND MONITORING PERFORMANCE DATA AND ACTION LEVELS

A. Action levels serve as a guide for determining whether performance at the circuit, district, or national level warrants investigation or followup action. Action levels are listed on the AssuranceNet Action Level Matrix (See Attachment 1). The following applies based on the availability of objective, measureable data:

1. **Objective Data**. These measures take into account the normal variations that can be expected in performance. For these objectively determined performance measures, the action level is the same as the target level.

2. **Subjective Data**. For these measures, OFO must rely on more subjective assessments made by supervisors using the IPPS. Most target levels for these measures are set at 100 percent. While the supervisor is expected to follow up on individual performance in every case and ensure that there is appropriate management of individual employee performance, the district is expected to investigate further when a circuit or the district falls below 90 percent (action level) on these IPPS-driven measures. In addition, the district must monitor the performance of each circuit on these IPPS-driven measures over time (**example**: compare performance each quarter with previous quarters) to note any trends that may be developing, such as performance for the circuit trending downwards or showing little or no improvement.

B. When a circuit's or district's performance is below the action level, the DM or designee will look into the reasons the measure was not met and will document their findings and follow up. (See subparagraph XII.) (**NOTE**: Not every instance in which a performance measure falls below the action level should be construed as a failure to meet mission objectives. The point of establishing an action level and requiring further inquiry and followup is to ensure that attention is paid to critical areas of organizational performance and vulnerabilities and potential failures are addressed before they become actual failures.)

C. To determine the frequency of reviewing and monitoring performance data, OFO managers use the Action Level Matrix which lists the Analysis Window and the Frequency of Review. The Analysis Window indicates the amount of data that needs to be reviewed when performing the analysis. The Frequency of Review indicates how often the data will be reviewed. (**EXAMPLE**: For performance measure 1.2.1, the analysis window is 6 months and the frequency of review is quarterly. So, every quarter, 6 months of data should be reviewed and analyzed.)

XI. DATA REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

A. The district and FLSs have access to reports in AssuranceNet and they are encouraged to utilize them frequently. However, for the purpose of conducting monthly, quarterly or annual review and analysis of the AssuranceNet data, reports will be provided by either OFO HQ or the DAIG in the Office of Data Integration and Food Protection to the DOs and HQ management staff at the required frequencies as outlined in subparagraph XI. D.

B. Depending on the performance measure involved and the activity the measure represents, the data reviewed in a given month or quarter may actually reflect a larger window of time than 1 month or 1 quarter. (**EXAMPLE**: Recall management measures have to be viewed for the entire year as recalls do not occur in every district every month, if at all, during a given year.) For performance measures that draw data from IPPS assessments, the organizational performance data makes little sense if viewed for less than a 6-month moving window because IPPS visits are not performed at the same rate and do not cover the full complement of elements and measures evenly within a given month or even within a given quarter.

C. The reporting tools available for reviewing AssuranceNet results are as follows:

1. **Circuit and District Level Performance Measure Reports**. These reports are available to FLSs and district and HQ users.

2. **Custom Reports and Dashboard Manager**. These reports are available to DMs, deputy DMs, DAs, and HQ users.

D. There are other tools and options available for viewing data at a greater level of detail for which action may be warranted or to further explore results and determine vulnerabilities. The AssuranceNet Action Level Matrix provides a detailed description of the functions, measures, and action levels. The performance measures table (see Attachment 2) provides brief information about the measures, and whether data sources are IPPS-driven or non-IPPS driven. The following outlines the expectation at each level and the reports that should be utilized, at a minimum:

1. **Headquarters Level**.

a. The OFO AA or DAA conducts a review of district performance on all measures using a specially designed report reflecting the past 4 quarters of data on each measure, for each district. This review will be done at least twice a year. This report is also available to the EAROs to review at least twice per year to look for performance trends in their assigned districts.

b. At a minimum, the EAROs conduct a quarterly review of the performance measure data for the previous quarter for their assigned districts. They also review the following set of reports covering the applicable quarter for each assigned district. (**NOTE**: Reports can be found in the AssuranceNet Custom Reports Public Folders under AssuranceNet/Master Custom Reports.)

(1) AssuranceNet custom reports showing district performance for all measures under Functions 1, 2, 6, 7, and 17 for the past quarter.

(2) AssuranceNet performance measure reports showing district performance under Functions 3 and 5 for the past quarter.

(3) AssuranceNet performance measure report showing district performance for Function 4 for the past year.

(4) AssuranceNet custom report showing district performance on Function 8 measures, year to date beginning with the first day of the current performance rating cycle.

(5) DA HACCP and Data Analysis DA pages for applicable districts, to review the findings and comments entered for the 3 months falling within the quarter under review.

(6) Administrative (RMA) measures, Functions 9-14, using custom reports every quarter.

2. **District Level**. The DM is responsible for ensuring that district and circuit performance data is assessed, acted on, and appropriately documented. At a minimum, the DM ensures that a review of district and circuit performance with select performance measures is conducted monthly, with all other performance measures assessed at least quarterly. (**NOTE**: The custom reports listed below are available in the AssuranceNet Custom Reports Public Folders under AssuranceNet/Master Custom Reports in the subfolder with the district's name (**example**: AssuranceNet/Master Custom Report/Atlanta).)

a. AssuranceNet custom report showing circuit and district performance for all measures under Functions 1, 2, 6, 7, and 17 for the past quarter. **EXCEPTION**: Function 1 and 2 performance measures will be grouped for review by either monthly or quarterly reports, depending on the specific measure.

b. AssuranceNet performance measure report showing district performance under Functions 3 and 5 for the past quarter.

c. AssuranceNet performance measure report showing district performance for Function 4 for the past year.

d. Function 8 showing circuit and district performance on all Function 8 measures, year to date beginning with the first day of the current performance rating cycle to locate where circuits and the district may not be making expected progress at the current point in the rating cycle on these annual measures.

e. Custom reports for administrative Functions 9 -14.

3. **Circuit Level**.

a. The FLS reviews AssuranceNet data for the circuit on a monthly basis covering the previous month, for the following performance measures:

(1) 1.5.2

(2) 1.5.3

(3) 2.1.1

(4) 2.2.1

(5) 2.3.1

(6) 2.4.1

(7) 2.4.2

(8) 17.2.1

b. The circuit level review should be conducted late in the month to ensure all data for the previous month has been captured in the system. The FLS will be provided with a custom or other report reflecting the actual performance against targets for the above measures. The FLS may also use other reports to further analyze the data on the custom reports and to determine if there is any outlier establishment level performance that would be of concern and that might have led to the performance level of the circuit being below the target or action level. Additional reports include:

(1) Performance measure reports in AssuranceNet.

(2) PBIS reports entitled "AssuranceNet Summary" and "AssuranceNet Details." (**NOTE**: The PBIS User's Guide provides instructions for generating these reports.)

c. For the remaining measures that apply to circuits, the FLS reviews the custom or other reports provided by the district on a quarterly basis, to determine if there are any performance measures falling below the action levels and to identify the followup action indicated as a result, if any. The remaining circuit measures include:

(1) All Function 1 measures **except** 1.3.3.

(2) All Function 2 measures **except** 2.3.3, 2.3.5, 2.3.8, and 2.4.3.

(3) All Function 6, 7, and 17 measures.

d. The FLS should view establishment level data for Functions 1, 2, and 17 where available, to determine whether there are results that are out of the range of the performance levels at most other establishments in the circuit.

e. The FLS reviews and observes subordinate supervisors' IPPS and STAR assessments as required and makes comments in AssuranceNet on the IPPS report and STAR form.

f. The supervisory public health veterinarian reviews and observes IPPS assessments as required and makes comments in AssuranceNet on the IPPS reports.

g. The FLS uses the performance measure report for Function 8, year to date beginning with the first day of the current performance rating cycle to determine their progress on performance measures for conducting, reviewing, and observing IPPS assessments. The FLS also uses the IPPS standard report to determine progress.

XII. REPORTING AND FOLLOWING UP

A. Each level of management is required to provide documentation to establish that applicable data have been reviewed and analyzed, and that followup has been initiated as appropriate. OFO management also determines whether there has been a failure to meet or exceed the action levels listed on the AssuranceNet Action Level Matrix. (See Attachment 1.)

B. Each level of management uses the Action Level Matrix as a guide for determining whether performance is trending downward or failing, thus indicating that attention needs to be given to the functions and activities that the performance measures address. The following describes specific reporting repsponsibilities by review level:

1. **Headquarters Level**.

a. The AA or DAA will discuss with the EAROs any concerns that emerge from review of district performance as reflected in the AssuranceNet data. The EARO documents any followup as outlined in subparagraph b.

b. At a minimum, the EAROs should document the results of their quarterly review on the EARO/AA Oversight form in AssuranceNet, summarizing their specific conclusions, function by function, and documenting discussion of the findings and follow up with the respective districts.

2. **District Level**.

a. The DM is responsible for ensuring that the data assessment is performed, accurate, and appropriately documented. The DM ensures that AssuranceNet reports and analyses provided by DAIG DAs and HQ or district personnel are reviewed and correlated with other relevant reports and analyses. The DM will brief the EARO for their district when they have concerns about the district's failure to meet or exceed the action levels. The district is expected to keep a record of its review and analysis and to document the followup actions taken.

b. At a minimum, the districts are to complete the data analysis DA form in AssuranceNet each month to reflect the outcome of this monthly analysis and followup action in detail. The AssuranceNet User Guide has specific instructions on completing this form. (**NOTE**: There will be additional information entered for the third month of each quarter to reflect the quarterly AssuranceNet data reviews. (**EXAMPLE**: For the first quarter of the calendar year, January and February reporting would reflect district review and analysis of the monthly reports and data, whereas the March reporting would reflect not only the monthly analysis but also analysis for the previous quarter.))

3. **Circuit Level**. The FLS documents any followup that they conduct in response to AssuranceNet results for a given month or quarter, as appropriate, either in response to their own review of the data or in response to the district's review of the data. Specifically, if the circuit falls below an action level for the relevant period, the FLS should be prepared to provide an explanation to the DO. The FLS is not expected to provide an establishment-by-establishment explanation as to why establishment level performance fell below the performance targets set for the circuit or district. FLSs provide explanations only when the circuit's performance falls below action levels or is trending downward. FLSs provide these explanations to the DO in accordance with the district's established protocol for this purpose.

XIII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Refer questions concerning this directive to OFO's Regulatory Operations staff. Refer all AssuranceNet application questions to AssuranceNet.HelpOFO@fsis.usda.gov.

Assistant Administrator
Office of Management

Attachments

1 Sample AssuranceNet Action Level Matrix
2 Performance Measures Table Identifying Non-IPPS Driven and IPPS-Driven Data Sources

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
	Function 1: Ante Mortem/Post Mortem Inspection							
Control 1.1: BSE Testing								
1.1.1	100% of CNS ante mortem condemned cattle are sampled for per Agency Policy	100%	eADRS	N/A	< 100%	FLS/DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Control 1.2	*Zoonotic/General Pathology AM/PM Inpection*							
1.2.1	100% of diseased carcasses or parts are retained/identified according to regulations.	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
1.2.2	100% of foreign animal diseases detected and reported to APHIS	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 100%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Control 1.3 Humane Handling								
1.3.1	100% of noncompliance documented under PBIS 04C02	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
1.3.2	100% of egregious noncompliances result in enforcement action under the Rules of Practice	100%	Assurance Net	AM/PM	<100%	FLS/DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
1.3.3	100% of HATS procedures are verified on a routine basis by the DVMS	100%	Assurance Net	AM/PM	<100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Control 1.4: Condemned Animals/Product Control								
1.4.1	100% of condemned animals and inedible product identified and properly disposed	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Control 1.5: Residue Screening								
1.5.1	100% of In-plant residue testing is being initiated, performed and reported in accordance with applicable directives and notices	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
1.5.2	95% of agency scheduled samples (FSIS Form 10,210-3) have the appropriate tissue collected and are properly submitted	95%	M2K	N/A	<95%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly
1.5.3	100% of the time plant management is notified of sample collection and given the opportunity to control the effected carcass and parts	100%	M2K	N/A	< 100%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly
Function 2: HACCP/Pathogen Reduction Execution								
Control 2.1: 5013 - PBIS 06 Procedures								
2.1.1	76% of scheduled PBIS 06 procedures are performed	76%	PBIS	N/A	<76%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly
2.1.2	100% of non-compliances documented with NR	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
2.1.3	100% of verification of establishment's response to NR	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Control 2.2: SSOPs – PBIS 01/02 Procedures								
2.2.1	73% of scheduled PBIS 01 activities are performed	73%	PBIS	N/A	<73%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly
2.2.2	100% of non-compliances documented with NR	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.2.3	100% verification of establishment's response to NR	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Control 2.3: HACCP – PBIS 03 Procedures								
2.3.1	64% of scheduled PBIS 03 procedures are performed	64%	PBIS	N/A	<64%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly
2.3.2	100% of non-compliances documented with NR	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DMEARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.3.3	100% of non-compliant 01 procedures followed by 02 procedure	100%	Assurance Net	HACCP	<100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
2.3.4	100% verification of establishment's response to NR	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.3.5	1% or 25 closed food safety NR's reviewed at District level	1% or at least 25	Assurance Net, PBIS	HACCP	< 25	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
2.3.6	100% Establishment testing results are reviewed and assessed consistent with Directive 5000.2. (Target 100%)	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.3.7	100% Establishment results reviewed and assessed consistent with Directive 5000.2	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.3.8	100% of Execution of establishment prerequisite programs is effectively verified by inspection personnel	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	<90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Control 2.4: Pathogen Sampling								
2.4.1	95% of scheduled samples collected annually result in product sample sent to lab or sample forms returned to lab with reason for non-collection	95%	M2K	N/A	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly
2.4.2	100% of the time plant management is notified of sample collection and given the opportunity to control the effected product	100%	M2K	N/A	< 100%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Monthly/ Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
2.4.3	Applicable PBIS HACCP 02 procedure performed on production lot associated with positive pathogen laboratory results	100%	Assurance Net	HACCP	< 100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
2.4.4	100% of Listeria monocytogenes samples are collected in accordance with Agency policies and procedures as prescribed in current directive and notices. (Target 100%)	95%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90 %	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.4.5	100% of E. coli O157:H7 sampling programs are carried out using methods prescribed in current Agency directives and notices. (Target 100%)	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.4.6	100% of Salmonella verification testing of raw meat and poultry is carried out in accordance with current Agency directives and notices. (Target 100%)	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
2.4.7	100% of establishments profiles are kept up to date by Inspection Personnel	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Function 3: HACCP/Pathogen Reduction Design								
Control 3.1: Food Safety Assessments								
3.1.1	All food safety assessments are performed in accordance with FSIS Directive 5100.1 and utilizing appropriate FSA methodology	100%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
3.1.2	FSA's are posted within five working days if no enforcement action is taken	100%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
3.1.3	FSA report is executed and posted to AssuranceNet within 48 hours of exit conference when enforcement action results	100%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
3.1.4	Enforcement letters are prepared and issued at the exit conference	100%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
3.1.5	20% of FSAs reviewed by DDM/DM	20%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 20 %	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
3.1.6	100% of FSAs reviewed by Lead EIAO or DCS	100%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
3.1.7	All EIAO-trained Public Health Veterinarians (PHVs) lead one or more FSAs per year and participate in two others per year	100%	Assurance Net	FSA	< 90%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
3.1.8	100% of FSAs reviewed per quarter by the EAROs (Each EARO is to review one per assigned District so there should be 15 EARO reviews reflected per quarter)	AssurancNet/FSA	Assurance Net	FSA	<90%	AA/DAA	Quarter/Year	Yearly
Function 4: Recall System Management								
Control 4.1: Pre-Recall Activity								
4.1.1	DDM or designee verifies product held status within approximately two hours of presumptive positive notification and if all product has not been held, a recommendation is made to plant management to begin gathering product information and distributions records and initiate a recall	100%	Assurance Net	Recall	< 100 %	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
4.1.2	If product not held, a recommendation is made to the plant management to begin gathering product information and distribution information	100%	Assurance Net	Recall	< 100 %	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
4.1.3	100% compliance with preliminary recall	100%	Assurance	Recall	< 100 %	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Control 4.2: Recall Activity								
4.2.1	All Recall Databases complete and recall committee personnel available when contacted	100%	Assurance Net	Recall	< 100%	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Control 4.3: Recall Effectiveness								
4.3.1	All effectiveness checks and product disposition verification activities are completed according to FSIS Directive 8080.1, Rev. 4, Attach. 3, Tables 1-5	100%	Assurance Net	Recall	< 100%	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
4.3.2	Product disposition is accurately verified and	100%	Assurance	Recall	< 100%	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
4.3.3	Recall Effectiveness Activities Report are entered into Tracking Recall Effectiveness Checks System (TRECS) and completed in accordance with timeframes outlined in the directive	100%	Assurance Net	Recall	< 100%	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Function 5: Enforcement								
Control 5.1: Administrative Enforcement Report (AER)								
5.1.1	90% of AERs accurately cite the sections of FMIA, PPIA, and EPIA	90%	Assurance Net	AER	< 90%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
5.1.2	100% of AERs accurately follow the Rules of Practice for actions taken	100%	Assurance Net	AER	< 100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.3	100% of closed out AERs cases support enforcement action taken	100%	Assurance Net	AER	<100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.4	90% of AERs have expected exhibit documents, which are understandable and clearly described	90%	Assurance Net	AER	< 90%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.5	95% of AER forms (FSIS Form 5400-9) are properly completed	95%	Assurance Net	AER	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.6	100% of potential criminal activities referred to OPEER	100%	Assurance Net	AER	< 100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.7	100% of AER cases are entered into AssuranceNet within 48 hours	100%	Assurance Net	AER	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.8	100% of AERs are reviewed by DCS	100%	Assurance Net	AER	< 100%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
5.1.9	10% of AERs are reviewed quarterly by DDM	10%	Assurance Net	AER	< 10%	DM/EARO	Quarter/Year	Quarterly
5.1.10	100% of District level NR appeals reviewed per quarter by the EAROs	100%	Assurance Net/AER	AER		AA/DAA	Quarter/Year	Twice Yearly
5.1.11	100% of AERs reviewed per quarter by the EAROs. (Target 100%) (Each EARO is to review one AER per assigned District per quarter so there should be 15 EARO reviews of AERs each quarter	100%	Assurance Net/AER	AER		AA/DAA	Quarter/Year	Twice Yearly
Function 6: Food Security/Reporting of Non-Routine Incidents								
Control 6.1: Verification of Food Security Threat Conditions								
6.1.1	75% of PBIS 08 procedures are performed in accordance with threat condition and risk based criteria per Agency policy	75%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 75%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
6.1.2	100% of the time procedures for identifying, reporting and documenting non routine incidents are understood and followed	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
6.1.3	100% of the time District Offices initiate and update significant incidents in FIMS on a timely basis	100%	Assurance Net	HACCP	<90%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 7: Exports								
Control 7.1: Export Certification and Verification of Country Requirements								
7.1.1	100% review of destination country requirements	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
7.1.2	100% verification of product compliance with applicable federal laws and regulations of foreign requirements	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
7.1.3	100% verification of product safety, wholesomeness and inspection labels and certificates	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
7.1.4	100% verification that authorized inspection sites meet general sanitation and facility requirements	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 95%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
Function 8: In-Plant Performance System (IPPS)								
Control 8.1: In-Plant Performance System (IPPS)								
8.1.1	Conduct two (2) assessments on all non-supervisory direct reports annually	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90 %	FLS/DM/EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.1.2a	FLS review of 10% of employee assessments conducted by SPHV/SCSI/SFI	10%	Assurance Net	IPPS	<10%	FLS/DM/EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.1.2b	FLS review 1% of employee assessments by direct observation	1%	Assurance Net	IPPS	<1%	FLS/DM/EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.1.3a	DM Team (DM/DDM) review of 10% of assessments conducted by FLS/SPHV/SCSI/SFI	10%	Assurance Net	IPPS	<10%	DM/EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.1.3b	DM review 1% of employee assessments by direct observation	1%	Assurance Net	IPPS	<1%	EAROs	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.1.4	EAROS review of 2% of DM Team reviews	2%	Assurance Net	IPPS	<2%	AA/DAA	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.2.1	100% of SPHVs/SCSIs have received an in-plant STAR assessment	100%	Assurance Net	STAR	<100%	FLS/DM/EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.2.2	50% of STAR assessments conducted by SPHV are reviewed by FLS	50%	Assurance Net	STAR	<50%	FLS/DM/EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.2.3	DM/DDM reviews at least 1 STAR assessment per circuit performed by the FLS	1per circuit	Assurance Net	STAR	<1 per circuit	EARO	Rating year to date	Quarterly
8.2.4	5% of STAR assessments are reviewed by the EARO	5%	Assurance Net	STAR	<5%	AA/DAA	Rating year to date	Quarterly
Function 9: Budget Management								
Control 9.1: Salary and Benefits								
9.1.1	Actual salary and benefits expenditures are within 1% without exceeding the District's allocation	1%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	>1%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
9.1.4	Actual operating expenditures are within 1% without exceeding District's allocation.	1%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	>1%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
9.1.5	Actual non-performance awards expenditures are within 1% without exceeding the District's allocation	1%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	>1	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 10: Labor Relations								
Control 10.1: Resolving Grievances								
10.1.1	95% of grievance responses are forwarded to LR specialist prior to issuance	95%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 11: Workplace Violence Prevention								
Control 11.1: Knowledge and Awareness								
11.1.1	Documented WPV training on all new employees	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 12: Employee Relations								
Control 12.1: Reports of Misconduct								
12.1.1	90% of reports of misconduct are forwarded to LERD staff within five working days of receipt by District Office	90%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 90%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 13: Equal Employment Opportunity/Civil Rights (EEO/CR)								
Control 13.1: Outreach/Recruitment								
13.1.1	A strategy that includes six outreach visits per year targeting an under represented demographic group in the District	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 85%	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Control 13.2: Work Environment								
13.2.1	100% of District employees receive annual civil rights training	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 90 %	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Function 14: Plant Requirements and Servicing								
Control 14.1: Grants of Inspection								
14.1.1	All grants of inspection are issued in full accordance with Standard Business Practice #3 Grant Inspection	100%	Assurance Net	Admin DA	< 95 %	DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Quarterly
Function 15: Data Management and Analysis								
Control 15.1: Data Assessment and Analysis								
15.1.1	Monthly summary of District food safety/food security inspection performance by Circuit is prepared and analyzed	100%	Assurance Net	Admin DA	< 100%	DM/EARO	Month	Quarterly
15.1.2	Instances in which performance measures were not met are identified and analyzed	100%	Assurance Net	Admin DA	< 100%	DM/EARO	Month	Quarterly
15.1.3	Corrective actions for failures and problem areas are initiated expeditiously	100%	Assurance Net	Admin DA	< 100%	DM/EARO	Month	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
9.1.2	Actual travel expenditures are within 1% without exceeding the District's allocation	1%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	>1%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
9.1.3	Travel vouchers are reviewed and submitted or returned to the employee for correction within three working days of receipt	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
9.1.4	Actual operating expenditures are within 1% without exceeding District's allocation.	1%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	>1%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
9.1.5	Actual non-performance awards expenditures are within 1% without exceeding the District's allocation	1%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	>1%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 10: Labor Relations								
Control 10.1: Resolving Grievances								
10.1.1	95% of grievance responses are forwarded to LR specialist prior to issuance	95%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 11: Workplace Violence Prevention								
Control 11.1: Knowledge and Awareness								
11.1.1	Documented WPV training on all new employees	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 12: Employee Relations								
Control 12.1: Reports of Misconduct								
12.1.1	90% of reports of misconduct are forwarded to LERD staff within five working days of receipt by District Office	90%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 90%	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly
Function 13: Equal Employment Opportunity/Civil Rights (EEO/CR)								
Control 13.1: Outreach/Recruitment								
13.1.1	A strategy that includes six outreach visits per year targeting an under represented demographic group in the District	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 85%	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Control 13.2: Work Environment								
13.2.1	100% of District employees receive annual civil rights training	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 90 %	DM/EARO	Year to date	Quarterly
Function 14: Plant Requirements and Servicing								
Control 14.1: Grants of Inspection								
14.1.1	All grants of inspection are issued in full accordance with Standard Business Practice #3 - Grant Inspection	100%	Assurance Net	Data Analysis DA	< 95 %	DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Quarterly
Function 15: Data Management and Analysis								
Control 15.1: Data Assessment and Analysis								

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
15.1.1	Monthly summary of District food safety/food security inspection performance by Circuit is prepared and analyzed	100%	Assurance Net	Data Analysis DA	< 100%	DM/EARO	Month	Quarterly
15.1.2	Instances in which performance measures were not met are identified and analyzed	100%	Assurance Net	Data Analysis DA	< 100%	DM/EARO	Month	Quarterly
15.1.3	Corrective actions for failures and problem areas are initiated expeditiously	100%	Assurance Net	Data Analysis DA	< 100%	DM/EARO	Month	Quarterly
Function 16: Performance Management System								
Control 16.1: Conduct Performance Management System review (non In Plant)								
16.1.1	100% of performance appraisals for ratable non-bargaining unit employees are submitted to pay pool manager by October 30 annually	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95 %	DM/EARO	Year	Annually
16.1.2	100% of employee in a ratable status receive mid-cycle progress reviews by March 31st	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 95%	DM/EARO	Year	Annually
16.1.3	100% of mission critical occupational groups receive formal, entry level on the job, or classroom training, as required	100%	Assurance Net	Admin RMA/RMS	< 90%	DM/EARO	Year	Annually
17.0 Other Consumer Protection								
17.1 Voluntary Reimbursable Inspection								
17.1.1	100 % SPS noncompliances where voluntary services are performed result in an NR.. (Target 100%)	20%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
17.1.2	100% of verification that product identified as adulterated or improperly labeled is controlled and results in corrective action	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
17.2 Economic Adulteration and Labeling Verification								
17.2.1	Procedures to verify for economic adulteration and labeling requirements comprise no more than 20% of procedures performed	20%	Assurance Net	PBIS	Greater than 20%	FLS/DM/EARO	Month/Quarter	Quarterly
17.2.2	100% of verification that product identified as adulterated or improperly labeled is controlled and results in corrective action	100%	Assurance Net	IPPS	< 90%	FLS/DM/EARO	6 months	Quarterly
18.1.1	EARO review AssuranceNet performance measure data for all assigned Districts each quarter	100%	Assurance Net	EARO/AA Oversight Form	<90	DM/EARO	Quarter	Quarterly

Number	Performance Measure	Target Level%	Data Source	Associated Data	Action Level	Management Level	Analysis Window	Frequency of Review
18.1.2	AA/DAA reviews EARO quarterly performance measure assessments twice per year.	100%	Assurance Net	EARO/AA Oversight Form	<90	AA/DAA	Quarter	Semi-annually

PERFORMANCE MEASURES TABLE
IDENTIFYING NON-IPPS DRIVEN AND IPPS-DRIVEN DATA SOURCES

Performance Measure	Non-IPPS Driven	IPPS Driven	Management Level
1.1.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
1.2.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
1.2.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
1.3.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
1.3.2	X		FLS/DM/EARO
1.3.3	X		DM/EARO
1.4.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
1.5.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
1.5.2	X		FLS/DM/EARO
1.5.3	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.1.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.1.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.1.3		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.2.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.2.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.2.3		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.3.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.3.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.3.3	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.3.4		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.3.5	X		DM/EARO
2.3.6	X		EARO/AA
2.3.7		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.3.8		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.4.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.4.2	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.4.3	X		DM/EARO
2.4.4	X		FLS/DM/EARO
2.4.5		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.4.6		X	FLS/DM/EARO
2.4.7		X	FLS/DM/EARO
3.1.1	X		DM/EARO
3.1.2	X		DM/EARO
3.1.3	X		DM/EARO
3.1.4	X		DM/EARO

Performance Measure	Non-IPPS Driven	IPPS Driven	Management Level
3.1.5	X		DM/EARO
3.1.6	X		DM/EARO
3.1.7	X		DM/EARO
3.1.8	X		AA/DAA
4.1.1	X		DM/EARO
4.1.2	X		DM/EARO
4.1.3	X		DM/EARO
4.2.1	X		DM/EARO
4.3.1	X		DM/EARO
4.3.2	X		DM/EARO
4.3.3	X		DM/EARO
5.1.1	X		DM/EARO
5.1.2	X		DM/EARO
5.1.3	X		DM/EARO
5.1.4	X		DM/EARO
5.1.5	X		DM/EARO
5.1.6	X		DM/EARO
5.1.7	X		DM/EARO
5.1.8	X		DM/EARO
5.1.9	X		DM/EARO
5.1.10	X		AA/DAA
5.1.11	X		AA/DAA
6.1.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
6.1.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
6.1.3	X		DM/EARO
7.1.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
7.1.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
7.1.3		X	FLS/DM/EARO
7.1.4		X	FLS/DM/EARO
8.1.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
8.1.2a		X	FLS/DM/EARO
8.1.2b		X	FLS/DM/EARO
8.1.3a		X	DM/EARO
8.1.3b		X	DM/EARO
8.1.4		X	AA/DAA
8.2.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
8.2.2	X		FLS/DM/EARO
8.2.3	X		DM/EARO

Performance Measure	Non-IPPS Driven	IPPS Driven	Management Level
8.2.4	X		AA/DAA
9.1.1	X		DM/EARO
9.1.2	X		DM/EARO
9.1.3	X		DM/EARO
9.1.4	X		DM/EARO
9.1.5	X		DM/EARO
10.1.1	X		DM/EARO
10.1.2	X		DM/EARO
10.1.3	X		DM/EARO
13.1.1	X		DM/EARO
13.2.1	X		DM/EARO
14.1.1	X		DM/EARO
15.1.1	X		DM/EARO
15.1.2	X		DM/EARO
15.1.3	X		DM/EARO
16.1.1	X		DM/EARO
16.1.2	X		DM/EARO
16.1.3	X		DM/EARO
17.1.1		X	FLS/DM/EARO
17.1.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
17.2.1	X		FLS/DM/EARO
17.2.2		X	FLS/DM/EARO
18.1.1	X		DM/EARO
18.1.2	X		AA/DAA