One Team, One Purpose

We are one team, with one purpose, and that is to protect public health. FSIS employees take pride in their work that helps prevent foodborne illness.

www.fsis.usda.gov
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The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) dedicates its time, attention, and resources to keeping food safe. Federal laws, such as the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906 (FMIA) and the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 (PPIA), among others, give the agency the statutory authority to inspect all meat, poultry, and processed egg products.

As FSIS pursues its food safety mission to protect public health, it addresses other fundamental issues such as the health and humane handling of all animals brought to slaughter and processing establishments. It also ensures effective outreach and education for consumers, industry, academics, the public health and medical communities, and other critical partners that contribute to the safety of our food supply.

In pursuit of its mission, FSIS has established a robust end-to-end strategic planning program that promotes alignment of action to goals, mission, and vision.

FSIS has established a robust end-to-end strategic planning program

STRATEGIC VISION
The FSIS Strategic Plan serves as the guiding document for all long-term activities, keeping the agency’s focus on preventing foodborne illness and securing the public’s trust as a public health regulatory agency. The plan is structured using three core themes:

- Preventing Foodborne Illness,
- Using Science to Understand and Influence the Farm-to-Table Continuum, and
- Empowering People and Strengthening Infrastructure
ANNUAL PLANNING

The themes exemplify the major areas of focus for the agency and serve as an umbrella for FSIS’ 8 strategic goals, 17 outcomes, and 36 measures. Operationally, FSIS follows an Annual Performance Plan (APP), which is a 12-month organizational action plan derived directly from the Strategic Plan. In fiscal year 2014, this roadmap laid out the path toward the long-term strategic outcomes utilizing 47 APP results, each with specific supporting activities to be completed by yearend. Progress is tracked throughout the year against the strategic measures and outcomes. At the close of the fiscal year, FSIS provides this report summarizing the agency’s performance in meeting these goals, outcomes, and measures.

PEOPLE

Agency employees serve on the front lines of food safety. FSIS’ organizational structure is designed to create efficiencies, while driving effectiveness in pursuit of its food safety mission.

The agency mission is carried out through 12 Program Offices: Codex Alimentarius Commission (CODEX), Civil Rights Staff (CRS), Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), Office of Data Integration and Food Protection (ODIFP), Office of Field Operations (OFO), Office of Investigation, Enforcement and Audit (OIEA), Office of Management (OM), Office of Outreach, Employee Education and Training (OEEET), Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Education (OPACE), Office of Public Health Science (OPHS), and Office of Policy and Program Development (OPPD). These programs are managed in a matrix performance environment to foster collaboration and cooperation and to support informed strategic decisionmaking. The organizational structure and strategic plan also serve to encourage opportunities to reach out beyond agency borders to collaborate on foodborne illness prevention measures and other activities.

The majority of employees who make up these program offices fall into one of six different job functions, each of which is critical to pursue the mission successfully. Their individual performance standards are directly linked to the APP so that clarity of purpose and mission are understood by all.

Agency employees serve on the front lines of food safety.

• Food Inspectors are in every federally inspected establishment ensuring that every livestock, poultry and product for further processing, including processed egg products have been inspected and receives the mark of inspection.

• Evaluation, Investigation, and Analysis Officers (EIAOs) conduct comprehensive food safety assessments (FSAs) to verify the application and validation of scientific principles associated with food safety regulations and policies in slaughter and processing establishments.

• Consumer Safety Inspectors (CSIs) ensure that slaughter and processing establishments comply with Federal food safety regulations and policies. They verify plant activity and review records to make sure that companies comply with requirements to ensure a safe food product. If violations are found, CSIs take enforcement action and issue a Noncompliance Record (NR).

• Investigators track down pathogen sources that cause illness when it occurs and remove the contaminated food from commerce.

• Scientists test samples for contaminants and report results back to inspectors at plants. They explore new methods to make testing more effective and efficient in finding pathogens.

• Veterinarians ensure that animals are healthy and safe for human consumption as well as ensure that slaughter and processing establishments comply with Federal food safety regulations and policies.

• Other food safety professionals develop policies, procedures, processes, and educational materials and foster awareness about best practices to keep consumers safe. Through a variety of roles, they provide the infrastructure to keep the agency operating effectively, performing in areas like budget, administration, communications, and data.

This combination of FSIS’ robust strategic planning agenda and over 9,000 committed employees form the foundation of the agency’s focus on ensuring that America’s food is safe for consumption by using effective and modern food safety techniques grounded in science.
Protect Consumers and Prevent Foodborne Illness

One Team, One Purpose

9,438 Employees Ensuring that Meat, Poultry, and Processed Egg Products are Safe, Wholesome, and Correctly Packaged

12 Programs

- Office of Field Operations (OFO)
- Office of Policy and Program Development (OPPD)
- Office of Public Health Science (OPHS)
- Office of Data Integration and Food Protection (ODIFP)
- Office of Inspection, Enforcement and Assessment (OIEA)
- Office of Management (OM)
- Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)
- Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO)
- Civil Rights Staff (CRS)
- Office of Outreach, Employee Education and Training (OODET)
- Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Education (OPACE)
- CODEX

Our Team

By the Numbers

• Prevent Foodborne Illness
• Understand and Influence Farm-to-Table Continuum
• Empower People and Strengthen Infrastructure

3 Themes

8 Goals. 17 Outcomes. 36 Measures.

Strategic Plan Elements
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
FSIS FY 2014 Performance

FY 2014 was a year once again marked by collaborative agency activity supporting our public health objectives. From the implementation of cross-agency working group findings to the introduction of new and innovative food safety policies and sampling techniques, FSIS remained steadfast in its advancement toward being an agile and modern food safety agency.

As the agency’s performance agenda fosters continual improvement through strategic planning and program performance, FSIS is repeatedly evaluating and improving its approach to food safety operations. This Year in Review report includes the organization’s goals, objectives, and measures that guide FSIS’ work to reduce the presence of foodborne pathogens and residues and reduce foodborne illness.

Left: FSIS conducted surveillance for 134 foodborne outbreaks with potential linkage to FSIS-regulated products.
Right: FSIS controlled 3,091,454 pounds of meat and poultry products in-commerce to prevent possible injury or illness to the consumer.

To achieve movement in these key areas, FSIS monitors its supporting goals, measures, and corresponding activities year-round as these supporting activities are critical to achieving positive results. Using portfolio management tools such as tracking performance against targets, and assigning color ratings, the agency is able to monitor its ongoing performance and implement effective decisionmaking to improve outcomes. Assigning scores such as green, yellow, and red provides agency management with indicators of FSIS’ progress or challenges to making headway on preventing foodborne illness and protecting public health.

For example, FSIS has been pursuing improvements in risk reduction, food inspection, and compliance. And in FY 2014, the agency focused on improving food safety by tackling Salmonella and other pathogens and is modernizing the poultry slaughter system. With the publication of a final poultry slaughter modernization rule in 2014, FSIS is now planning for the implementation of the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS). NPIS focuses inspectors’ attention and activity on functions that detect and prevent pathogens from entering the food supply. It’s a science-based system that should prevent more than 5,000 illnesses a year.

Another important effort supporting the agency mission involves outreach to stakeholders, domestic and international. With respect to international stakeholders, FSIS created the Office of International Coordination (OIC) within the Office of the Administrator to coordinate the agency’s activities to address international issues. Regarding all stakeholders, FSIS has made education and information a large part of its fight against foodborne illness. FY 2014 marked the first full year of a new Website that uses responsive design principles—the user’s view of the site is optimized for the device type, be it desktop, tablet, or smartphone. This way, consumers, as well as industry and scientists, can access answers to questions on their own terms in a method that displays properly no matter how they access the site.

The agency work is also committed to the humane treatment of animals. FSIS has taken significant steps over the last year to strengthen its ability to enforce humane handling laws at livestock slaughter facilities nationwide, through the use of a systematic approach to compliance.

The story in this year’s report is one of agency employees and leadership devoting their time, focus, and commitment to keeping the American public safe. The goals, objectives, and measures outlined in this document are the foundation of how FSIS achieves its mission, and each of its programs draws on them to ensure that the food we regulate is safe and foodborne illnesses are prevented. The following pages illustrate FSIS achievements during FY 2014, while also noting those areas where FSIS must remain vigilant in order to close the gap on threats to the food supply in FY 2015.
FY 2014 at a Glance

How Do We Measure Up?

Key Measures Improved

7.3.1: Percent of workplace injury/illness cases
Brought workplace injuries down to 5.47% this year from 8.65% in 2013.

6.1.1: Percent of food safety appeals granted
Brought granted food safety appeals down to 10% from 50% in 2013, exceeding 2014 target by 29.7% points.

We have met/exceeded 72% of our targets for the year.

We improved our data collection and collected data for 35 of the 36 measures — up from only 21 out of 36 measures in 2012.

Did We Meet Our Goals?

ON TARGET

GOAL 2 Compliance, Enforcement & Humane Handling
GOAL 4 Prevention Through Collaboration
GOAL 5 Science-Driven Analysis
GOAL 6 Effective Policy
GOAL 8 Innovative Methodology

CAUTION

GOAL 1 Inspection & Public Health
GOAL 7 Employee Empowerment

OFF TARGET

GOAL 3 Public Education & Outreach

A Year in Review—FSIS Planning and Performance Agenda
FSIS Performance of the Three Key Corporate Food Safety Measures as Required by the U.S. Department of Agriculture

Strategic Plan Measure 1.1.1
Closing the Gap to Meet the All-Illness Measure

This measure tracks total illnesses attributed to FSIS-regulated product as a result of *Salmonella*, *Listeria monocytogenes* (*Lm*), and *E. coli O157:H7*. FSIS has not consistently met this target. While the overall FoodNet case rate for *E. coli O157:H7* decreased slightly in FY 2014, FSIS did not meet its illness-reduction targets for *E. coli O157:H7* (based on Healthy People 2020 targets). This caused FSIS to miss the overall All-Illness Measure target: 386,265 actual illnesses compared to a goal of 384,462 illnesses (a difference of only~1,900 illnesses).

However, FSIS did consistently achieve the target for the *Salmonella* illness measure due in part to a decrease in *Salmonella* attribution due to agency-regulated products in 2009-2011 as compared to 2008 – 2010. The downward trend continues for *Salmonella* illnesses, and FSIS is closing the overall all-illness gap. In fact, since 2012, FSIS has seen a reduction of over 93,000 illnesses and moved from achieving 84% of the 2012 target to achieving 99.5% of FY 2014 target. In FY 2015 and beyond, FSIS plans to stay vigilant in implementing the *Salmonella* Action Plan and by pursuing other strategies to mitigate the risk.

Data Sources:

1) Pathogen-specific Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) FoodNet case rates of foodborne illnesses,
2) Pathogen-specific CDC foodborne illness outbreak data (used to estimate pathogen-specific FSIS attribution),
3) Pathogen-specific, domestically acquired foodborne illness CDC Scaling Factors, and
Strategic Plan Measure 2.1.1
Percentage of Establishments that Passed Salmonella Verification Testing Performance Standard

In 2014, FSIS consistently exceeded the target of 92% of broiler establishments passing the carcass Salmonella Verification Testing Standard. This measure tracks whether young chicken slaughter establishments are effectively minimizing the opportunity for Salmonella to pass into final product entering commerce. The percentage of establishments passing has steadily increased over time. FSIS continues to look for ways to improve its Salmonella sampling programs, such as the use of a “moving window” to replace discrete sample sets. The agency is also determining how to use sampling information to account for certain risk factors such as serotypes of human health concern and will continue to develop sampling programs that can be used to calculate prevalence.

Strategic Plan Measure 2.3.1
Percentage of Establishments with a Food Defense Plan

A functional food defense plan is a set of procedures or practices that an establishment uses to reduce the risk of unintentional adulteration for its incoming raw materials or outgoing products. The plan must be documented, implemented, tested periodically, and reviewed annually or when changes occur within or outside the establishment that could affect the vulnerability of the product being produced. The plans are designed to help plants take action quickly, decisively, and effectively to minimize adverse impact from contamination. USDA has been working with establishments to encourage them to voluntarily adopt functional food defense plans. The voluntary adoption of functional food defense plans by 90% or more of industry is considered by FSIS to be a level at which rulemaking would not be warranted. USDA established a goal of getting 85% of industry to adopt food defense plans by the end of FY 2014, with the ultimate goal of getting to 90% by the end of FY 2015. FY 2014 Food Defense Plan Survey results indicated 84% of surveyed establishments currently have a functional food defense plan, thus missing the FY 2014 target by 1 percent. The percentage of official establishments with a functional food defense plan has been steadily increasing since the first survey was initiated in 2006, indicating progress continues to be made. Large and small plants generally have food defense plans in place, while the very small plants have greater challenges meeting this recommendation due to fewer available resources. FSIS has in place several strategies to help very small plants, including publishing a Small Plant Newsletter, operating a Small Plant Help Desk, and ensuring inspectors are available and educated to answer questions. FSIS has also developed a number of tools and resources, such as the General Food Defense Plan and the Food Defense and Recall Preparedness: A Scenario-Based Exercise Tool, to help very small plants develop and implement a functional plan. Adoption of functional food defense plans by the remaining establishments will require additional outreach and education measures to overcome challenges, which is something FSIS plans to address in FY 2015.
CASE STUDY

A Culture of Continuous Improvement: Leveraging the Strategic Performance Working Group (SPWG) to Confront Shiga toxin-producing E. coli (STEC)

BACKGROUND: FSIS consciously and consistently reviews data to search for trends and track indicators to measure outcomes of activity. As part of this continuous improvement model within its strategic agenda, FSIS established in FY 2013 its SPWG, an executive initiative involving a cross-functional working group of FSIS employees. In reviewing the FSIS All-Illness Measure (a key FSIS performance indicator that tracks the number of Salmonella, E. coli O157:H7, and Listeria monocytogenes foodborne illnesses associated with FSIS-regulated meat, poultry, and processed egg products), the SPWG identified and aggressively pursued Salmonella as a major public health concern for the agency. This effort resulted in the Salmonella Action Plan (SAP), which began rolling out in FY 2014 and will continue through FY 2015. In FY 2014, the SPWG took a similar approach to address concerns about Shiga toxin-producing E. coli contamination on regulated product. It was evident to the SPWG by reviewing CDC FoodNet data that the overall number of E. coli O157:H7 illnesses nationally had either plateaued or increased over the past 18 months. To quickly address this critical issue, FSIS leadership asked the SPWG to develop strategies to reduce contamination levels from this pathogen.

METHODOLOGY: The SPWG approach involved reaching across the agency to tap into the collective experience of frontline employees, mid-level managers, and headquarters executives from a variety of program areas, including the Office of Field Operations; Office of Public Health Science; Office of Policy and Program Development; Office of Data Integration and Food Protection; Office of Investigation, Enforcement, and Audit; Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Education; and Office of Field Employee Education, and Training; among others. Using modern collaboration tools such as social media and crowd sourcing, along with traditional meetings with senior managers and experts, the group gathered field input and expert advice. In FY 2014, the group focused its approach on examinations of several high-functioning districts with respect to E. coli detection. Des Moines, IA; Dallas, TX; and Denver, CO presented their processes from which the SPWG developed a way forward to reduce STEC-related illnesses.

FINDINGS: From the various input sources, including related data from outside entities, the SPWG concluded that a combination of (1) improving sanitary dressing practices designed by industry and (2) improving how FSIS in-plant personnel and Enforcement Investigations and Analysis Officers (EIAOs) understood and assessed these practices were the most promising means of bringing down STEC levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS: In FY 2015, FSIS is considering six SPWG recommendations involving sanitary dressing: (1) Conduct Correlations with OFO; (2) Perform Assessments of (Sanitary Dressing) Verification Tasks; (3) Use Photographs in Training Materials; (4) Issue Compliance Guidance; (5) Develop and Provide Training; and (6) Assess the Use of Indicator Bacteria to Assess Effectiveness of Sanitary Dressing. The SPWG hypothesizes that these action items will improve industry’s understanding and implementation of proper sanitary dressing and will reduce the number of consumer illnesses from STEC from beef products.

FSIS began analyzing for Salmonella in all beef products it collects for Shiga toxin-producing E. coli (STEC) testing. Through this change, the agency greatly increased the data it collects on Salmonella in beef products.
LOOKING AHEAD

FY 2015 and Beyond

At the beginning of each fiscal year, FSIS publishes its Annual Performance Plan (APP) as the year’s roadmap toward fulfilling the agency’s mission and, ultimately, its vision. The multi-year Strategic Plan and the APP are at the front end of a comprehensive performance management process to help ensure that the agency produces desirable and meaningful results in an effective and efficient manner as good stewards of taxpayers’ dollars. The APP outlines the results to be achieved that year as well as the actions the agency will pursue to achieve those results. In its FY 2015 APP, FSIS plans to pursue an ambitious plan to modernize the agency and drive innovation and collaboration. It has documented several core themes from which program areas support and contribute, sometimes simultaneously.

MODERNIZE: First and foremost, the agency’s key initiatives (Corporate Performance Measures) are designed to drive down the instances of foodborne illness caused by pathogens like Salmonella and E. coli O157:H7. With the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS) finalized in August 2014, the agency is planning to implement NPIS in FY 2015. The agency will also continue to execute on the Salmonella Action Plan (SAP), implement new Salmonella performance standards and intends to implement overall sampling activities. With respect to E. coli, based on collaborative efforts across the agency with external partners, FSIS plans to implement lessons learned and best practices on sanitary dressing to prevent cross-contamination and decrease the instances of E. coli O157:H7 in FSIS-regulated product.

COLLABORATE: FSIS’ effort to modernize extends to its approach to research and collaboration as well. FSIS will continue to work within its existing partnership with the Interagency Food Safety Analytics Collaboration (IFSAC). The purpose of this group is to coordinate activities and analyses across FSIS, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The agency will continue planning for a public meeting, scheduled for early 2015, to share findings from analyses to estimate harmonized attribution fractions for Salmonella, E. coli O157:H7, Listeria monocytogenes, and Campylobacter, along with other key IFSAC projects.

In FY 2015, FSIS is planning to implement the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS).

INNOVATE: In pursuit of scientific innovation, FSIS’ scientists will study genetics using acquired laboratory instruments to sequence the genome of bacterial isolates. Adding this capability will permit the agency to have a higher degree of definition and knowledge of the pathogen characteristics associated with human health. In the regulatory arena, siluriform (catfish) inspection is in the planning stages of development. Results of these and other priorities are tracked through measurable outcomes and are reported throughout the year in monthly APP reports. This agility will propel the agency forward into the next fiscal year to achieve planned results.
FY 2014 Progress to Goals

Throughout FY 2014, FSIS pursued an aggressive agenda to combat foodborne illness and protect public health. The agency achieved notable success in Goal 1 in hitting targets for Salmonella, while the E. coli target emerged as the tougher obstacle and was a contributing factor for the agency to miss the All-Illness target. The agency began reporting on the percentage of establishments that meet “for cause” Food Safety Assessments and monthly Hazard Analysis Verification (HAV) decision criteria more than once a year. The process to collect a baseline for this measure was delayed because of new technology and measuring methodology coming online. As a result,

GOAL 1
Inspection and Public Health

ASSET
To support FSIS inspectors in the field working at establishments with limited or no Internet connectivity, FSIS deployed an updated component to the PHIS Disconnected State to provide an enhanced off-line capability to inspectors. To support our State partners, PHIS State was released in April 2014 providing the same domestic capabilities as the Federal system. PHIS import was integrated to receive information from U.S. Customs and Border Patrol Automated Commercial Environment (ACE)/International Trade Data System (ITDS) allowing secure, real-time transfer of certificate information.

OPPORTUNITY
To better estimate illnesses from specific food products, FSIS must broaden data collection as no single CDC data source is both updated in real-time and reports what food products caused the foodborne illness.

GOAL 2
Compliance, Enforcement, and Humane Handling

ASSET
Continuous improvement in the percentage of young chicken (broiler) slaughter establishments passing the carcass Salmonella Verification Testing Standard.

OPPORTUNITY
Improving FSIS Salmonella sampling programs and reducing Salmonella incidence in raw, comminuted poultry and poultry parts.

GOAL 3
Public Education and Outreach

ASSET
Leveraging non-traditional outreach opportunities, such as extensive social media outreach, to educate the public and promote food safety messages to unconventional audiences, leading to a higher than average engagement on routine messages. For example, FSIS exceeded its FY 2014 Twitter target by 165%, and a higher-than-normal engagement on social media has propelled FSIS messages to millions of customers.

OPPORTUNITY
Immeasurability of the goal due to a lack of reliable and repeatable data source that can be compared to the data used to set the goal target.

GOAL 4
Prevention Through Collaboration

ASSET
Continued strong working relationships with research and public health partners to address FSIS research priorities, improve estimates of FSIS’ effects on public health and increase understanding of FSIS activities by our partners and the industry.

OPPORTUNITY
Maintain forward momentum on current priorities and projects, continue effective communication of FSIS priorities, needs, and activities to stakeholders, and ensure timely public release of final products.
is more aspirational in nature. The agency also continues to pursue improvements in employee engagement and satisfaction as well as in hiring practices. Successes were seen in many other areas, including information sharing, industry adherence to policy, and the food safety appeals process. Internally, the agency exceeded expectations regarding workplace injuries (down from 9.1% in FY 2012 to 5.47% in FY 2014), training staff on Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) issues and procedures, and public awareness/exposure.

**GOAL 5**

**Science-Driven Analysis**

**ASSET**
Aligned the scientific agenda to respond to emerging concerns and provided the science to support policy decisions. Laid the foundation to move toward whole genome sequencing for samples of FSIS-regulated products.

**OPPORTUNITY**
Better attribution of illnesses to FSIS-regulated products are needed to determine if Strategic Plan 2016 targets ensure the appropriate level of food safety.

**GOAL 6**

**Effective Policy**

**ASSET**
The New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS) regulation published on August 21, 2014. All implementing instructions to the field have either been issued or are ready to be issued. Necessary industry guidance has been issued or is in clearance.

**OPPORTUNITY**
Lack of investment in business processes and procedures threatens our effectiveness and efficiency under expanding workload and limited resources.

**GOAL 7**

**Employee Empowerment**

**ASSET**
Agency ability to provide quality customer service in an efficient and effective manner is our standard operating practice.

**OPPORTUNITY**
Lack of investment in business processes and procedures threatens our effectiveness and efficiency under expanding workload and limited resources.

**GOAL 8**

**Innovative Methodology**

**ASSET**
Measured the innovation and effectiveness of short-, medium-, and long-term initiatives and establishing baselines in terms of saved time, saved/avoided cost, improved accuracy, increased data availability, and public health impact.

**OPPORTUNITY**
Implementing the Goal 8 process to establish baselines and determine effectiveness is competing with other agency priorities. Cross-program resource contention is due to POCs being detailed to fulfill positions resulting from attrition.
**GOAL 1**

**Measure 1.1.1 Total number of *Salmonella*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, and *E. coli* O157:H7 illnesses from products regulated by FSIS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>405,178</td>
<td>479,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>394,770</td>
<td>427,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>384,362</td>
<td>386,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of illnesses reduced in 3 years: 93,356.*

**Faces of FSIS**

“For any person interested in protecting the public’s health and preventing foodborne illnesses—whether a scientist, a teacher, or a college student—and seeking a way to help make food products safe, wholesome, and accurately labeled, I believe that there are awesome opportunities in food safety through FSIS.” —KRISTIN BEATY

- Finalized contract requirements and took delivery of FSIS’ Public Health Information System (PHIS) export functionality which allows:
  - Interested parties to apply for an export application online;
  - Applicants (including corporations, individual establishments, and individual export brokers) to export product via the online applications;
  - FSIS to streamline the export process;
  - FSIS to streamline and better document the return goods process; and
  - FSIS to charge for export services.

- Ensured 82% of investigative cases and 85% of enforcement actions addressed food safety violations.

- Completed economic analysis for expanding the testing for non-O157 in ground beef and components other than trim. The economic analysis used information obtained from the Pathogen Controls survey. FSIS will announce the economic analysis in the Federal Register and respond to comments.

- Announced and began implementing the strategy to co-analyze all raw beef product samples for *Salmonella* and STECs.

- 93% of FSIS follow-up surveillances resulted in establishment compliance. Drafted a best practices guideline for retailers, based on the risk assessment findings, to help protect public health by decreasing the potential for *Lm* contamination at retail.
• The percentage of broiler establishments passing the carcass Salmonella Verification Testing Standard meeting the FY 2014 goal of 92%.

• The newly established Office of International Coordination met with 16 foreign governments on a wide variety of issues regarding the FSIS equivalence program.

• The final import rule requiring all official import inspection establishments have Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) was published.

• The percentage of official establishments with a functional food defense plan increased from 83% in 2013 to 84% in 2014.

• Approximately 95% of in-commerce facilities have implemented food defense practices.

• The October 2013 issuance of an FSIS Compliance Guide and annual on-site assessments resulted in 63% of the active slaughter establishments having a systematic approach to humane handling, which exceeds the FY 2014 target of 60%.

GOAL 2

Measure 2.2.1 Percentage of slaughter plants identified during District Veterinary Medical Specialist (DVMS) humane handling verification visits as having an effective systematic approach to humane handling (all four elements of a systematic approach implemented).

Faces of FSIS

“…my co-workers, the in-plant inspection team, and I, make a difference to public health each day …The EIAO team has worked tirelessly to accomplish the goal of completing a food safety assessment at all of the active plants in the Alameda district over the past 4-year cycle; our district is very proud of the team’s great accomplishment.” —DR. CHAU.VU
GOAL 3 | Public Education and Outreach

Enhance Public Education and Outreach To Improve Food-handling Practices

GOAL 3
Measure 3.2.1/d FSIS Electronic Media Outreach: Twitter Followers.

- Education efforts supported FSIS’ Salmonella Action Plan by informing consumers of foodborne risks and illness prevention. Conducted media tours and webinars on Salmonella, as well as authored a blog on the topic that was shared nearly 1,000 times on social media.

- Developed new public service announcements (PSAs) in coordination with the Ad Council. Consumer behavior data from various sources were used to guide the creation of the new ads. Partnered with Kansas State University to look at consumer behavior, which showed that cross-contamination and the lack of food thermometer usage are significant risks for consumers, and that the new PSAs directly address these issues. One of the Ad Council’s PSAs developed this year also focused on Salmonella.

- FSIS exceeded its FY 2014 Twitter target by 165%, and a higher than normal engagement on social media has propelled FSIS messages to millions of consumers.

- Conducted a free promotional campaign with Facebook in June. “Page Posts” and “Like” ads were promoted throughout the month. This effort increased the number of “Likes” on the foodsafety.gov Facebook page from 20,000 to more than 110,000.

- Exceeded public education targets to at-risk and vulnerable audiences, Spanish speakers, and the deaf community. These efforts were improved most notably through the USDA Food Safety Discovery Zone, which saw more than 1,700,000 visitors, a 176% increase from FY 2013.

- Gathered consumer behavior data from the Ad Council, Kansas State University, the International Food Information Council, and Foodsafety.gov to inform FSIS safe food-handling messages to consumers.

Faces of FSIS

“I am glad that we are providing this service and that it is being well received. I think about the information that I’d like to receive, and I work to provide it to our deaf and hard-of-hearing audience. This proves that we have improved our outreach and are reaching our target.”

—BRIDGETTE KEFFEE-HOOGSON
• Revised the Research Priorities Review Panel Charter to incorporate lessons learned during the first 2 years of the Research Priorities Review Panel.

• Adopted new research priority, which acknowledges the importance of molecular genetics to food safety research.

• Adopted new research studies (within individual priorities) that focus on the safety of ethnic foods that may pose a significant risk for a sub-section of the population.

• Created a special webinar dedicated to the Cooperative Interstate Shipment (CIS) Agreement in collaboration with the Department’s “Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food” initiative, which led to greater participation in monthly outreach calls with Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) Contact and Coordinator and State Directors.

• Held a National Advisory Committee for Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI) Public Meeting in January 2014 to solicit stakeholder input on Food Safety Handling Labels and the FSIS Establishment-Specific Data Release Strategic Plan.

• Developed an Establishment-Specific Data Release Strategic Plan.

• Expanded outreach to small and very small plants via exhibits and conferences.

• Organized and held a face-to-face meeting in Washington, D.C., on September 3-5, 2014, for IFSAC Steering Committee and Technical Workgroup members to discuss ongoing projects and future project development.

• Developed four new IFSAC project proposals for FY 2015, which include efforts in refining Campylobacter attribution, incorporating more data in attribution estimates from outbreak data, improving information about point of contamination attribution, and developing a new template for routine IFSAC attribution reporting.

Strengthen Collaboration Among Internal and External Stakeholders

GOAL 4
Measure 4.1.2 Key Federal partners U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): Percentage of results from interagency collaboration on analytics used in FSIS policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faces of FSIS

“I really enjoy working with some of the best minds in public health and food safety to figure out how best to use the data we have, identify new sources of data, understand why people get sick, and learn how we can prevent outbreaks in the future.”

—DR. JOANNA ZABLOTSKY KUFEL
Effectively Use Science to Understand Foodborne Illness and Emerging Trends

GOAL 5
Measure 5.2.1 Percentage of identified public health and food safety gaps addressed across the Farm-to-Table Continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Baseline (70%)</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Improved traceback timelines so that, in all cases, it takes a median of 6 days from initiation to recall action. Consumer complaints were evaluated within 2 days of receipt. 100% of the investigations conducted in response to consumer complaints were initiated in less than 9 days.

• Generated critically important data through the Chicken Parts Baseline Survey for developing the first-ever chicken parts performance standards that will be implemented by FSIS in 2015. The report for the Raw Liquid Egg Baseline Survey was published on the FSIS Website on September 4, 2014. Completed shakedown and planning for Beef/Veal Carcass Baseline Survey and officially began the actual survey August 1, 2014.

• Completed the National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods’ (NACMCF) Department of Defense Microbiological Criteria and Norovirus documents and made ready for adoption in early FY 2015.

• Published a final rule on the Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection based on a risk assessment showing illnesses avoided using this new approach.

• Updated FSIS research priorities, adding one new priority: Identify unique attributes of pathogen outbreak strains that may increase the probability of foodborne illness.

• Added four priority associated studies:
  o Evaluate biocide resistance of outbreak versus non-outbreak pathogen strains;
  o Develop or identify effective pre-harvest interventions to reduce levels of human pathogens in poultry;
  o Develop or identify approaches to control human pathogens in dried and fermented products; and
  o Develop or identify approaches to control human pathogens in dry cured ham (Supported Goals 4 and 5).

• Finalized a report summarizing the risk assessment that evaluated options for performance standards for Salmonella and Campylobacter in chicken parts, comminuted chicken, and comminuted turkey.

• Completed exploratory multi-hazard identification projects; validated a multi-compound tranquilizer method for beef, pork, and poultry; and validated a multiple-hormone method for use in the FY 2015 NRP.

Faces of FSIS

“FSIS is committed to incorporating up-to-date scientific information into the development of its policies. In OPHS Science staff we analyze scientific data from its own sampling programs, partner with the USDA Agriculture Research Service to design scientific studies that are relevant FSIS regulated products, and also review the current scientific literature to provide support in developing policies to improve our food safety system and ensure FSIS regulated products are safe for the consumer.”

—PHIL BRONSTEIN
GOAL 6 | Effective Policy

Implement Effective Policies
To Respond to Existing and Emerging Risks

GOAL 6
Measure 6.1.2 Percentage of regulated industry adhering to key public health-related policies (establishments with no public health-related non-compliances/year).

Faces of FSIS
“… (One investigation I worked) made an impact on ready-to-eat (RTE) foods policy, resulting in an FSIS notice which led to changes at establishments … Today, working with policy, I am now answering questions arising from that notice to ensure that “best practices” are being implemented. This is one example of how I have been able to watch firsthand as data and science impact FSIS policy.” — SCOTT SEYS
• Quadrupled the number of paper-based surveys for FSIS field employees. As a result, the overall score for the surveys of field employees related to workers’ understanding of their impact on public health increased from 92.6% in 2013 to 93.3% in 2014.

• Successfully transitioned to the eRecruit automated staffing tool. Provided virtual/hands-on training to program areas to ensure that they could properly utilize this hiring tool.

• Developed the FSIS Specific Leadership Competency Model and accompanying Reference Guide to assist with outreach, recruiting, career development, succession planning, and evaluation. The Cross-Cutting Competency model and Reference Guide will be posted on the FSIS Intranet for use by all employees.

• Exceeded Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Civil Rights training goals for supervisors/managers. In FY 2014, 83% of managers/supervisors completed 3 hours of EEO training.

• Exceeded EEO and Civil Rights training goals for non-supervisory employees. To date, 95% of non-supervisory employees have completed 2 hours of EEO training.

• Reduced the rate of employee injuries and illnesses to 5.47%.

• Executed actions necessary for the agency to successfully transition out of the Public Health Human Resources System (PHHRS) demonstration project before the June 30, 2014 deadline, with a 99.6% accuracy rate.

• Conducted outreach and recruitment efforts designed to increase applicant pools of individuals with disabilities. To date, 76% of managers/supervisors have completed the MD-715 training during which managers/supervisors are made aware of the challenges in improving the employment and advancement of persons with targeted disabilities.
GOAL 8  |  Innovative Methodology

- A total of 11 innovative initiatives were tracked.
- The FSIS Meat, Poultry, and Egg Product Inspection (MPI) Directory was released as a mobile application for use on Apple devices. Public feedback is that the app is easy to use and results are immediate. Customer ratings averaged 4.3/5 and is currently the agency’s highest-rated mobile app.
- The Sharknado social media results exceeded expectations, all at no additional cost to the agency. The pilot demonstrated a unique, innovative opportunity for a Goal 8 objective to test the value of live-Tweeting food safety information with images during a weekend movie event. As a result, the agency achieved record Twitter activity (single-most shared tweet in agency history, four times the average number of impressions, 11 times the average number of retweets, eight times the average number of replies, 19 times the average number of favorites, and 16 times the average number of total engagements). The agency gained more Twitter followers who were more likely to share information, as evidenced by a significant increase in shared food safety tweets having been shared after the event than before the event.

Measure 8.2.1 Percentage of documented implemented processes, methodologies, or technologies that are evaluated to assess whether they meet the intended outcomes or otherwise contribute to the agency’s efforts to perform its mission.

Faces of FSIS

“FSIS has a great mission. Not only is it interesting, but the work the agency does matters. Protecting the public’s health is rewarding work, and if I do my job well, no one will ever know my name.”

— JEREMY TODD REED
GOAL 1: ENSURE THAT FOOD SAFETY INSPECTION ALIGNS WITH EXISTING AND EMERGING RISKS

1.1.1 Total number of Salmonella, Listeria monocytogenes, and E. coli O157:H7 illnesses from products regulated by FSIS.
1.2.1 Percent of domestic establishments that meet the “for cause” Food Safety Assessments and monthly Hazard Analysis Verification decision criteria more than once per year.
1.2.2 Percent of importing countries requiring more immediate inspection or reinspection attention more than twice within the previous year.
1.3.1 Percent of priority in-commerce facilities (e.g., warehouses, distributors and transporters) covered by surveillance activities.
1.3.2 Percent of follow-up surveillances resulting in compliance.

GOAL 2: MAXIMIZE DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH FOOD SAFETY POLICIES

2.1.1 Percent of broiler plants passing the carcass Salmonella verification testing.
2.2.1 Percent of slaughter plants identified during District Veterinary Medical Specialist (DVMS) humane handling verification visits as having an effective systematic approach to humane handling (all four elements of a systematic approach implemented).
2.3.1 Percent of all official establishments with a functional Food Defense Plan.
2.3.2 Percent of food defense practices implemented at in-commerce facilities.
2.3.3 Outreach to eligible countries to encourage implementation of a system that protects product from unintentional contamination.

GOAL 3: ENHANCE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH TO IMPROVE FOOD-HANDLING PRACTICES

3.1.1 Average percentage of consumers who follow the four key food safety “best practices” (i.e., clean, separate, cook and chill) and thermometer use.
3.2.1-b FSIS Electronic Media Outreach: Page views on the FSIS Website.
3.2.1-c FSIS Electronic Media Outreach: YouTube Views.
3.2.1-d FSIS Electronic Media Outreach: Twitter Followers.
3.2.1-e FSIS Electronic Media Outreach: Visitors to the Food Discovery Zone.

GOAL 4: STRENGTHEN COLLABORATION AMONG INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

4.1.1 Research: Percentage of time products from three USDA research agencies (i.e., Agricultural Research Service, Economic Research Service, and National Institute of Food and Agriculture) used by FSIS and shared with stakeholders.
4.1.2 Key Federal partners U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): Percentage of results from interagency collaboration on analytics used in FSIS policy.
4.1.3 Small and Very Small Plants: Percentage of identified opportunities realized to improve information sharing.

GOAL 5: EFFECTIVELY USE SCIENCE TO UNDERSTAND FOODBORNE ILLNESS AND EMERGING TRENDS

5.1.1 Percent of identified public health and food safety gaps addressed across the Farm to Table Continuum.
5.1.2 Percent of completed science agenda items that meet quality standards for information rigor, clarity, and defensibility of methods used.
5.1.3 Percent of annual science agenda completed and number of agenda items initiated.

GOAL 6: IMPLEMENT EFFECTIVE POLICIES TO RESPOND TO EXISTING AND EMERGING RISKS

6.1.1 Percent of food safety appeals granted (categories of appeals that were overturned by a higher level supervisor).
6.1.2 Percent of regulated industry adhering to key public health-related policies (establishments with no public health related non-compliances/year).
6.1.3 Frequency of reviews examining the effectiveness of FSIS policies regarding significant public health risks.

GOAL 7: EMPOWER EMPLOYEES WITH TRAINING, RESOURCES, AND TOOLS

7.1.1 Average score on the Annual Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey for questions related to workers’ understanding of their impact on public health.
7.2.1 Percent of competency gaps closed for targeted groups.
7.2.2 Percent of all eligible FSIS employees with an Individual Development Plan (IDP) in place.
7.2.3 Percent of all managers/supervisors that complete 3 hours of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) training annually.
7.2.4 Percent of all non-managers/non-supervisors who complete 2 hours of EEO training annually.
7.3.1 Percent of workplace injury/illness cases.
7.3.2 Annual rate of staff vacancies.
7.3.3 Ranking in the Partnership for Public Service’s Annual Report, Best Places to Work in the Federal Government.
7.3.4 Increase the workforce for Persons with Targeted Disabilities.

GOAL 8: DEVELOP, MAINTAIN, AND USE INNOVATIVE METHODOLOGIES, PROCESSES, AND TOOLS

6.1.1 Percent of innovative processes, methodologies, or technologies for which the agency has established a baseline.
6.1.2 Percent of innovative processes, methodologies, or technologies that, once employed, are evaluated by the agency.
6.1.3 Percent of documented implemented processes, methodologies, or technologies that are evaluated to assess whether they meet the intended outcomes or otherwise contribute to the agency’s efforts to perform its mission.

1 Measure 3.1.1 was rated black because no data was available pending the development of an interim survey tool. Goal 3 was rated red overall pending the development of interim survey measurement tool.
2 Measure 3.2.1-a was retired due to more effective measurements in the form of 3.2.-b-e.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Direction</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down Up</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>405,178</td>
<td>479,621</td>
<td>▼ 349,770</td>
<td>427,711</td>
<td>▼ 384,362</td>
<td>386,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>▼ 20.00%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>▼ 20.00%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>85.80%</td>
<td>▲ 85.00%</td>
<td>85.80%</td>
<td>▲ 85.00%</td>
<td>85.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>87.06%</td>
<td>▲ 82.00%</td>
<td>89.90%</td>
<td>▲ 83.00%</td>
<td>88.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.28%</td>
<td>▲ 90.00%</td>
<td>90.37%</td>
<td>▲ 92.00%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>▲ 45.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>▲ 60.00%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>▲ 81.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>▲ 85.00%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>▲ 91.00%</td>
<td>94.80%</td>
<td>▲ 91.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
<td>▲ 60.00%</td>
<td>65.50%</td>
<td>▲ 70.00%</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 75.00%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline (18%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 18.00%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>▲ 25.00%</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline (11%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 32.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>▲ 53.00%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline (66%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 68.00%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>▲ 71.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline (98%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>▲ 95.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline (100%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>▲ 95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline (70%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 60.00%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>▲ 60.00%</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>40.33%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>▼ 40.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>▼ 39.70%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>73.80%</td>
<td>▼ 19.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>▼ 20.00%</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>▼ 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>▼ 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>▼ 91.00%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>▼ 92.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▼ n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▼ 10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>▼ 100.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>▼ 100.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>New Measure</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▼ 60.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>▼ 75.00%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>New Measure</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▼ 40.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>▼ 60.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>▼ 6.10%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>▼ 6.00%</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>▼ 6.50%</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>▼ 6.00%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>38.39%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>▼ 37.05%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>▼ 37.50%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>New Measure</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▼ 2.00%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>▼ 2.00%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>▲ 55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>▲ 71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▲ 100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>▲ 80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Down = Red, Up = Green, Color = Light Green, Target = Blue, Actual = Purple, Trend = Gray
The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual’s income is derived from any public assistance program (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA’s TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
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