



**FY 2014**  
**CBJ VOL. 1**  
**PERFORMANCE DATA**

**FY 2014 Annual Performance Plan &  
FY 2012 Annual Performance Report**

**DISCONTINUED INDICATORS**

**U.S. Department of State**

## *Discontinued Indicators*

As discussed in the upfront section entitled, "Selection Criteria for Performance Indicators", the Department of State has shifted to a more robust and outcome-oriented method for performance measurement. As part of this initiative, the Department adopted a set of SMART performance criteria for developing and selecting performance measures for the Annual Performance Plan. SMART indicators must be specific, measureable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound. The Department's indicators were selected because they: 1) show progress toward achieving the Department's Strategic Priority Goals; 2) link directly to the policy priorities which are supported by budget resources, including the Agency Priority Goals (APGs); and 3) identify trends in order to gauge the improvements made in providing the American people a more efficient, effective, and accountable government.

The 38 indicators below are proposed for discontinuation in the FY 2014 Annual Performance Plan due to the evolution of next-phase progress in the programs, the Department's changes to its strategic priorities, an effort to improve quality, and an increase in linking indicators to resource allocations. Additionally, the Department's implementation of the QDDR has led to new multiyear strategic planning processes in which bureaus develop new performance indicators. The 38 indicators proposed for discontinuation relate to six of the seven Strategic Goals with the Bureau/Account owner bolded at the end of the indicator title. To view performance data for every discontinued indicator, see:

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/203415.pdf>

## *Performance*

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Average number of civilian responders deployed per month. ( <b>Conflict Stabilization Operations</b> )				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ Improved But Not Met	◀▶ On Target	▼ Below Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	Range: 60-70				
FY 2012 Target	Range: 70-80				

FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 60
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 78
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 60
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 11.4 employees/mo [Baseline]
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 2 employees/ month
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 2.3 employees/ month
Reason for Discontinuation	CSO's strategy now emphasizes quantity of responses rather than quality of responses, and is focusing 80% our efforts on a more limited number of strategically important countries. Furthermore, this indicator is sensitive to budgetary changes, making meaningful comparisons across years difficult.

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Average rating denoting degree to which UN Peacekeeping Missions in Near East Asia funded through the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities Account (CIPA) achieve pre-established U.S. Government objectives. ( <b>International Organization Affairs</b> )				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	2.5				
FY 2012 Target	2.5				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 2.5				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 2.55				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 3.0				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 3.0				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 3.0				

FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 2.5 [Baseline]
Reason for Discontinuation	Rapid evolution in global peacekeeping operations renders regional assessments more difficult and less meaningful. Restoring a global indicator is deemed to more accurately reflect trendlines and general U.S. priorities.

**Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Average rating denoting degree to which United Nations peacekeeping missions in Africa funded through the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities Account (CIPA) achieve pre-established U.S. Government objectives. ( <b>International Organization Affairs</b> )
--	--

**PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND**

FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
▼ Below Target	▲ Above Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target

**TARGETS AND RESULTS**

FY 2014 Target	N/A
FY 2013 Target	2.5
FY 2012 Target	2.5
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 2.5
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 2.5
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 2.3
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 2.3
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 2.3
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 1.83 [Baseline]
Reason for Discontinuation	Rapid evolution in global peacekeeping operations renders assessments specific to a single region more difficult and less meaningful. The Bureau's global indicator more accurately reflects trendlines and general U.S. priorities.

**Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Key milestones in achieving full denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and preventing the export of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and missile-related technology by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). <b>(East Asian and Pacific Affairs)</b>				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ Improved But Not Met	▼ Below Target	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target	▼ Below Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	Contingent upon North Korea's cooperation, pursue multilateral discussions on steps towards irreversible denuclearization, including on UEP, and an initial verification protocol. Seek to expand discussions with DPRK on improving its international standing. Enhance international implementation of sanctions to curb DPRK proliferation. Maintain international unity in response to any DPRK provocations. Further U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral coordination on the DPRK.				
FY 2013 Target	Closely coordinate with the new ROK administration on DPRK denuclearization and nonproliferation goals and to improve North-South relations. Seek international unity in response to any DPRK provocations. Engage China to influence the DPRK to refrain from provocations, take appropriate steps to denuclearize, and improve its international standing. Contingent on DPRK cooperation, explore resumption of multilateral dialogue on denuclearization. Negotiate early steps toward irreversible denuclearization, including on the DPRK UEP, and begin initial verification activities. Enhance international implementation of sanctions to curb DPRK proliferation. Maintain U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral approach to DPRK.				
FY 2012 Target	Evaluate DPRK intentions toward nuclear and proliferation activities in light of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Kim Il-sung and continued succession activities in the DPRK. Contingent upon North Korea's cooperation and genuine change in behavior, negotiate early steps towards irreversible denuclearization, including on the DPRK Uranium Enrichment Program (UEP), and an initial verification protocol. Seek to enhance the international community's implementation of sanctions to curb DPRK proliferation activities. Enhance U.S.-Japan-ROK Korea trilateral approach to DPRK and ensure policies remain aligned. Strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance and keep Japan engaged in regional problems.				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b></p> <p>Following unexpected death of Kim Jong Il, U.S. closely monitored leadership transition to Kim Jong Un. Took part in two rounds of U.S.-DPRK bilateral discussions on denuclearization that resulted in DPRK announcing a moratorium February 29 on nuclear tests, missile launches, and uranium enrichment. After DPRK abrogated February 29 understanding by conducting a launch using ballistic missile technology on April 13, further enhanced trilateral U.S.-Japan-ROK coordination and broadened international consensus condemning DPRK provocations. UN Security Council issued strong Presidential Statement condemning launch and directing designation of additional targets for sanctions. Engaged closely with Six-Party partners on implementation of sanctions against DPRK. Strengthened U.S.-Japan alliance through deployment of second TPY-2 radar in Japan.</p>				

FY 2011 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: On Target</b>  Coordinated with Six-Party Partners to seek verifiable denuclearization. Unprecedented Japan/ROK unity through two trilateral ministerials. At China-U.S. Summit, discussed importance of improved North-South relations. ROK/DPRK bilateral denuclearization talks. Held first round of U.S.-DPRK talks in 19 months. Strengthened implementation of UN and domestic sanctions. President signed E.O. 13570 requiring review of all direct/indirect DPRK imports. Expanded counter-proliferation coordination. Brought the US-Japan alliance to the next stage by issuing the first 2+2 agreement in four years. Japan is the second largest donor after the United States to both Afghanistan and Pakistan and has continued to disburse its 2009 commitments of \$5 billion and \$1 billion, respectively.</p>
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: On Target</b>  North Korea engaged in unprecedented provocative behavior by sinking the ROK naval vessel <i>Cheonan</i> in March 2010, and shelling Yeongpyong Island in November 2010. North Korea also revealed a uranium enrichment program (UEP) in November 2010 in violation of UN Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874. In light of these provocations, goals for North Korea were adjusted toward preserving regional stability and coordinating with regional partners and allies. The U.S. remains on target toward achieving these adjusted goals due to close consultations with allies and partners in the Six-Party Talks. The United States hosted the first-ever ministerial level U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral meeting, continued to implement sanctions and encouraged the international community to implement sanctions against North Korea in a full and transparent manner.</p>
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b>  U.S. experts observed disablement at Yongbyon from 11/2007 to 4/2009 when the DPRK expelled them. At that time, eight of eleven Second Phase disablement steps had been completed.  IAEA and U.S. experts departed in April following North Korea's launch of a ballistic missile. On May 25, North Korea announced it had tested a nuclear device. In June, the DPRK announced its intention to reprocess spent fuel rods and to reverse other disablement steps. The UN Security Council unanimously passed UNSCR 1874 and the U.S. seeks full and transparent implementation of the resolution.  The U.S. continues to seek the verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in a peaceful manner and DPRK's return to the NPT and IAEA safeguards as stated in the September 19, 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks.</p>
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b>  The DPRK provided a declaration of its nuclear programs on June 26, 2008. The DPRK began disablement of the three core nuclear facilities at Yongbyon, although the DPRK halted disablement activities in August 2008. Disablement activities were reinitiated in October 2008, though at a slower pace.</p>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b>  DPRK nuclear test in October 2006 prompted passage of UNSCR 1718 and imposition of sanctions. Six-Party Talks resumed and parties agreed to begin implementation of the September 2005 Joint Statement, beginning with February 13, 2007 Initial Actions agreement. DPRK shut down and sealed Yongbyon nuclear facility and IAEA personnel returned to conduct monitoring and verification activities. Parties agreed to cooperate in economic, energy, and humanitarian assistance and delivered an initial 50,000 tons of heavy fuel oil. Working groups set up by the "Initial Actions" agreement all met. Instances of isolated proliferation-related behavior on the part of firms from Asian nations continued, but some states, including the Republic of Korea (ROK), indicated willingness to cooperate more closely in preventing WMD-related proliferation in Asia.</p>
Reason for Discontinuation	<p>While denuclearization of the Korean peninsula remains a key EAP goal, foreign assistance funds were no longer programmed towards this objective, as the Six-Party Talks have not occurred since 2008.</p>

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Number of bilateral and multilateral joint military exercises in the Near East region. (Near Eastern Affairs)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	◀▶ Improved But Not Met	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	85-57				
FY 2012 Target	85-87				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 107				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 88				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 113				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 77				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 85 [Baseline]				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A				
Reason for Discontinuation	Due to changing circumstances in the region, this indicator was removed from NEA's FY 2013 Bureau Strategic and Resource Plan as it is no longer a meaningful metric of NEA's programs.				

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Number of countries in sub-Saharan Africa that are rated as "critical" by the Fund for Peace Failed States Index. (African Affairs)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	◀▶ On Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					

FY 2014 Target	N/A
FY 2013 Target	20 countries
FY 2012 Target	21 countries
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 21
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 22
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 22 countries
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 22 countries
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 20 countries [Baseline]
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 18 countries
Reason for Discontinuation	The programs and activities related to this indicator are supported primarily with Foreign Assistance resources, not State Operations. Performance is being monitored and tracked via the Department's Foreign Assistance Performance Plan and Report submission.

**Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Number of NEA countries with Financial Intelligence Units that meet the standards of the Egmont Group. (Near Eastern Affairs)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
New Indicator, No Rating	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	13				
FY 2012 Target	13				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 11				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 9				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 8				

FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 8
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 7
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 7 [Baseline]
Reason for Discontinuation	This indicator is not linked to the Bureau's new internal strategic planning and budgeting documents. NEA uses three other performance indicators that better measure its goal, "Counter Threats and Advance Civilian Security."

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Numeric assessment of South Sudan in the Failed States Index created by the Fund for Peace. (African Affairs)			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ Improved But Not Met
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	107.5				
FY 2012 Target	108.1				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 108.7				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 108.7				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	The programs and activities related to this indicator are supported primarily with Foreign Assistance resources, not State Operations. Performance is being monitored and tracked via the Department's Foreign Assistance Performance Plan and Report submission.				

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Numeric assessment of Sudan in Failed States Index created by the Fund for Peace (African Affairs)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	110				
FY 2012 Target	110.6				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 109.4				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 108.7				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 111.8				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 112.4 [Baseline]				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	The programs and activities related to this indicator are supported primarily with Foreign Assistance resources, not State Operations. Performance is being monitored and tracked via the Department's Foreign Assistance Performance Plan and Report submission.				

<b>Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Status of Iran's Nuclear Weapons Program and Adherence to Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Obligations. ( <b>International Security and Nonproliferation</b> )				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					

FY 2014 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iran's suspension of all uranium enrichment-, reprocessing-, and heavy water-related activities (also termed 'proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities') continues and negotiations continue or conclude on a long-term political settlement.</li> <li>• IAEA inspections and investigations continue into any remaining outstanding issues.</li> </ul>
FY 2013 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiations with Iran continue until agreement on a long-term political settlement.</li> <li>• Iran maintains a full suspension of all proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities, verified by the IAEA.</li> <li>• IAEA inspections and investigations continue into any remaining outstanding issues.</li> <li>• Iran provides full cooperation such that the IAEA is able to conclude that Iran's nuclear program declarations appear correct and complete.</li> </ul>
FY 2012 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iran re-suspends all proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities, verified by the IAEA, and negotiations continue on a long-term political settlement.</li> <li>• IAEA inspections and investigations continue into any remaining outstanding issues with the aim of demonstrating that Iran's power program declarations are correct and complete.</li> <li>• A coalition of states is maintained to press Iran to comply with its international obligations and to implement measures against Iran's use of the international financial system to support proliferation and terrorist activities.</li> </ul>
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite ongoing negotiations with the P5+1, Iran continues to improve its uranium enrichment capability and has not halted other proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities.</li> <li>• Iran refuses to cooperate with the IAEA.</li> <li>• A coalition of states is maintained to press Iran to comply with its international obligations and to implement measures against Iran's use of the international financial system to support proliferation and terrorist activities.</li> </ul>
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iran continues to refuse to suspend its activities, as required by multiple UNSC and IAEA Resolutions, and failed to reach an agreement with the P5+1 that would satisfy the international community's concerns.</li> <li>• The IAEA continues its investigation of Iran's nuclear program. In November 2011, the IAEA issued a report on the possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear program, which also indicated that some nuclear weapons-related activities may be ongoing in Iran today. As a result, the IAEA overwhelmingly passed a resolution condemning Iran's continued failure to cooperate.</li> <li>• The U.S., EU, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Canada, Norway and Switzerland enacted measures limiting Iran's ability to finance its proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities.</li> </ul>

FY 2010 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b>  While P5+1 took unprecedented steps to engage with Iran, it was clear by the end of 2009 that Iran was not ready to engage. In keeping with a dual-track policy, the U.S. decided to pursue a UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) to encourage Iran to negotiate substantively and in good faith; in June, 2010, SC adopted UNSCR 1929. The U.S. then worked with like-minded countries to ensure implementation and take additional, autonomous national measures to supplement the goal of bringing Iran to the table. In late 2010, Iran agreed to meet with the P-5+1 in Geneva; a second meeting was agreed to in 2011. While IAEA inspections have been ongoing in 2010, Iran refuses to answer questions about possible military dimensions to its nuclear program, and denies access to individuals and facilities, and has failed to halt its enrichment activities.</p>
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b>  Iran has continued to refuse to comply with its United Nations Security Council (UNSC) obligations. The Obama Administration conducted an extensive Policy Review on Iran, intended to identify ways to execute the President's policy objective of preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability while changing the tone of the interactions, including through direct engagement and diplomacy.</p>
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b>  Iran continued to refuse to re-suspend its proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities or to cooperate fully with the IAEA. In coordination with Treasury, a diplomatic track through unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral sanctions was pursued. In addition to UNSCRs 1696, 1737, and 1747, UNSCR 1803 was adopted in March 2008, imposing additional Chapter VII sanctions on Iran in an effort to get Iran to suspend its nuclear activities and engage in negotiations on the future of its nuclear program. UNSCR 1835 was adopted in September 2008, restating the obligations on Iran and demanding its compliance. The IAEA remained seized of the issue and, in February 2008, was presented with information that described in detail Iran's effort to develop a nuclear warhead, work that the U.S. Intelligence Community assessed was halted in late 2003.</p>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Below Target</b>  Iran continued to refuse to re-suspend its proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities enrichment-related activity or to cooperate fully with the IAEA. The U.S. has pursued a diplomatic track through unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral sanctions in coordination with the Treasury Department. In addition to UN SCR 1696, two more resolutions were unanimously adopted (UNSCRs 1737 and 1747) and Chapter VII sanctions were imposed on Iran in an effort to achieve the desired impact of Iran suspending its proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities, cooperating fully with the IAEA, and engaging in negotiations on the future of its nuclear program. A third Chapter VII sanctions resolution, UNSCR 1803, was adopted in March 2008 when Iran continued to fail to comply with its UNSC and IAEA obligations.</p>
Reason for Discontinuation	<p>This indicator will continue to be used by management. However, in order to streamline the number of indicators reported in this document it will no longer be shown.</p>

**Strategic Goal 1: Counter threats to the United States and the international order, and advance civilian security around the world**

**Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner**

Verification R&D programs focus on closing key detection and verification capability gaps identified in AVC's arms control R&D verification requirements document regarding nuclear weapons programs, foreign materials, and weapons production facilities and processes. **(Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance)**

**PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND**

FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V Fund funds up to 10 projects to investigate cutting edge technologies, methodologies or approaches.</li> <li>• Program results inform development and implementation of relevant arms control, verification, and compliance policies, agreements and commitments.</li> <li>• Establishment and continuation of DOE, DOD and IC R&amp;D programs to address AVC-identified detection and verification gaps.</li> <li>• Promising R&amp;D programs, initially funded with AVC monies, are pursued in greater depth by other agencies.</li> <li>• Planned critical intelligence collection programs key to verification, compliance and implementation are funded fully -- e.g., Cobra Judy Replacement, DOD Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) programs.</li> <li>• Key MASINT sensor programs and analysis techniques to detect and characterize nuclear testing and missile launches are deployed/maintained to assist verification.</li> </ul>				
FY 2013 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V Fund funds up to 5 projects to investigate cutting edge technologies, methodologies or approaches.</li> <li>• Program results inform development and implementation of relevant arms control, verification, and compliance policies, agreements and commitments.</li> <li>• Establishment and continuation of DOE, DOD and IC R&amp;D programs to address AVC-identified detection and verification gaps.</li> <li>• Promising R&amp;D programs, initially funded with AVC moneys, are pursued in greater depth by other agencies.</li> <li>• Planned critical intelligence collection programs key to verification, compliance and implementation are funded fully -- e.g., Cobra Judy Replacement, DOD Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) programs.</li> <li>• Key MASINT sensor programs and information analysis techniques to detect nuclear testing and ballistic missile launches are deployed to assist verification.</li> </ul>				

FY 2012 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V Fund funds up to 3 projects to investigate cutting edge technologies, methodologies or approaches.</li> <li>• Program results inform development &amp; implementation of relevant arms control, verification, &amp; compliance policies, agreements &amp; commitments.</li> <li>• DOE, DOD, &amp; IC agencies seek AVC input and/or invite AVC to sit on R&amp;D investment decision-making panels and start projects to address AVC-identified detection &amp; verification capability gaps.</li> <li>• Promising R&amp;D programs, initially funded by AVC, are pursued by other agencies.</li> <li>• Planned critical intelligence collection programs key to verification, compliance and implementation are funded fully -- e.g., Cobra Judy Replacement, DOD MASINT programs.</li> <li>• Key MASINT sensor programs and information analysis techniques are deployed to assist verification.</li> </ul>
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: On Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bureau created an unclassified Verification Technology Research and Development Needs Document. This is the first time that a “Needs Document” has been available in unclassified form.</li> <li>• Seed monies provided through the V Fund have been allocated to twelve technical projects with community partners.</li> <li>• Agencies provided candidate projects for review and recommendation by interagency committees chaired by AVC.</li> <li>• Critical collection programs remained funded and supported.</li> <li>• AVC continued to work with partners in the IC on the Cobra Judy Replacement as well as on other important verification, compliance and monitoring sensors.</li> </ul>
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: On Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bureau technology requirements established and disseminated throughout Science &amp; Technology community. Seed monies provided through the V Fund have been allocated to twelve technical projects with community partners.</li> <li>• AVC, DOE and National Nuclear Security Agency jointly-sponsored calls for research and development projects, working groups and verification technology demonstration projects relating to nuclear testing and nuclear-related monitoring issues.</li> <li>• Agencies provided candidate projects for review and recommendation by interagency committees chaired by AVC.</li> <li>• Critical collection programs remained funded and supported.</li> </ul>

FY 2010 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: On Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seed monies provided through the V Fund have been allocated to over a dozen technical projects with community partners.</li> <li>AVC, DOE and NNSA jointly-sponsored calls for research and development projects, working groups and verification technology demonstration projects relating to nuclear testing and nuclear-related monitoring issues.</li> <li>Agencies provided candidate projects to the Verification and Monitoring Task Force.</li> <li>Critical collection programs were fully funded.</li> </ul>
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> N/A</p>
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A</p>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A</p>
Reason for Discontinuation	<p>Indicator continues to be an important activity for the Arms Control, Verification and Compliance Bureau. However, for the purpose of the Congressional Budget Justification, AVC's indicators were revised to better reflect the Department's highest strategic priorities.</p>

Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being					
Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner		Average percentile score for sub-Saharan Africa on the World Bank Institute's Worldwide Governance Rule of Law Indicator (Scale = 0 to 100). (African Affairs)			
PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
New Indicator, No Rating	N/A	◀▶ On Target	▼ Below Target	◀▶ On Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	29.1				
FY 2012 Target	28.7				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Data not yet available				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 28.4				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 28.1				

FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 28.6
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 28.3 percent [Baseline]
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 28.6
Reason for Discontinuation	The programs and activities related to this indicator are supported primarily with Foreign Assistance resources, not State Operations. Performance is being monitored and tracked via the Department's Foreign Assistance Performance Plan and Report submission.

<b>Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Financial Stability Improvement Ratio - Percentage of countries with active debt relief agreements with Paris Club creditors that have an active International Monetary Fund program or have successfully completed it, and do not have protracted arrears to international creditors. <b>(Economic and Business Affairs)</b>				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
New Indicator, No Rating	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	n/a				
FY 2013 Target	85%				
FY 2012 Target	85%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 90%				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 90%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 88%				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 85%				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 87%				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 84% [Baseline]				

Reason for Discontinuation	This indicator was based on the notion that the number of debtor nations successfully pursuing IMF programs under agreement with Paris Club creditors would improve over time, which has occurred. The Highly Indebted Poor Country Initiative is winding down rendering this indicator no longer relevant.
----------------------------	---

**Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Improvements in media freedom in priority countries, as measured by the mean average Freedom of the Press rating for non-democratic countries and countries undergoing democratic transitions according to Freedom House. <b>(Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor)</b>
--	---

**PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND**

FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▼ Below Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating

**TARGETS AND RESULTS**

FY 2014 Target	67.6
FY 2013 Target	67.8
FY 2012 Target	68.0
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Data not yet available.
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 68.7
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 68.6 (Baseline)
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 68.1
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 67.6

Reason for Discontinuation	DRL will continue to monitor media freedom and freedom of expression more broadly and the Freedom of the Press survey will be a useful source of information on media freedom. We have replaced this indicator with a broader measure of civil society, which better reflects our budget request.
----------------------------	---

**Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Increased labor rights in priority countries, as measured by the percentage of countries with progress on workers' rights to freedom of association after sustained U.S. Government diplomatic and/or programmatic engagement. <b>(Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor)</b>
--	--

**PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND**

<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating

**TARGETS AND RESULTS**

FY 2014 Target	57.0%
FY 2013 Target	57.0%
FY 2012 Target	42.9%
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> The Human Rights Reports covering FY2012 will not be available until Spring 2013.
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> Two of the 14 targeted countries made notable progress on labor rights. Therefore, DRL met the target of improvement in 28.6% of the targeted countries.
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 14.3% (Baseline)
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A
Reason for Discontinuation	Data quality assessment for this indicator revealed significant data limitations. DRL will continue to monitor and report on labor rights through our Human Rights Reports and will work to advance labor rights through our diplomatic and programmatic efforts.

**Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Level of corruption in China as measured by the World Bank's Control of Corruption percentile rank. <b>(East Asian and Pacific Affairs)</b>
--	---

**PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND**

FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▼ Below Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	36.2				
FY 2012 Target	46				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Data expected August 2013				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Data expected August 2012				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 32.5				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 37.8				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 41.3 [Baseline]				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 33.8				
Reason for Discontinuation	The Department has replaced this indicator with a better measurement of the long-term economic outcomes the United States seeks in China. The level of corruption, while important, does not support the top U.S. economic policy priorities in China.				

Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Level of two-way trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, excluding U.S. energy-related imports. (African Affairs)				
PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	▲ Above Target	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target					
FY 2013 Target	\$40 billion				
FY 2012 Target	\$35 billion				

FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> \$34.4 B (Q's 1, 2, 3 only)
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> \$42.4 billion
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> \$26 billion
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> \$24.3 billion
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> \$33.5 billion
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	The programs and activities related to this indicator are supported primarily with Foreign Assistance resources, not State Operations. Performance is being monitored and tracked via the Department's Foreign Assistance Performance Plan and Report submission.

**Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Median World Bank Regulatory Quality Estimate for developing countries (range - 2.5 to +2.5). (Economic and Business Affairs)
--	---

**PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND**

FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating

**TARGETS AND RESULTS**

FY 2014 Target	-0.29
FY 2013 Target	-0.30
FY 2012 Target	-0.31
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Data expected Sept 2013.
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> -0.33
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> -0.33
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> -0.36
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> -0.36

FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> -0.29
Reason for Discontinuation	Due to streamlining measures to reduce the number of indicators, EB believes that other indicators better captured current priorities.

<b>Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Number of countries that meet criteria for Food Security Phase 2 funding (Secretary/Executive Secretariat)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	New Indicator, No Rating	N/A
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	N/A				
FY 2012 Target	5				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b>				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> [Baseline]				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	The QDDR made USAID the lead agency for the Feed the Future global hunger and food security initiative. As such, USAID is responsible for indicators related to implementation of Feed the Future programming. Therefore, this indicator will be transferred to USAID.				

**Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Number of work programs established by partner economies leading to completion of 20 Low Emission Development Strategies that contain concrete actions by 2013. (Oceans, Environment and Science)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	▲ Above Target	◀▶ On Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	U.S. assistance to support the development of LEDS will be on track to reach 20 countries by the end of 2013.				
FY 2012 Target	At least 12 agreed work programs established for supporting LEDS development. (cumulative)				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> At least 12 agreed work programs established for supporting LEDS development. (cumulative)(preliminary rating, subject to revision after September 30)				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> [Target has changed, per discussion with OMB in the context of the climate change High Priority Performance Goal; it should read "Engagements or interest statements from 10 partner economies and 2 agreed work programs established for supporting LEDS development"] In FY 2011, we secured 11 statements of engagement or interest and finalized 2 agreed work programs.				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> The USG had engagement with, or received interest statements from, 7 partner economies, including : Bangladesh, India, Mexico, Georgia, Indonesia, Gabon, and Colombia.				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> New program. Baseline: zero engagements or interest statements from partner economies, zero agreed work programs established for supporting LEDS development.				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	This program has evolved as the Department has incorporated lessons learned from early implementation. As a result, this indicator has been replaced with one that provides a more meaningful assessment of the Department's climate change strategy.				

**Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Percentage of Total Latin America Primary Energy Supply Comprised of Alternative Fuels (renewables, biofuels, and geothermal). (Western Hemisphere Affairs)
--	---

<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating			
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	33%				
FY 2012 Target	32%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b>				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b>				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b>				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b>				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 30.7%				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 30.2% [Baseline]				
Reason for Discontinuation	WHA will discontinue this indicator as it has a substantial data quality limitation: data has not been reliably available and lags for two to three years. As such, it does not represent current energy usage and is accordingly not useful in establishing a pattern or assessing programmatic needs.				

<b>Strategic Goal 3: Expand and sustain the ranks of prosperous, stable and democratic states by promoting effective, accountable, democratic governance; respect for human rights; sustainable, broad-based economic growth; and well-being</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Progress in negotiating and implementing an agreement to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions and avoid dangerous human interference with the climate system as demonstrated by key negotiation milestones and status of 2020 action commitments by the major economies. <b>(Oceans, Environment and Science)</b>				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target					

FY 2013 Target	Long term indicator
FY 2012 Target	Long term indicator
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> Long term indicator
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> Long term indicator
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> Long term indicator.
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	This indicator was discontinued in response to a request for a greater emphasis on quantitative indicators.

<b>Strategic Goal 4: Provide humanitarian assistance and support disaster mitigation</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Percentage of internally displaced persons and refugee returnees surveyed who responded that they feel safe in their location of return ( <b>Near Eastern Affairs</b> )			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
New Indicator, No Rating	New Indicator, No Rating	New Indicator, No Rating	New Indicator, No Rating	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target					
FY 2013 Target	85%				
FY 2012 Target	84%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Data not available.				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b>				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 80.4% [Baseline]				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 80.9%				

FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 65.2%
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 9.1%
Reason for Discontinuation	This is a PRM-owned indicator based on a survey completed by the International Organization on Migration. The survey questions have changed, so there is no FY 2011 Data for this question. The bureaus will look for a replacement for the FY 2015 OMB Submission.

<b>Strategic Goal 5: Support American prosperity through economic diplomacy</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Establishment and promulgation of an Energy Security Strategy. ( <b>Energy Resources</b> )			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	N/A				
FY 2012 Target	Ensure the Energy Security Strategy is widely promulgated throughout the Department, both domestically and internationally. Work with regional bureaus and U.S. Missions to ensure the strategy is included in the allocation of resource planning in energy consuming and producing countries. Work to reconcile discrepancies in various regional priorities. Promulgate within the interagency.				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> Secretary Clinton elaborated the Department's energy security strategy in a major policy speech at Georgetown University on October 18, 2012. <a href="http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/10/199330.htm">http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/10/199330.htm</a> Additionally, on November 8 2012, the Secretary sent policy guidance to all U.S. embassies worldwide instructing them to elevate their reporting on energy issues and pursue more outreach to private sector energy partners. ("Secretary Clinton's 7th Policy Guidance Cable: Energy Policy.") A fact sheet of this policy guidance is available at: <a href="http://www.state.gov/r/pa/pl/2012/200637.htm">http://www.state.gov/r/pa/pl/2012/200637.htm</a>				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> N/A				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				

FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	With these discrete deliverables complete, ENR will focus on different indicators.

<b>Strategic Goal 5: Support American prosperity through economic diplomacy</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Median number of days required to start a business in countries that are not members of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; median cost of starting a business as a percentage of per capita income in those countries. <b>(Economic and Business Affairs)</b>				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▼ Below Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	19 days; 16%				
FY 2013 Target	20 days; 16%				
FY 2012 Target	21 days; 17%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 29.8 days; 30.2 AVERAGE				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 19 days; 17.2%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 22 days; 18.5%				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 26 days, 20% [Baseline]				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	Although the indicator has been largely successful, FY 2012 numbers show an average (not median) in excess of target. The World Bank has no data past June 2012 and no median calculations. The Department has new indicators that measure commercial successes with a direct impact on jobs & prosperity.				

<b>Strategic Goal 5: Support American prosperity through economic diplomacy</b>	
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Percentage of world energy supplies from non-oil sources. <b>(Energy Resources)</b>

PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	N/A				
FY 2012 Target	65.8%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 67.4%				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 65.4%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 65.4%				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 65.4% [Baseline]				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 64.7%				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 64.2%				
Reason for Discontinuation	Data source and quality is no longer reliable. Due to budget limitations, the Energy Information Administration (within the Department of Energy) does not regularly produce the report that tracks and monitors this data.				

Strategic Goal 6: Advance U.S. interests and universal values through public diplomacy and programs that connect the United States and Americans to the world					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Initiation or implementation of positive change in local organizations or communities by IIP foreign audiences as measured by the percentage of IIP program participants surveyed who responded that they applied knowledge gained from the program to improve their local organization or community. ( <b>International Information Programs</b> )				
PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	58%				

FY 2013 Target	57%
FY 2012 Target	Biennial data
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> N/A
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 79 percent
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Biennial data collection
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 54%-revised baseline
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> Not Applicable*
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 32% [Baseline]
Reason for Discontinuation	There are several other IIP indicators in the Congressional Budget Justification that link to more significant budget priorities.

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Accuracy of the adjudication process as measured by the percentage of audited passport issuances found to have a high likelihood of Issuance in Error (IIE) (Consular Affairs)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	N/A				
FY 2012 Target	.2 %				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> <0.1%				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> <0.1%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 0.2 percent				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 0.2 percent				

FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 0.2 percent [Baseline]
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	Due to the large sample size and intricacies of data collection, IIE data analysis often lags many years behind the planning year making it difficult to measure goal attainment in a timely manner.

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Completion and timely submission of the post Annual Inspection Summary (AIS) and annual maintenance plans. ( <b>Overseas Buildings Operations</b> )			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▼ Below Target	▼ Below Target	▲ Above Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	AFCS: 89% AIS: 89%				
FY 2013 Target	AFCS: 89% AIS: 89%				
FY 2012 Target	AFCS: 89% AIS: 89%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 95%				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 73% AFCS, 73% AIS				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> AFCS: 80%; AIS: 80%				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> AFCS: 89%; AIS: 87% *				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	OBO opted to discontinue this indicator in favor of 2 indicators that more fully illustrate OBO performance on key priorities.				

**Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally**

<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Conversion to web-based visa processing as measured by: 1) the percentage of non-immigrant (NIV) visa applications submitted electronically and; 2) the percentage of immigrant (IV) visa applications submitted electronically. ( <b>Consular Affairs</b> )				
PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	▼ Below Target	◀▶ Improved But Not Met
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	100% (NIV); 100% (IV)				
FY 2013 Target	100% (NIV); 100% (IV)				
FY 2012 Target	100% (NIV); 100% (IV)				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 100% (NIV); 18% (IV)				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 100% (NIV); 16% (IV)				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 97% (NIV); 0% (IV)				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 10% (NIV); 0% (IV)				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> N/A				
Reason for Discontinuation	The percentage in FY 2012 remained static because unanticipated technical issues delayed expansion of the pilot and worldwide roll-out. System improvements still underway. The Bureau will monitor this indicator for internal purposes but will not report on it in the CBJ.				

Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Percent of medical reviews and clearances completed within 30 days. ( <b>Medical Services</b> )				
PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▲ Above Target	◀▶ On Target	▲ Above Target
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				

FY 2013 Target	90 percent
FY 2012 Target	89 percent
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 95.46% clearances completed.
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 87 percent
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 86 percent
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 81 percent
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	The indicator "percentage of medical reviews and clearances completed within thirty days" is no longer relevant as MED has streamlined the process and increased the staff of medical professionals performing the clearance reviews. This has alleviated the backlog that formerly existed.

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Percentage of major management systems integrated into the Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW). ( <b>Information Resource Management</b> )			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ Improved But Not Met	◀▶ On Target	▼ Below Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	73%				
FY 2012 Target	70 percent				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 67.5				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> On target				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 42 percent				

FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 37.5 percent [Baseline]
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	Several other IT indicators link to more significant budget priorities, so the decision was made to streamline indicators by cutting the one related to EDW.

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Percentage of overseas positions that are vacant ( <b>Human Resources</b> )			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▼ Below Target	◀▶ Improved But Not Met	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	4%				
FY 2013 Target	4%				
FY 2012 Target	6%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Not available.				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 14%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Below Target</b> 16.7%				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 5%				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	We have aligned our indicators with our Agency Priority Goals (APGs). This is no longer an APG indicator.				

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Percentage of United Nations Specialized Agencies funded by the Contributions for International Organizations account (FAO, IAEA, ICAO, ILO, IMO, ITU, UNESCO, UPU, WHO, WIPO, and WMO) that have demonstrated progress on 5 or more goals of the United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative. <b>(International Organization Affairs)</b>			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	◀▶ On Target
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	N/A				
FY 2012 Target	100%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 100%				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 90%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 91%				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 72%				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 54%				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	Phase 1 of the United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative ended in 2012. Phase II was recently launched, and new indicators will be developed to capture relevant data.				

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>		Ratio of Change between Cost/Seat and Rent, expressed as a factor. <b>(Administration)</b>			
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>

N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶ On Target	◀▶ On Target	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				
FY 2013 Target	1 (or less)				
FY 2012 Target	1 (or less)				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> N/A				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 0.8				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> .9				
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>				
Reason for Discontinuation	The Bureau of Administration (A) was asked to replace this indicator with one that more clearly portrays their management of office space and is easier to understand. A Bureau replaced this with an indicator that addresses average utilization of office space/person in buildings in the D.C. area.				

Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Status of Domestic Facility Greening at the Department of State. ( <b>Administration</b> )				
PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND					
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target
TARGETS AND RESULTS					
FY 2014 Target	N/A				

FY 2013 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New leases will use the GSA "green" lease, and all leases shall be LEED-Silver (or equivalent) buildings. Equipment shall meet Energy Star standards (or equivalent), where applicable. LEED (or equivalent) documentation will be provided upon occupancy.</li> <li>• All building renovations exceeding 5,000 sq ft will be consistent with LEED-NC or –CI Silver, (or equivalent) certification or better. All renovations &gt;\$1 million shall be at least LEED-CI or –NC Silver, with full documentation provided at the time of occupancy.</li> <li>• 50% of owned/delegated facilities will be LEED-EB or GBI certified.</li> <li>• Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions (Scope 1 &amp; 2) reduction projections will be 6% of the 2008 baseline as required in the Department’s Sustainability Plan (submitted under Executive Order # 13514).</li> </ul>
FY 2012 Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New leases will use the GSA "green" lease, providing space in LEED-Silver (or equivalent) buildings and equipment meeting Energy Star standards (or equivalent), where applicable. LEED (or equivalent) documentation will be provided upon occupancy.</li> <li>• All building renovations exceeding 5,000 sq ft will be consistent with LEED-NC or –CI Silver, (or equivalent) certification or better. All renovations &gt;\$1 million shall be at least LEED-CI or –NC Silver, with full documentation provided at the time of occupancy.</li> <li>• 40% of owned/delegated facilities will be LEED-EB or GBI certified.</li> <li>• Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions (Scope 1 &amp; 2) reduction projections will be 4% of the 2008 baseline as required in the Department’s Sustainability Plan (submitted under Executive Order # 13514).</li> </ul>
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Above Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>All new leases are GSA “Green” leases, requiring a minimum of LEED-Silver;</b></li> <li>• <b>All OPR renovation projects &gt;5,000sq-ft are required to be LEED-Silver or higher;</b></li> <li>• <b>44% of owned/delegated buildings have been certified (40% was goal);</b></li> <li>• <b>GHG reduction from 2008 baseline was 10% (4% was goal)</b></li> </ul>
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Above Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new leases are utilizing the GSA “green” lease language; however, no new leases were awarded in FY11.</li> <li>• Renovations &gt;5,000 sq ft are following LEED-Silver (or equivalent) processes. No renovations larger than 5,000 sq ft were completed in FY11.</li> <li>• As of the end of FY11, 40% of the owned/delegated domestic building portfolio is USGBC LEED-Silver (or higher) or GBI Green Globes certified. Four domestic buildings are Energy-Star certified.</li> </ul>

FY 2010 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: Above Target</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green leasing – SA 25 (Hagerstown, MD warehouse) was certified LEED Silver in November 2009.</li> <li>• Two major renovations (&gt;\$1 million) completed in FY2010 were Building 84 in Charleston (the Department was awarded LEED-NC Platinum), and expects the facility to be "net-zero" energy consumption (first ever for both criteria for the Department)); and the NFATC Gymnasium (expected to be LEED-NC Silver). The Department is awaiting final certification confirmation.</li> <li>• In FY2010, two facilities received GBI-3 Globes certification (SA-1 and the Florida Regional Center (FRC)), bringing the Department's owned/delegated portfolio total to 4 (4 of 10, or 40%). In addition, FRC was certified as Energy Star, the third domestic Department facility to achieve that status.</li> </ul>
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<p><b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b></p> <p>All major renovations initiated in FY 2009 were designed to LEED-NC Silver expectation (i.e., Buildings 644 and 84 at the Charleston Regional Center, and the National Passport Center (NPC-2) addition in Portsmouth, NH. The design requirements for FAST-C and ESOC-West (ARRA initiatives) met LEED-NC Silver requirements.</p> <p>"GBI-Green Globes (2)", the equivalent to LEED-Silver certification, was awarded to the National Visa Center (NVC) in Portsmouth, NH in March, 2009. Similar certifications were initiated for the Beltsville Information Management Center and SA-1. Additionally, NVC received the Silver Energy Star certification in April, 2009.</p>
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	The Bureau of Administration (A) was asked to replace this with a specific quantitative indicator. The A Bureau proposed it address LEED certification for domestic buildings & expanded it to include other sustainable buildings certifications to match a goal in the Dept's Agency Sustainability Plan.

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>						
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Total cumulative number of United States Government personnel moved into more secure, safe, and functional facilities since 2000. <b>(Overseas Buildings Operations)</b>					
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>						
FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	◀▶ On Target	▲ Above Target	▲ Above Target	
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>						
FY 2014 Target	N/A					

FY 2013 Target	26,012
FY 2012 Target	24,512
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 25,364
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 23,918
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: On Target</b> 21,548
FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 20,012 personnel [Baseline]
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 18,539 personnel
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b> 14,940 personnel
Reason for Discontinuation	OBO will continue to use this indicator in its management of this issue. However, in order to streamline the number of indicators reported in the CBJ, OBO opted to discontinue this indicator in favor of 2 indicators that more fully illustrate OBO performance on key priorities.

<b>Strategic Goal 7: Build a 21st century workforce; and achieve U.S. government operational and consular efficiency and effectiveness, transparency and accountability; and a secure U.S. government presence internationally</b>					
<b>Discontinued Indicator and Bureau Owner</b>	Vacancy rate for Civil Service positions. (Human Resources)				
<b>PRIOR YEAR RATINGS TREND</b>					
<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
N/A	N/A	New Indicator, No Rating	▲ Above Target	◀▶ Improved But Not Met	Data Not Yet Available, No Rating
<b>TARGETS AND RESULTS</b>					
FY 2014 Target	5%				
FY 2013 Target	5%				
FY 2012 Target	6%				
FY 2012 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Data Not Yet Available, No Rating</b> Not available.				
FY 2011 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Improved But Not Met</b> 7.3%				
FY 2010 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: Above Target</b> 8.5%				

FY 2009 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: New Indicator, No Rating</b> 9.8% [Baseline]
FY 2008 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
FY 2007 Rating and Result	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Reason for Discontinuation	The Bureau has aligned indicators with the Department's Agency Priority Goals (APGs). This is no longer an APG indicator.

