1. 

AUDIT OF VBA'S DATA RELIABILITY IN THE CLAIMS PROCESSING WORKLOAD REPORTING SYSTEM

Reliability of data in VBA's claims processing workload reporting system can be enhanced and opportunities exist to use beneficiary demographic data to estimate future workload requirements.

Report No.: 7D2-B01-020

Date: February 27, 1997

Office of Inspector General

Washington DC 20420

Memorandum to the Acting Under Secretary for Benefits (20)

Audit of VBA's Data Reliability in the Claims Processing

Workload Reporting System

1. This project was initiated at the request of the Veterans Benefits Administration's (VBA) Chief Financial Officer because of concerns that the workload reporting system, especially for Compensation and Pension (C&P) benefits, was not sufficiently accurate to assure appropriate workload reporting and performance measurement of VBA operations. Shortly after we initiated this project, VBA management suspended a planned C&P organizational restructuring due to management's concerns regarding the accuracy of workload data.

2. VBA needs to maintain accurate and reliable workload reporting so that it can effectively track and measure organizational performance and assure effective use of staff resources. In carrying out its responsibility for administering monetary benefits to support the nation's statutory obligation to its veterans, VBA's C&P program operations encompass substantial field staffing resources with 4,320 Full-Time Equivalent Employees assigned to Adjudication Divisions in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. These field sites are responsible for managing and completing a substantial claims workload that included 2.7 million C&P claims and about $18 billion in veterans benefits paid during Fiscal Year 1996.

3. The audit found that VBA's data reliability of its Work-in-Progress (WIPP) system needs to be improved. Our analysis of the WIPP data file disclosed:

An over reporting by approximately 5.3 percent in the number of original compensation claims completed.

An understatement of the reported time to complete processing of original compensation claims by an average of 10 days.

An inability of the WIPP system to report the total processing time for cases that were transferred from one Regional Office (RO) to another for processing.

4. The audit focused on VBA workload reporting and distribution. Our primary objective was to test data validity and demonstrate how VBA systems could be used to better assure the accuracy and reliability of reported accomplishment of benefit claims processing. The audit reviewed workload reporting associated with processing original compensation claims, since this has been a specific concern of VBA management. Our review results identified opportunities for VBA to enhance the accuracy and reliability of workload reporting and performance measurement of claims processing operations with improved tracking of the delivery of benefits to beneficiaries. In addition, there are opportunities to use beneficiary demographic data derived from the C&P automated files as a tool to enhance predictions of future workload.

5. Our review of WIPP data files showed that over reporting occurred because duplicate completed compensation cases were included and incomplete claims processing actions were incorrectly reported as completed. This resulted in more completed compensation case counts and shorter case completion times than should have been reported. These types of reporting errors may be controlled by establishing system edits and by increasing management oversight and review. The audit has shown that the temporary nature of WIPP data files leaves VBA vulnerable to workload reporting errors and system manipulation because WIPP data is not available for management oversight and review. VBA should routinely collect and analyze this data to help assure more accurate and reliable workload reporting and performance measurement.

6. In addition to under reporting claims processing timeliness, the audit found that the current workload management system does not provide VBA with information on how long it actually takes to process a veteran's claim when claims work is transferred between ROs. VBA data reporting systems are designed to measure organizational unit productivity and can only tell how long it takes to process a claim if only one RO is involved in the case processing. When claims work is transferred between ROs, individual timelines can only be reported for case work completed by each RO. While this provides a measure of each RO's timeliness, it does not provide a true measure of the total length of time that was required to complete claims processing actions and provide veterans with a decision on their

benefit requests. VBA needs to modify existing system productivity reporting so that it can adequately measure and track the timeliness of claims work that is transferred between ROs.

7. Our audit also found that there are opportunities for VBA to use demographic data on beneficiaries, derived from the C&P automated files, as a tool for enhancing the estimate of future workload. Since veteran population is a key factor considered by VBA as part of planning for organizational restructuring, our analysis provides VBA with a useful profile of each RO and the actual client base served. This type of information can be used by VBA (with other factors currently in use) in estimating future demand for claims, shifting workload, and completing reasonableness tests of work performed. The beneficiary distribution information can provide greater insight into future workload issues since the use of only veteran population data does not include the significant number of non-veteran beneficiaries (20 percent of all beneficiaries are survivors).

8. Given the importance of VBA's claims processing operations and the opportunities we identified to enhance workload reporting and performance measurement, we provided program officials with interim briefings and survey results packages during the course of the audit so appropriate corrective actions could be considered as soon as possible. Our discussions with key VBA officials indicated that automated systems could be better used as a tool in assessing data reliability and how demographic distribution information on VA beneficiaries could be useful in understanding workload generation.

9. The report includes recommendations to address the issues which are discussed above. These recommendations can provide for a strengthened management information system with enhanced workload reporting and performance measurement, and use of demographic data on beneficiaries as a tool in addressing workload generation issues. The Acting Under Secretary for Benefits agreed with the report recommendations and provided acceptable implementation actions. We consider the report issues resolved and will follow up on planned actions until they are completed.

[Signed]

MICHAEL G. SULLIVAN

Assistant Inspector General

for Auditing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

VII FINAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION 26

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. VBA Can Enhance the Accuracy and Reliability of its Workload Reporting System

Our analysis of claims processing workload reporting found over reporting in the quantity of work performed (analysis of original compensation claims showed over reporting of work completed by about 5.3 percent) and the timeliness of processing claims took longer than reported (analysis of original compensation claims showed claims processing took an average of 10 days longer than reported). Our review of the Veterans Benefits Administration's (VBA) Work-in-Progress (WIPP) system data files showed that these reporting errors occurred because duplicate completed compensation cases were included and incomplete case processing actions were incorrectly reported as completed. This resulted in more completed case counts and shorter case completion timelines than should have been reported. *(Results of audit of data validation in the WIPP system are in Appendix III on pages 13-15.)* These types of reporting errors can be controlled by establishing appropriate system edits and by increasing management oversight and review.

Our audit has shown that the temporary nature of WIPP data files leaves VBA vulnerable to workload reporting errors and system manipulation because the WIPP data is not available for management oversight and review. VBA should routinely collect and analyze this data to help assure more accurate and reliable workload reporting and performance measurement. In addition, the current workload reporting system does not allow VBA to know how long it actually takes to process a veteran's claim when claims processing work is transferred between Regional Offices (RO). VBA's reporting systems are designed to measure organizational unit productivity and can tell how long it takes to process a claim if only one RO is involved in the case processing. VBA needs to modify existing system productivity reporting so that it can adequately measure and track the timeliness of claims work that is transferred between ROs.

VBA Organizational Restructuring Decisions Involving Claims Processing Activities Need to be Based on Reliable Work Measurement Data

Our review efforts were performed at the request of the VBA Chief Financial

Officer to assist VBA in a data validation effort that would help assure that future organizational restructuring decisions are made with the best work measurement data available. Claims processing restructuring decisions are being considered on how to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of VBA's operations based upon existing management information from systems that have not always been highly regarded. As VBA's plans to restructure the organization become more essential to meet the Agency's challenges, and have a greater impact on staff and clients, the Agency has come under increasing challenges to the validity of the data used to make these decisions.

VBA's efforts to meet the challenges in restructuring operations is focused on field operations that do not require direct personal contact with clients. Also, the most significant and contentious restructuring must be done in the processing of C&P benefits, VBA's largest program. In carrying out its responsibility for administering monetary benefits to support the nation's statutory obligation to its veterans, VBA's C&P program operations involve substantial field staffing resources with 4,320 Full-Time Equivalent Employees assigned to Adjudication Divisions in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. These field sites are also responsible for managing and completing a substantial claims workload that included 2.7 million C&P claims and about $18 billion in benefits paid in Fiscal Year 1996.

The audit focused on workload reporting associated with original compensation claims. The processing of original compensation claim has been an area of specific concern for VBA management and one in which they have been working to improve their quality and timeliness. Our data validation testing involving original compensation claims showed that VBA systems had workload reporting errors which have resulted in over reporting of the quantity of work performed and under reporting of the elapsed timeliness of claims processing. VBA can effectively eliminate these errors and establish more accurate and reliable workload reporting with appropriate system edits and expanded oversight and review of WIPP data.

VBA Systems Can be Used to Better Assure the Accuracy and Reliability of Reported Claims Processing Work

Based upon prior audit work in VBA program areas, we determined that VBA's automated data processing systems could be used as a validation tool to perform internal data consistency checks and to recalculate some of VBA's work measurement data. Available VBA management information can be used to

provide nationwide oversight of claims processing to provide better assurance of the accuracy and reliability of reported work and improved tracking of the delivery of benefits to beneficiaries. This is particularly important since VBA no longer conducts field station surveys that would show erroneous workload reporting patterns and facilitate the identification of errors that should be reviewed and corrected.

Workload Reporting Errors Can be Better Controlled

Our analysis of workload reporting found over reporting of the quantity of work performed (analysis of original compensation claims showed over reporting of work completed by about 5.3 percent) and the timeliness of claims processing took longer than reported (analysis of original compensation claims showed claims processing took an average 10 days longer than reported). *(Results of audit of data validation in the WIPP system are in Appendix III on pages 13-15.)* WIPP data was collected for a 6-month period (January-June 1996) from the Regional Data Processing Centers. This data reflects details of work processed on individual veteran claims by each RO and provides key information such as: which employee accomplished the reported work, type of adjudication work activities reported (end product codes), and dates of completed actions. Our analysis of WIPP system information involving work completed on original compensation awards showed over reporting of end product work accomplished because duplicate completed cases were included. For the 6-month period included in our review, we identified 4,079 duplicate case work counts out of 76,568 reported. This type of reporting error can be controlled by establishing appropriate system edits that would prevent duplicate credit for end product work completed on original compensation claims.

Based upon our analysis of data on original claims that were reestablished and authorized during the period of our review, we also found under reporting of the elapsed time associated with claims processing. Our analysis of the detailed WIPP data files showed that original compensation claims took an average of 10 days longer to process than reported by VBA (161 days versus 151 reported in original WIPP data). The lower reported elapsed time resulted from the 4,079 duplicate completed cases that were included in the work counts and from another 6,754 cases where incomplete case processing actions were incorrectly reported as completed. Typically, these actions occur when RO staff cancel a pending claim in the WIPP system and then reestablish the claim, showing a new date of claim as the date on which it is reestablished. The new claim is completed in a few days and the WIPP data system reflects a lower average number of days per case than

should have been reported. *(Results of audit of data validation in the WIPP system are in Appendix III on pages 13-15.)* Timeliness of claims processing is a key VBA productivity measurement that should accurately reflect the efforts of RO staff in delivering benefits to beneficiaries. Our review results show that the temporary nature of the WIPP data files leaves VBA vulnerable to not identifying workload reporting errors and system manipulation because the data is no longer available for management oversight and review. VBA should routinely collect and analyze this data to help assure more accurate and reliable workload reporting.

During the course of the audit, we provided C&P staff with case examples involving multiple WIPP records in which they agreed that the data we provided indicated that there was excessive work performed or claimed. While our review did not include reviews of individual veteran claims folders maintained at the ROs, the nature of the reported work counts identified showed and VBA management agreed that reporting errors are occurring.

Tracking of Claims Work Transferred Between Regional Offices Needs to be Improved

The current workload reporting system does not allow VBA to know how long it actually takes to process a veteran's claim when work on the claim is transferred between ROs. VBA data reporting systems are designed to measure organizational unit productivity and can only tell how long it takes to process a claim if only one RO is involved in the case processing. When claims work is transferred between ROs, individual timeliness can be reported for case work completed by each RO, but not cumulatively for the claim.

Our review identified cases where multiple timelines had been reported for case work completed by each RO, which did not reflect the actual time that the veteran was waiting for a benefit decision. While the current workload reporting system provides a measure of an RO's timeliness, it does not provide a true measure of the total length of time that was required to complete veteran claims processing actions and provide veterans with a decision on their benefit requests. At the time of our review, over 27,000 cases were reportedly transferred from one RO to another for claims processing through June of Fiscal Year (FY) 1996. VBA needs to modify the existing work measurement system and productivity reporting so that they focus on accurately measuring and tracking how well VA is meeting veterans' claims processing needs involving claims work transferred between ROs.

Conclusion

Our review identified opportunities for VBA to enhance the accuracy and reliability of workload reporting and performance measurement of claims processing operations with improved tracking of the delivery of benefits to beneficiaries. Maintaining accurate and reliable workload measurement is particularly important at this time since VBA is considering significant organizational restructuring that will be based, in part, on this information.

For More Information

Results of audit of data validation in the WIPP system are in Appendix III on pages 13-15.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the Acting Under Secretary for Benefits take the following actions to improve reporting, oversight, and tracking of work associated with benefit claims processing:

a. Establish appropriate system edits to help prevent duplicate reporting of work on benefit claims.

b. Routinely collect and analyze WIPP data to help assure accurate and reliable workload reporting and performance measurement.

c. Modify existing system productivity reporting to assure appropriate tracking of the timeliness of claims processing involving work transferred between Regional Offices.

Acting Under Secretary for Benefits Comments

We concur with Recommendation 1. In fact, we are taking action to address the processing timeliness measurement concerns associated with brokered work referred to in sub-element c. We are amending the instructions on brokered work to require that stations sending cases must maintain a pending issue control on each case temporarily transferred to another station to be worked. Upon return of

the case, the station of original jurisdiction will complete a review of the brokered cases then finalize the pending end product. This change allows us to capture the total processing time for each brokered case and eliminates potential distortion to the average processing time of all original compensation claims.

We support the concept of system edits expressed in sub-element a to prevent duplication of work credit. We also agree with sub-element b that management at the local, area, and national levels should have the ability to routinely collect claims completion data to monitor the accuracy of and ensure the reliability of workload reports and associated performance measures. In addition, I am establishing a Performance Measures Task Group to identify ways to prevent errors in the systems, improve the integrity of the systems, and address all of the concerns raised by your report. A draft of their charter was included with the Acting Under Secretary's comments and is on page 25.

(See Appendix VI on pages 24-25 for the full text of the Acting Under Secretary's comments.)

Office of Inspector General Comments

The Acting Under Secretary's comments and implementation actions are acceptable and responsive to the recommendation. We consider the issues resolved and will follow up on planned actions until they are completed.

2. Beneficiary Demographic Data Should be Used in Estimating Future Workload

VBA can improve its ability to estimate future workload requirements through the use of beneficiary demographic data (those veterans and survivors receiving benefits) derived from the C&P automated files. We identified three possible demographic distributions of VA beneficiaries that could be useful in understanding workload generation: veteran population, beneficiary file assignment, and beneficiary residence. Since veteran population is a key factor being considered by VBA as part of its planning for organizational restructuring, our analysis provides a useful profile of each RO and the actual client base served. This information could be used by VBA in predicting future demand for claims, shifting workload, and completing reasonableness tests of work performed.

An analysis of the C&P master record files as of March 1996, found a number of variances between reported veteran population and beneficiaries as a proportion of

their respective populations. We compared the percentage of total veteran population with the percentage of total VA beneficiary population in each state and the District of Columbia. This analysis identified variances between these percentages which VBA needs to consider in estimating future demand for claims work. For example, in California, with the largest number of both veterans (about 2.8 million) and beneficiaries (about 267,000), the percentage of veterans residing in the State (10.81 percent) exceeds the percentage of beneficiaries (8.05 percent) by a variance 2.76. An estimate of future workload in California based on veteran population alone could overstate the amount of claims work that the smaller percentage of beneficiaries in the state actually would generate. Conversely, in the District of Columbia the variance between the percentage of veterans (0.19 percent) and the percentage of beneficiaries (1.63 percent) is -1.44, indicating a greater amount of claims work than would be expected if only veteran population data was considered. *(Details of the distribution of veterans and beneficiaries by state are in Appendix IV on pages 16-19.)*

Our analysis also showed that 16.2 percent of beneficiaries live within the jurisdictional boundaries of a RO other than the one that services their claim. This is not totally unexpected as case transfers between ROs are not required when a beneficiary moves, only when the beneficiary requests it or there is a claim to change benefits. However, this variance, between veterans who live within a RO jurisdiction and those who do not, should be identified when determining the RO workload. *(Details of the comparison of Regional Office of Jurisdiction with beneficiary residence are in Appendix V on pages 20-23.)* Our analysis shows that beneficiary distribution can provide a useful insight into workload generation issues (in addition to using overall veteran population information), because the use of only veteran population data does not include the significant number of non-veteran beneficiaries (20 percent of all beneficiaries are survivors). The number of non-veteran beneficiaries represent workload requirements that need to be addressed when considering future demand for services. The use of beneficiary data also takes into account only those who are using the system, not all who may be eligible and not making demands upon it.

We believe that VBA could benefit from using the two beneficiary distributions we have discussed. The beneficiary distribution by residence could be useful in estimating future demand for claims. Variances from current jurisdictional assignment would indicate shifting workload demands. The jurisdictional assignment distributions would be most useful for conducting reasonableness tests

when compared to work performed. Variance from current jurisdictional assignment could indicate workload churning or greater efficiency. For example, states that have significantly lower proportions of resident beneficiaries than case assignments, such as New York, would be expected to have lessening workload demands, and states that have significantly higher proportions of resident beneficiaries than case assignments, such as Florida, would be expected to have increasing workload demands. Estimates of future workload could take these shifts into account when allocating resources. *(Details of the comparison of Regional Office of Jurisdiction with beneficiary residence are in Appendix V on pages 20-23.)* Our comparison of RO workload distribution and beneficiary distribution provides a demonstration of the types of demographic distributions of beneficiaries that we believe can be useful to VBA in understanding and predicting workload generation.

Conclusion

There are opportunities for VBA to use demographic data on beneficiaries derived from C&P automated files as a tool in estimating future workload in addition to using veteran population data. Since veteran population is a key factor being considered by VBA as part of its planning for organizational restructuring, we believe our analysis provides a useful profile of each RO and the actual client base served.

For More Information

Details of the demographic distribution of veterans and beneficiaries by state are in Appendix IV on pages 16-19.

Details of the comparison of Regional Office of Jurisdiction with beneficiary residence are in Appendix V on pages 20-23.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the Acting Under Secretary for Benefits consider using the types of demographic distributions of beneficiaries identified in the audit as additional tools in estimating future demand for benefit claims work.

Acting Under Secretary for Benefits Comments

We concur with Recommendations 2. The additional demographic data regarding beneficiaries might well fit into our larger Business Process Re-engineering effort

to fundamentally redesign the claims adjudication process.

(See Appendix VI on pages 24-25 for the full text of the Acting Under Secretary's comments.)

Office of Inspector General Comments

The Acting Under Secretary's comments indicate agreement with our recommendation that they consider using the types of demographic distributions of beneficiaries identified in the audit. We consider the issue resolved and will follow up on VBA's future actions to use demographic data on beneficiaries as a part of the Business Process Re-engineering effort.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Objectives

The project was initiated at the request of the Veterans Benefits Administration's (VBA) Chief Financial Officer because of concerns that VBA's workload reporting system, especially for Compensation and Pension (C&P) benefits, was not sufficiently accurate to assure appropriate workload reporting and performance measurement of VBA operations. We focused our audit efforts in two areas: workload reporting and distribution. Our primary objective was to test the validity of workload data and demonstrate how VBA management systems could be used to better assure the accuracy and reliability of reported work on processing veteran benefit claims.

Scope and Methodology

The audit focused on validating those data items that are the most significant in terms of their impact on work/staff distribution and those most likely to be challenged as subject to error or manipulation. Based upon prior audit work in VBA program areas, we determined that VBA's automated data processing systems could be used as a validation tool to perform internal data consistency checks and to recalculate some of VBA's work measurement data. We recalculated samples of the work accomplished, who did it, and how long it took to do; to validate the productivity relationships reported in the existing automated workload reporting system. Our review focused on original compensation claims as a means to test data validity and demonstrate how the system could be used to enhance the accuracy and reliability of workload reporting and performance measurement. The audit included the following key elements:

- Analyzed the Distribution of Operational Resources management information system and VBA restructuring plans to identify the most significant productivity data and how it is being used.

- Collected Work-in-Progress (WIPP) system data for a 6-month period (January-June 1996) from the Regional Data Processing Centers with the assistance of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Technical Support Staff. The WIPP system captures the claimed work performed and pending for individual claims records and produces summary reports of Regional Office (RO) performance. Normally this automated record is transitory and can not be recreated to validate individual claims records. Collection of this data facilitated the validation of productivity measures at the individual claims level.

Recalculated selected productivity measures using the C&P master record and subsidiary transaction records (WIPP) to validate the current productivity measures and provided the results to VBA during the course of the audit.

Compared demographic data on beneficiaries with workload distribution to demonstrate usefulness of beneficiary information in predicting future workload. With the assistance of OIG Technical Support Staff we took an extract from the March 1996 C&P mini-master record and sorted the beneficiary data by RO. We also created an alternate RO code by the beneficiary's ZIP code to identify the actual client base served by each RO.

The audit was performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.**BACKGROUND**

Currently, VBA is involved in initiatives to reengineer benefit delivery programs in concert with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Organizational modeling is an important component in all of VBA's reengineering activities that is being undertaken at each RO. VBA is redesigning the basic benefits delivery organization that embodies its Adjudication and Veterans Services Division operations. As a part of this process, VBA proposed an initiative to consolidate C&P program activities. In evaluating ROs for the proposed consolidation effort, VBA considered work measurement data in the evaluation process. However, because of concerns regarding the accuracy and reliability of reported work measurement data, VBA suspended its organizational restructuring initiative involving C&P program activities. VBA is continuing to focus on using business process reengineering methods to develop methods to restructure RO operations.

VBA's workload reporting system evolved in the mid-1950's in response to the need for an organized and systematic work measurement system that could be used to identify and allocate resources needed to accomplish necessary work. In 1985, VBA changed from a predominately manual work measurement system to an automated productivity measurement system. In 1991, the current work measurement system became operational and includes performance measurement information on C&P claims processing work that was the subject of our data validation focus on this project.

Based upon prior audit work in VBA program areas, we determined that VBA's automated work measurement system data could be used as a validation tool to

perform internal consistency checks and to recalculate some of the work measurement data. Our automated data analysis focused on workload reporting and distribution, to test data validity and demonstrate how VBA systems could be used to better assure the accuracy and reliability of reported work on veteran benefit claims.

RESULTS OF AUDIT OF DATA VALIDATION IN THE WORK-IN-PROGRESS (WIPP) SYSTEM

Workload and Timeliness Measurement for Compensation and Pension Actions

Regional Offices (RO) process C&P claims using a computer system known as "Target." Target also generates management reports of the number and type of C&P actions completed by each RO and the average length of time taken to complete each action. These reports are based on information input and actions taken by RO Adjudication Division staff at various times during the processing of each claim.

The two most critical pieces of information for these reports are the end product code (EPC) and the date of claim. When Adjudication Division staff receive an application, letter, document, or other correspondence, they must determine the claim or issue involved. This issue is identified in Target by an EPC. Each EPC has an assigned work rate standard measured in decimal hours. The standard represents the amount of labor, as determined by periodic studies, required to complete a particular EPC. "Assignment of the correct EPC is of prime importance, because it properly accounts for time required to complete similar issues and it affects the projection of future workloads."

Two EPCs are used to identify original compensations claims. EPC 110 identifies claims involving one to seven issues. Each disability claimed or identified is considered a separate issue. EPC 010 identifies claims with eight or more issues. A pending EPC 110 or 010 should not be cleared (reported as completed) until all issues raised by the claim have been resolved.

The date of claim is defined as the date of receipt in the RO of the material requiring a determination. The date entered is the basis for determining actual processing time required to complete action on a specific claim and the average processing time for all claims of this type.

The input of the information needed to establish a claim in the Target system creates a Pending Issue File (PIF). The Work-in-Progress (WIPP) subsystem of Target uses PIF information to track pending workload and to measure how long VA takes to complete each claim.

The accuracy of the information in the PIF determines WIPP's effectiveness as a management tool and the validity of workload and processing time reports generated from this information. Our analysis of WIPP transactions for a 6-month period (January 5 through July 5, 1996) found that ROs had actually adjudicated 4,079 fewer original compensation claims-5.3 percent-than the total reported for this period. We also found that the average time needed to process original compensation claims during this period was 10 days greater-6 percent-than the reported processing time. (*Our analysis of WIPP data is summarized on page 15*.)

WIPP System Lacks Controls to Prevent Incorrect Actions That Can Overstate the Amount of Work Completed and Understate Processing Time

The Target system lacks controls that would prevent RO staff from taking actions which would give them credit for work they have not actually completed or under report the length of time actually taken to complete action on a claim. Two commands used in Target processing of claims-CAUT (Claims Authorization) and PCLR (Pending Issue Clear)-will clear pending WIPP controls and give the RO credit for completing action on a claim. Another command-PCAN (Pending Issue Canceled)-will cancel an existing PIF with no end product credit. The Target system does not keep a record of these transactions after they are processed, and VBA does not capture them for further analysis or quality control purposes.

Our review of WIPP transactions for original compensation claims found two

methods by which RO staff used PCLR, CAUT, and PCAN actions to get credit for work that was not completed and to under report the time it took to complete action on a claim. An RO can receive credit for completing two or more EPC 010/110 actions on the same claim by "PCLRing" (and receiving credit for completing) a claim that has been pending for some time. The RO then immediately establishes a new claim for disability compensation, using the date of claim for the new claim as the date on which it is reestablished. The RO then clears the new claim within a few days by a CAUT action. These types of cases are identified on page 15 in the summary of our analysis of WIPP data as "duplicates." We identified 4,079 of these duplicate cases and calculated the additional processing days associated with the "PCLRd" pending claims. Duplicate cases over report the true number of original compensation claims completed by the number of times the duplicate actions are taken. They also distort the reported average processing time of these claims.

For example, a pending EPC 110 with a date of claim of September 25, 1995 was "PCLRd" by the RO on January 18, 1996. The processing time was 115 days. A second EPC 110, with a date of claim of January 18, 1996, was established on January 19, 1996. The second claim was cleared by a CAUT action on January 24, 1996 with a processing time of only 6 days. In this example, the RO received credit for completing two original compensation claims with an average processing time of 60 days ([115+6]÷2). However, the RO actually took 121 days to complete only one claim.

ROs can also distort the reported average processing time of original compensation claims by canceling a pending claim with a PCAN command and then immediately reestablishing the claim, showing the date of claim for the new claim as the date on which it is reestablished. The RO then clears the new claim within a few days by a CAUT action. These cases are identified below in the summary of our analysis of WIPP data as "extra day cases." We identified 6,754 such cases and calculated the additional processing days associated with the "PCANd" pending claims.

Although ROs do not receive credit for completing the "PCANd" claim in extra day cases, these cases distort the reported average processing time of original compensation claims. Only the processing time of the reestablished claim is considered when calculating average processing time. The time associated with the "PCANd" claim is disregarded. For example, a pending EPC 110 with a date of claim of January 26, 1996 was "PCANd" by the RO on May 22, 1996 after it had

been pending for 117 days. The RO reestablished the claim on May 29, 1996 with the same date of claim, and cleared it with a CAUT action on June 5, 1996. Although the reported processing time for this case was only 7 days, it actually took 131 days to complete.

Summary of Analysis of WIPP Actions for Original Compensation Claims								
	Number	**Elapsed**	**Processing**		***Total CAUTs/PCLRs-All Cases***			
Action	**of Cases**	**Days**	**Time**		Number of cases/Elapsed days		76,568	11,595,818
Cases With One EPC 010 Or 110 Action					**Average Processing Time-**			
CAUT	59,760	9,077,619	152		**All CAUTs/PCLRs**		**151**	
PCAN	2,256	297,638	132					
PCLR	5,975	816,075	137		***Duplicates***			
Totals	**68,157**	**10,233,325**	**150**		Number of cases/Elapsed days		4,079	559,708
					Percentage of total			
Cases With Multiple EPC 010/110 Actions					CAUTs/PCLRs		5.3%	
CAUT	5,133	901,587	176		Average Processing Time-Duplicates			137
PCAN	537	59,222	110					
PCLR	5,700	800,537	140		***"Extra Day" Cases***			
Totals	**11,370**	**1,761,346**	**155**		Number of cases/Elapsed days		6,754	753,694
					Percentage of total			
TOTALS-ALL CASES					CAUTs/PCLRs		8.8%	
CAUT	64,893	9,979,206	154		Average Processing Time-Extra Day Cases			112
PCAN	2,793	356,860	128					
PCLR	11,675	1,616,612	138		**Total Elapsed Days-CAUTs/PCLRS**			
Totals	**79,361**	**11,952,678**	**151**		**and Extra Day Cases**			**12,349,512**

					Average Processing Time-	
					CAUTs/PCLRs and Extra Day Cases	161
					Extra Days Added to Average	
					Processing Time	10
					Percentage Increase in Average	
					Processing Time	6%

DISTRIBUTION OF VETERANS AND BENEFICIARIES BY STATE

Use of Demographic Data by VBA for Planning Purposes

VBA has established a Field Restructuring Task Group "charged with developing recommendations by which the benefits delivery function can be restructured to maintain or improve accessibility and service, while minimizing adverse impact on affected employees and achieving resource savings." One of the assumptions guiding the Task Group in its work is: "Consideration will be given to customer service data, which indicates that veterans and their families desire improved access to services." In recommending sites for realignment or expansion, one of the selection criteria to be used by the Task Group is: "Demographics of the veteran population (to support decisions on locations of additional access points to improve and expand service)."

The supporting data package prepared by the Task Group included a listing of the number of veterans per state and the total number in the United States (excluding Puerto Rico). We found no indication that the Task Group has received any other demographic data to aid in its decision-making. However, consideration of only veteran population distribution by the Task Group would neglect several important considerations:

Only about 10 percent of all veterans are also C&P beneficiaries. Not all veterans are eligible for C&P benefits or in need of these benefits.

About 20 percent of C&P beneficiaries are not veterans but surviving spouses and children. (*A summary of veteran population and active VA cases is on page 17.*)

We believe that data showing the place of residence of all C&P beneficiaries, both veterans and survivors, taken from the C&P master record would be a useful tool in predicting future workload patterns. This data considers those who are currently

using the system, not those who may not be eligible or who do not intend to apply for C&P benefits. The state-by-state distribution of all C&P beneficiaries shows the pattern of cases currently serviced by VBA and would be useful in estimating service demands in the near future. Continued analysis of beneficiary distribution over a period of time would identify any shifting workload patterns.

	Veteran Population and Active VA Cases		
	Total veteran population (6/1/95 estimate)		26,067,000
	Veteran pension cases	432,895	
	Veteran compensation cases	2,235,675	
	Total veteran cases		2,668,570
	Death compensation cases	307,097	
	Death pension cases	354,582	
	Total death cases		661,679
	Total active cases (as of 9/30/95)		**3,330,249**

Percentage of all veterans who are also VA beneficiaries 10.2%

Percentage of active C&P cases that are veteran cases 80.1%

Percentage of total cases that are death cases 19.9%

State-by-State Distribution of All Veterans and VA Beneficiaries

The *Annual Report of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs-Fiscal Year 1995* contains a table, based on U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census data, listing the estimated number of veterans living in each state and the District of Columbia as of July 1, 1995. We used this information to calculate the percentage of all veterans in each jurisdiction.

We also extracted the addresses of all beneficiaries-veterans and surviving spouses-from the March 1996 C&P master record. Using this information and a ZIP Code directory, we determined the number of beneficiaries with mailing addresses in each state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. We also calculated the percentage of all beneficiaries in each jurisdiction.

We then computed a variance for each state by subtracting the state's percentage of VA beneficiaries from its percentage of veterans. (*Details of our comparison of veteran and beneficiary population, by state are on page 19.*) The following variances in states with large veteran and beneficiary populations are of interest:

In California, with the largest number of both veterans and beneficiaries, the percentage of veterans residing in the state exceeds the percentage of beneficiaries in the state by a variance of 2.76.

In Illinois, the percentage of veterans exceeds the percentage of beneficiaries by a variance of 1.68.

On the other hand, in Texas, which ranks second in beneficiary population and third in veteran population, the percentage of beneficiaries exceeds the percentage of veterans by a variance of 1.15.

Other states with significant beneficiary and veteran populations-Florida, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina, Georgia, and Michigan-show variances of less than 1.

We recognize the following limitations in our variance calculations:

The state veteran populations are estimates, as of July 1, 1995, while the number of VA beneficiaries in each state is derived from the March 1996 C&P master record.

The FY 1995 *Annual Report* does not show the estimated number of veterans living in Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

We did not calculate the number of beneficiaries living in Wyoming.

Beneficiaries receiving Direct Deposit/Electronic Fund Transfer payments sometimes change addresses without notifying VA of the change. We did not attempt to determine the number of beneficiaries whose C&P master record addresses are not correct.

Our comparison of veteran and beneficiary populations is not intended to be used as an actual planning document. Rather, it is intended to be a prototype of the kind of analysis we believe would be a useful tool along with veteran population data in estimating workload for each RO.

	Comparison of Veteran and Beneficiary Population, By State (Sorted By Variance)					
		Veterans Residing In State		VA Beneficiaries Residing In State		
	STATE	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Variance
	TOTALS	26,067,000	100%	3,322,025	100%	- -
	California	2,818,000	10.81%	267,277	8.05%	2.76
	Illinois	1,074,000	4.12%	81,107	2.44%	1.68
	Pennsylvania	1,363,000	5.23%	142,880	4.30%	0.93
	Michigan	949,000	3.64%	90,849	2.73%	0.91
	New York	1,538,000	5.90%	172,405	5.19%	0.71
	New Jersey	741,000	2.84%	73,965	2.23%	0.62
	Ohio	1,188,000	4.56%	131,052	3.94%	0.61
	Iowa	291,000	1.12%	17,119	0.52%	0.60
	Maryland	530,000	2.03%	49,147	1.48%	0.55
	Indiana	593,000	2.27%	57,942	1.74%	0.53
	Connecticut	339,000	1.30%	28,819	0.87%	0.43
	Wisconsin	507,000	1.94%	52,690	1.59%	0.36
	Virginia	705,000	2.70%	79,205	2.38%	0.32
	Minnesota	462,000	1.77%	51,806	1.56%	0.21
	Kansas	263,000	1.01%	31,042	0.93%	0.07
	New Hampshire	135,000	0.52%	14,852	0.45%	0.07
	Washington	631,000	2.42%	78,396	2.36%	0.06

	Idaho	*112,000*	*0.43%*	*12,504*	*0.38%*	*0.05*
	Utah	*138,000*	*0.53%*	*16,011*	*0.48%*	*0.05*
	Delaware	*78,000*	*0.30%*	*8,694*	*0.26%*	*0.04*
	Missouri	*586,000*	*2.25%*	*73,732*	*2.22%*	*0.03*
	Oregon	*371,000*	*1.42%*	*46,922*	*1.41%*	*0.01*
	Hawaii	*116,000*	*0.45%*	*14,595*	*0.44%*	*0.01*
	North Dakota	*59,000*	*0.23%*	*8,162*	*0.25%*	*-0.02*
	Alaska	*65,000*	*0.25%*	*8,945*	*0.27%*	*-0.02*
	Nevada	*186,000*	*0.71%*	*24,381*	*0.73%*	*-0.02*
	Vermont	*62,000*	*0.24%*	*9,057*	*0.27%*	*-0.03*
	Arizona	*459,000*	*1.76%*	*59,740*	*1.80%*	*-0.04*
	Montana	*95,000*	*0.36%*	*13,680*	*0.41%*	*-0.05*
	South Carolina	*380,000*	*1.46%*	*50,580*	*1.52%*	*-0.06*
	Kentucky	*367,000*	*1.41%*	*49,032*	*1.48%*	*-0.07*
	South Dakota	*74,000*	*0.28%*	*11,718*	*0.35%*	*-0.07*
	Massachusetts	*594,000*	*2.28%*	*79,352*	*2.39%*	*-0.11*
	Maine	*153,000*	*0.59%*	*23,486*	*0.71%*	*-0.12*
	New Mexico	*172,000*	*0.66%*	*28,879*	*0.87%*	*-0.21*
	West Virginia	*199,000*	*0.76%*	*32,385*	*0.97%*	*-0.21*
	Colorado	*385,000*	*1.48%*	*56,355*	*1.70%*	*-0.22*
	Rhode Island	*109,000*	*0.42%*	*21,607*	*0.65%*	*-0.23*
	Nebraska	*168,000*	*0.64%*	*30,650*	*0.92%*	*-0.28*
	Mississippi	*233,000*	*0.89%*	*43,739*	*1.32%*	*-0.42*

	Louisiana	*378,000*	*1.45%*	*62,867*	*1.89%*	*-0.44*
	Arkansas	*258,000*	*0.99%*	*49,976*	*1.50%*	*-0.51*
	Georgia	*685,000*	*2.63%*	*106,927*	*3.22%*	*-0.59*
	Oklahoma	*350,000*	*1.34%*	*65,786*	*1.98%*	*-0.64*
	Florida	*1,709,000*	*6.56%*	*240,207*	*7.23%*	*-0.67*
	North Carolina	*711,000*	*2.73%*	*113,543*	*3.42%*	*-0.69*
	Tennessee	*516,000*	*1.98%*	*88,898*	*2.68%*	*-0.70*
	Alabama	*427,000*	*1.64%*	*78,293*	*2.36%*	*-0.72*
	Texas	*1,647,000*	*6.32%*	*248,041*	*7.47%*	*-1.15*
	District of Columbia	*50,000*	*0.19%*	*54,104*	*1.63%*	*-1.44*
	Wyoming	*48,000*	*0.18%*	*Included in Colorado total*		
	Puerto Rico	*- -*	*- -*	*48,228*	*1.45%*	
	Philippines	*- -*	*- -*	*20,086*	*0.60%*	
	No address in C&P Master Record			*310*		

COMPARISON OF REGIONAL OFFICE OF JURISDICTION WITH BENEFICIARY RESIDENCE

Jurisdiction Over Claims Folders

In general, a beneficiary's claims folder is under the jurisdiction of the RO assigned the geographical area where the beneficiary maintains a permanent residence. However, VBA procedures do not require that claims folders be transferred from one RO to another solely because beneficiaries have changed addresses. As a result, many beneficiaries who have relocated since having a claim processed by VA are residing in the jurisdiction of ROs other than those where their claims folders are located. In March 1996, over 537,000 C&P beneficiaries-16.2 percent-were in this situation. The following table shows the number and percentage of various categories of beneficiaries living in the jurisdiction of ROs other than those holding their claims folders:

	Summary of Claims Folder Locations and Beneficiary Residence					
					Beneficiaries Living in Jurisdiction of RO Other Than RO Where Claims Folder Is Located	
	All C&P Beneficiaries				Number	Percentage
	Compensation			2,239,557	392,525	17.5%
	Pension:	Live	423,347		43,627	10.3%
		Death	343,451		42,963	12.5%
	All Pension			766,798		
	SC Survivors*			315,670	58,313	18.5%
		Totals		3,322,025	537,428	16.2%

** Dependency and Indemnity Compensation and Death Compensation*

Comparison of the Number of Claims Folders Located at Each RO With the Number of Beneficiaries Residing in RO's Area of Jurisdiction

We compared the number of C&P beneficiaries residing in each RO's jurisdiction with the number of claims folders at each RO. We did this comparison by first extracting information showing beneficiary addresses and claims folder locations from the March 1996 C&P master record. Using a list of the ZIP codes within each RO's area of jurisdiction and the master beneficiary record information, we determined the number of claims folders and the number of beneficiaries residing within each RO's jurisdiction. We then computed the difference between the number of claims folders at each RO and the number of beneficiaries residing in that RO's jurisdiction. We also calculated a ratio for each RO by dividing the number of claims folders at the RO by the number of beneficiaries residing in that RO's jurisdiction. The ratio is shown as a percentage. (Details of our comparison for each RO are on pages 22-23.)

We believe that the pattern of beneficiary residences and the ratios for each RO may be more reliable predictors of near-term future workload patterns than claims folder location alone. Although claims folders are not transferred between ROs solely because a beneficiary has relocated, they are transferred when a claim is received from a beneficiary residing in another RO's jurisdiction.

The following examples support our recommendation that analysis of the patterns of beneficiary residence should be used as an additional tool for planning purposes:

- ***About 17.5 percent of veterans receiving service-connected disability compensation live in the jurisdiction of ROs other than those having custody of their claims folders. Presumably, reopened claims from these veterans will be adjudicated at the ROs serving their place of residence and not at the ROs currently holding their claims folders.***

- ***At the Des Moines RO the ratio between claims folders and beneficiaries is 179.6 percent; that is, the number of claims folders at the RO is 79.6 percent greater than the number of beneficiaries living in the RO's jurisdiction. It seems likely that many claims folders now located at Des Moines RO will be transferred to other ROs for adjudication of reopened claims.***

Continued analysis of the ratios at each RO between beneficiary residence and claims folder location would be useful in identifying changing workload patterns. Ratios significantly greater or lesser than 100 percent at a particular RO may indicate that the RO will have an increasing or decreasing share of the total workload.

The following ratios as of March 1996 are of interest:

- ***As noted above, the ratio at the Des Moines RO was 179.6 percent. Other ROs having significantly higher numbers of claims folders than beneficiaries are Fargo (165.8 percent), Washington (125.8 percent), New York (121.7 percent), and Los Angeles (119.0 percent).***

- ***On the other hand, the ratio at the Reno RO was 71.0 percent; that is, the number of claims folders at the RO was only 71 percent of the number of beneficiaries residing in its jurisdiction. Other ROs having significantly***

higher numbers of beneficiaries than claims folders are Lincoln (73.4 percent), Baltimore (75.2 percent), San Diego (80.0 percent), and St. Petersburg (82.9 percent).

We recognize the following limitations in our comparison of the number of claims folders at each RO with the number of beneficiaries residing in its jurisdiction:

We made our comparison using March 1996 C&P master record data. Ratios may have changed since then.

We did not calculate the number of beneficiaries living in Wyoming.

Beneficiaries receiving Direct Deposit/Electronic Fund Transfer payments sometimes change addresses without notifying VA of the change. We did not attempt to determine the number of beneficiaries whose C&P master record addresses are not correct.

Our comparison is not intended to be used as an actual planning document. Rather, we offer it as the prototype of an additional analytical tool that could be useful for VBA in understanding and predicting workload generation and aid in its planning for restructuring.

Comparison of Number of Beneficiaries Residing in RO's Jurisdiction With Number of Claims Folders at RO (Sorted by Ratio)

Regional Office	State	Beneficiaries Residing in RO's Jurisdiction	Beneficiary Claims Folders at RO	Difference	Ratio
	TOTALS	3,322,025	3,322,025	537,428	- -
Des Moines	Iowa	17,119	30,752	13,633	1[79.6%]
Fargo	North Dakota	8,162	13,533	5,371	16[5.8%]
Washington	District of Columbia	54,104	68,054	13,950	1[25.8%]

	New York	New York	114,518	139,374	24,856	121.7%
	Los Angeles	California	92,739	110,352	17,613	119.0%
	Providence	Rhode Island	21,607	25,453	3,846	117.8%
	Louisville	Kentucky	49,032	57,216	8,184	116.7%
	Chicago	Illinois	81,107	92,531	11,424	114.1%
	Philadelphia	Pennsylvania	89,303	96,527	7,224	108.1%
	Columbia	South Carolina	50,580	54,510	3,930	107.8%
	Boise	Idaho	12,504	13,472	968	107.7%
	Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	53,577	56,860	3,283	106.1%
	Boston	Massachusetts	79,352	84,119	4,767	106.0%
	Manchester	New Hampshire	14,852	15,658	806	105.4%
	Milwaukee	Wisconsin	52,690	55,441	2,751	105.2%
	Jackson	Mississippi	43,739	45,911	2,172	105.0%
	Oakland	California	112,023	117,213	5,190	104.6%
	Hartford	Connecticut	28,819	30,057	1,238	104.3%
	Detroit	Michigan	90,849	94,541	3,692	104.1%
	Houston	Texas	93,070	96,542	3,472	103.7%
	Wichita	Kansas	31,042	32,183	1,141	103.7%
	Seattle	Washington	78,396	81,214	2,818	103.6%
	Roanoke	Virginia	79,205	81,760	2,555	103.2%
	Newark	New Jersey	73,965	75,775	1,810	102.4%
	Buffalo	New York	57,887	59,065	1,178	102.0%
	Honolulu	Hawaii	14,595	14,892	297	102.0%
	Regional Office	State	Beneficiaries Residing in RO's Jurisdiction	Beneficiary Claims Folders at RO	Difference	Ratio
	Denver	Colorado	56,355	57,475	1,120	102.0%
	Anchorage	Alaska	8,945	9,116	171	101.9%
	Muskogee	Oklahoma	65,786	66,796	1,010	101.5%
	New	Louisiana	62,867	63,631	764	101.2%

	Orleans					
	Sioux Falls	*South Dakota*	*11,718*	*11,800*	*82*	*100.7%*
	Little Rock	*Arkansas*	*49,976*	*49,991*	*15*	*100.0%*
	Montgomery	*Alabama*	*78,293*	*78,260*	*(33)*	*100.0%*
	Wilmington	*Delaware*	*8,694*	*8,683*	*(11)*	*99.9%*
	Salt Lake City	*Utah*	*16,011*	*15,952*	*(59)*	*99.6%*
	Cleveland	*Ohio*	*131,052*	*128,962*	*(2,090)*	*98.4%*
	San Juan	*Puerto Rico*	*48,228*	*47,311*	*(917)*	*98.1%*
	White River Jct	*Vermont*	*9,057*	*8,812*	*(245)*	*97.3%*
	Togus	*Maine*	*23,486*	*22,750*	*(736)*	*96.9%*
	Albuquerque	*New Mexico*	*28,879*	*27,820*	*(1,059)*	*96.3%*
	Ft Harrison	*Montana*	*13,680*	*13,014*	*(666)*	*95.1%*
	Waco	*Texas*	*154,971*	*147,302*	*(7,669)*	*95.1%*
	Huntington	*West Virginia*	*32,385*	*30,661*	*(1,724)*	*94.7%*
	Atlanta	*Georgia*	*106,927*	*100,980*	*(5,947)*	*94.4%*
	Winston-Salem	*North Carolina*	*113,543*	*106,316*	*(7,227)*	*93.6%*
	Indianapolis	*Indiana*	*57,942*	*53,939*	*(4,003)*	*93.1%*
	St. Paul	*Minnesota*	*51,806*	*47,513*	*(4,293)*	*91.7%*
	St. Louis	*Missouri*	*73,732*	*66,020*	*(7,712)*	*89.5%*
	Nashville	*Tennessee*	*88,898*	*77,190*	*(11,708)*	*86.8%*
	Portland	*Oregon*	*46,922*	*40,130*	*(6,792)*	*85.5%*
	Phoenix	*Arizona*	*59,740*	*50,191*	*(9,549)*	*84.0%*
	St. Petersburg	*Florida*	*240,207*	*199,150*	*(41,057)*	*82.9%*
	San Diego	*California*	*62,515*	*50,031*	*(12,484)*	*80.0%*
	Baltimore	*Maryland*	*49,147*	*36,970*	*(12,177)*	*75.2%*
	Lincoln	*Nebraska*	*30,650*	*22,497*	*(8,153)*	*73.4%*
	Reno	*Nevada*	*24,381*	*17,322*	*(7,059)*	*71.0%*
	Cheyenne	*Wyoming*	*Included in Denver total*			
	Manila	*Philippines*	*20,086*	*22,525*	*2,439*	*112.1%*

	No address in C&P Master Record	*310*			

ACTING UNDER SECRETARY FOR BENEFITS COMMENTS

Department of Veterans Affairs	***Memorandum***

Date: ***February 3, 1997***

From: ***Acting Under Secretary for Benefits (20)***

Subj: ***Draft Report of Audit of VBA's Data Reliability in the Claims Processing***

Workload Reporting System

To: ***Planning and Policy Staff Members***

1. We concur with Recommendation 1. In fact, we are taking action to address the processing timeliness measurement concerns associated with brokered work referred to in sub-element c. We are amending the instructions on brokered work to require that stations sending cases must maintain a pending issue control on each case temporarily transferred to another station to be worked. Upon return of the case, the station of original jurisdiction will complete a review of the brokered cases then finalize the pending end product. This change allows us to capture the total processing time for each brokered case and eliminates potential distortion to the average processing time of all original compensation claims.

2. We support the concept of system edits expressed in sub-element a to prevent duplication of work credit. We also agree with sub-element b that management at the local, area, and national levels should all have the ability to routinely collect claims completion data to monitor the accuracy of and ensure the reliability of workload reports and associated performance measures.

3. In addition, I am establishing a Performance Measures Task Group to identify ways to prevent errors in the systems, improve the integrity of the systems and address all the concerns raised by your

report. A draft of their charter is attached.

4. We concur with Recommendation 2. The additional demographic data regarding beneficiaries might well fit into our larger Business Process Re-engineering effort to fundamentally redesign the claims adjudication process.

[Signed]

Stephen L. Lemons

VA Form 2105

Mar 1989

Performance Measures

Task Group Charter

Draft

1. Identify Data Sets necessary to support the comprehensive Performance Measures of the Business Lines.

2. Recommend an approach to achieving a fully automated data collection system in support of the comprehensive Performance Measures.

3. Look at how the comprehensive Performance Measures can be used in resource allocation.

4. Other potential tasks or relationships:

a. Executive Information System

b. Doors

c. Work Measurement

d. Process Control

TASK FORCE COMPOSITION:

CHAIR

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

FINAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION

VA Distribution

Secretary of Veterans Affairs (00)

Acting Under Secretary for Benefits (20A11)

General Counsel (02)

Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning (008)

Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs (009)

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs (80)

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs (60)

Non-VA Distribution

Office of Management and Budget

US General Accounting Office

Congressional Committees:

Chairman, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Chairman, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Chairman, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight

Ranking Member, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight

Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Ranking Democratic Member, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies,

Committee on Appropriations

Ranking Member, Senate Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies,

Committee on Appropriations

Chairman, House Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies,

Committee on Appropriations

Ranking Member, House Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies,

Committee on Appropriations