Supporting Statement for
Training and Outreach Evaluation Forms
(Forms MMS-4420A-H)
(OMB Control Number 1010-0110)
(Expiration date: June 30, 2001)

A. Justification

1. What circumstances make this information collection necessary?

In accordance with Executive Order 12862, dated September 11, 1993, Setting Customer Service Standards (Attachment 1), the Minerals Management Service (MMS) is using training and outreach evaluation forms (Attachment 2) to survey its customers on the levels of satisfaction they are receiving in our training and outreach programs.

This is a request to extend the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) approval to continue to use the training and outreach evaluation forms that OMB approved on March 26, 1998. We have not changed the forms except to change the name Royalty Management Program (RMP) to Minerals Revenue Management (MRM). On October 8, 2000, MMS reorganized RMP and changed the name of the program to MRM. Questions on these evaluation forms have worked well during the last 3 years, and we anticipate that they will continue to be useful and adaptable to our continued training and outreach programs with our customers.

MMS frequently provides training and outreach sessions to its constituents to facilitate their compliance with laws and regulations and to ensure that they are well informed. In 2000, we presented eight training sessions to the oil and gas and solid minerals reporters on various aspects of royalty reporting, production reporting, newly reengineered reporting forms, and new valuation regulations. However, over the next year, we anticipate that the number of training sessions will be triple the average number of training sessions due to the intense learning curve involved with the new reengineered systems coming online, new valuation rules, etc.

Also in 2000, we provided over 50 outreach sessions to individual Indian mineral owners, Indian Tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs on Indian royalty management issues. Additionally, we provided several training sessions to our financial and systems contractors and State and Tribal auditors.

2. How, by whom, and for what purpose will the information be used?

At the end of each training or outreach session, MRM asks participants to complete and return evaluation forms. Responses are voluntary. Some questions are uniform across all of the evaluation forms; however, we also ask questions specific to each type of training or outreach or specific to that particular group of participants. We request feedback on several areas, including:

- Organization of training
- Level of detail
- Clarity of presentation

- Achievement of training objectives
- Relevance of subject matter
- Effectiveness of training materials
- Other topic suggestions for future sessions

MMS trainers/instructors will use the evaluation forms as they present to various groups, including industry, State auditors, Indian auditors, Indian Tribes and Indian allottees, MMS contractors, and MMS employees. We often conduct back-to-back training sessions that require a team of instructors to teach one day, travel the next, and teach again the following day. The evaluation forms that the participants complete are helpful to our volunteer instructors in providing immediate feedback that they can analyze in order to enhance future training and outreach sessions and to improve our service. Our trainers and outreach personnel review these evaluation forms collectively and individually:

- to get a "feel" for how the training is being received by participants,
- to react immediately to suggestions or criticisms forthcoming from the just-completed training session, and
- to provide a basis for overall changes for future training and outreach sessions.

Our trainers, who are subject matter experts from across MRM, find this feedback very valuable in making immediate improvements to MRM's training and outreach programs. They are in strong consensus that they want to continue gathering and utilizing this information.

MRM's Center for Excellence is the final repository of the information. Information from the evaluation forms will be entered in a Microsoft Access database. Periodic statistical reports will be created examining the overall effectiveness of the training and outreach programs. These reports will be used by the Center for Excellence in meeting its responsibility in quality assurance for MRM.

3. Does the collection of information involve the use of information technology? If so, does it reduce the burden and to what extent?

Our evaluation forms are filled out by hand at the end of each session and then immediately collected by the trainer/instructor. Therefore, the initial collection does not use information technology. After initial review by the trainers/instructors, the evaluation forms are sent to the MRM Center for Excellence for data entry and statistical analysis. Information technology is used in this stage of the process.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Can similar, available information be used or modified for this collection?

The information collected is specific to the just-completed training/outreach session.

5. What is the agency doing to minimize the burden on small businesses or other small entities?

There is no burden on small businesses or other small entities. MMS provides these training and outreach sessions free of charge.

6. What are the consequences to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently? Are there technical or legal obstacles to reducing the burden?

The quality of these sessions would be compromised if we did not receive feedback from the participants. There are no technical or legal obstacles to reducing the burden.

7. Are there any special circumstances that require exceptions to 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2)?

There are no special circumstances that require exceptions to 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).

8. What efforts did the agency make to consult with the public and a representative sample of respondents?

On August 1, 2000, we published a Federal Register Notice (65 FR 46942, Attachment 3) soliciting comments on the continued use of these evaluation forms. No comments were received. We also present these training and outreach evaluation forms to each group of participants at the conclusion of each training session and explain our reasons for requesting such feedback.

9. Will payment or gifts be provided to respondents?

Payment or gifts will not be provided to respondents.

10. What assurance of confidentiality is provided to respondents?

Confidentiality is not an issue when respondents are filling out these evaluation forms.

11. Does the information collected include any questions of a sensitive nature?

Questions of a sensitive nature are not included in these evaluation forms.

12. What is the estimated reporting and recordkeeping "hour" burden of the collection of information?

Over the next year of intense training on the newly reengineered MRM systems, we estimate that the average annual burden to the respondents is 350 hours [5,000 respondents x 70% response rate [3,500 responses) x 6 minutes per response]. Based on $50 per hour, we estimate that the hour burden cost to respondents is $17,500 (350 hours x $50). However, after the first year, we estimate that the average annual burden to the respondents will be reduced to 126 hours [1,800 respondents x 70% response rate (1,260 responses) x 6 minutes per response] with the hour burden cost to respondents estimated at $6,300 (126 hours x $50).

13. What is the estimated total annual reporting and recordkeeping "non-hour cost" burden of the collection of information, excluding any costs identified in Items 12 & 14?

There is no "non-hour cost" burden associated with this collection of information.

14. What is the estimated annualized cost to the Federal Government?

Over the next year, we estimate that to analyze and review the information submitted on the evaluation forms, the Government will spend approximately 2 hours per training or outreach session for a total of 300 hours. Based on a cost factor of $50 per hour, the total annualized cost to the Government is $15,000. However, after the first year, we estimate that this burden will be reduced to 120 hours with a cost to the Government of $6,000.

15. Are there any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the Form OMB 83-I?

The currently approved burden in Item 13 of Form OMB 83-I is 126 hours. We are increasing the burden hours in OMB's inventory from 126 hours to 350 hours. The increase of 224 hours is a result of re-estimating the number of respondents and average number of annual responses. After the first year, the burden hours will be reduced back to 126 hours. We will submit a Form 83-I adjusting burden hours to reflect this reduction. There is no cost burden requested in Item 14 of Form OMB 83-I.

16. Are there plans for tabulation and publication of the results of this collection of information?

MRM's Center for Excellence will conduct statistical tabulation with the technical assistance from MMS's Economics Division. The statistical analysis and reports will be distributed to the appropriate MMS management officials.

17. Is the agency seeking approval to not display the expiration date?

We will display the expiration date of OMB's approval on Forms MMS-4420A-H.

18. Are there exceptions to the certification statement in Item 19 of Form OMB 83-I.

To the extent the topics apply to this collection of information, we are not requesting exceptions to the "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions."

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

1. Describe the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used.

MMS conducts a variety of training and outreach sessions. These sessions vary in the size range of 30 to 75 participants. There is need for precise understanding on how the participants reacted to the session. Sessions often involve back-to-back training that requires a team of instructors to teach one day, travel the next, and teach again the following day. The evaluation forms that are requested from participants are important to our instructors in providing immediate feedback that they can analyze and digest over dinner and the plane ride that evening to the next training site. Obtaining this precision from a statistical sampling perspective, say using 95 percent confidence level and a 5 percent error, would require a sample size of 58 for a class of 75 or 27 for a class of 30. From a practical perspective, it does not make much sense to sample 75 percent to 90 percent of the class members. Statistical sampling would yield a small decrease in information collection activity. Therefore, all members of the class or session will be requested to complete the evaluation forms.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection of the information.

Every participant will be given an evaluation form. Historically, approximately 70 percent of the participants complete the evaluation form. Due to distribution to all participants, no stratification methods are required. Returned evaluation forms should yield a high confidence of results.

After initial review by trainers/instructors, the evaluation forms are sent to MRM's Center for Excellence for data entry and statistical analysis.

3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response.

With a high-response rate of approximately 70 percent of the participants completing the evaluation forms, more intense processes such as Dillman's Tailored Design Method are not required.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to undertaken.

A standard suite of descriptive statistics and graphs will be routinely produced. If any additional statistical analysis is suggested from the preliminary statistics, SAS with the Advanced Statistics module is available within MMS for further specific analysis.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on statistical aspects of the design and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

Questions concerning the statistical aspects of the survey should be directed to:

Ted D. Tupper
Mathematical Statistician
Minerals Management Service, MS 4050
381 Elden St.
Herndon, VA 20170
703-787-1513
Ted_Tupper@mms.gov

Questions concerning the collection, analysis, and use of this information can be directed to:

Ms. Connie Bartram
Manager, Center for Excellence
Minerals Revenue Management
Minerals Management Service
P.O. Box 25165, MS 320B2
Denver, CO 80225
303-231-3410