



APPENDICES





PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

To make the report more useful, this FY 2008 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) reports on targets and measures from the FY 2009 Annual Performance Plan (APP), that more accurately reflects updated targets of each performance measure. Individual bureau-specific APPs can be found on the Department Web site at http://www.osec.doc.gov/bmi/budget/budgetsub_perf_strategicplans.htm. The resource tables with the performance tables are also combined to make the information easier to follow.

The following tables provide an array of information that previously was shown in separate tables. The information should help the reader clearly understand the resources expended for each Strategic Goal, Objective, and Performance Outcome/Objective.

The system of reporting does not currently allow the Department to report on resources at the performance measure level, but it is the Department's hope to develop this capability in the future. For a given year, it is important to note that if a performance measure has been exceeded (more than 125 percent of target), the status box for that year will be shaded blue. If a performance measure has been met (100 to 125 percent of target), the box is shaded green. The status box for a measure that was slightly below target (95 to 99 percent of the target) is shaded yellow, while the box for a measure that was definitely not met is shaded red. In addition, for FY 2008 OMB introduced a new category, "improved, but not met." In those cases, the box is shaded orange. No targets that were in the form of text (e.g., a series of milestones met) would ever be considered exceeded since they cannot be quantified.

The information in the tables will follow the following format:

- Strategic Goal and Resources
- Objective and Resources
- Performance Outcome/Objective and Resources
- Performance Measure

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, measures that do not have FY 2008 targets are not included in any count in this document. FY 2008 resources for each performance outcome/objective may be estimates and may be updated in the budget for FY 2010.

Target and performance data are tracked back to FY 2001 where available. If a measure was developed after FY 2001, actual performance data is shown back to the year that the measure first appeared.

FTE = Full-time equivalent employment. All dollar amounts shown are in millions, unless otherwise indicated.

STRATEGIC GOAL 1

*Maximize U.S. competitiveness and enable economic growth for American industries, workers, and consumers**

STRATEGIC GOAL 1 TOTAL RESOURCES ¹ (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$2,015.1	\$1,809.6	\$1,842.1	\$1,857.5	\$2,018.6	\$2,108.9	\$2,150.2	\$2,626.2
FTE	13,914	11,916	11,265	11,475	11,953	12,223	11,459	12,259

¹ Prior year amounts differ from previous PARs because in FY 2008, the Department and NIST shifted the performance outcome, "Raise the productivity and competitiveness of small manufacturers (NIST)" from Strategic Goal 2 to Strategic Goal 1, becoming Strategic Objective 1.4.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.1

*Foster domestic economic development as well as export opportunities***

OBJECTIVE 1.1 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$756.9	\$677.5	\$645.0	\$633.2	\$625.6	\$627.1	\$583.8	\$625.3
FTE	2,240	1,990	2,013	1,869	1,908	1,849	1,528	1,703

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Promote private investment and job creation in economically distressed communities (EDA)***

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding ¹	\$362.3	\$296.6	\$258.3	\$254.8	\$212.5	\$208.3	\$183.7	\$207.9
FTE	165	155	149	137	139	128	132	129

¹ Actuals reflect direct obligations for economic development assistance programs (EDAP) and salaries and expenses (S&E); totals do not include one-time, disaster investments, or reimbursable funding.

* Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Goal 1 was known as "Provide the information and tools to Maximize U.S. competitiveness and enable economic growth for American industries, workers, and consumers"

** Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Objective 1.1 was known as "Enhance economic growth for all Americans by developing partnerships with private sector and nongovernmental organizations."

*** Prior to FY 2008, this outcome was known as "Increase private investment and job creation in economically distressed communities."

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Private investment leveraged - 9 year totals (in millions) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$4,173	\$2,080
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$1,937	\$1,350
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$2,331	\$1,162

¹ EDA tracks the results of its investments and jobs created/retained at 3, 6, and 9 year periods. The FY 2008 actual is a result of investments made in FY 1999. Since EDA did not begin tracking results until FY 1997 in this format, 9 year results are not available for the years prior to FY 2006.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Private investment leveraged - 6 year totals (in millions) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$1,393	\$970
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$2,118	\$1,200
FY 2006	Met	\$1,059	\$1,020
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$1,781	\$1,040
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$1,740	\$650
FY 2003	Exceeded	\$2,475	\$581

¹ This is the 6 year result measure. FY 2008 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2002. FY 2007 actuals as of investments made in FY 2001 and so on.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Private investment leveraged - 3 year totals (in millions) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$1,013	\$270
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$810	\$330
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$1,669	\$320
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$1,791	\$390
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$947	\$480
FY 2003	Exceeded	\$1,251	\$400
FY 2002	Exceeded	\$640	\$420
FY 2001	Exceeded	\$971	\$130

¹ This is the 3 year result measure. FY 2008 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2005. FY 2007 actuals as of investments made in FY 2004 and so on.

APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Jobs created/retained - 9 year totals ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	57,701	56,900
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	73,559	54,000
FY 2006	Met	50,546	50,400

¹ EDA tracks the results of its investments and jobs created/retained at 3, 6, and 9 year periods. The FY 2008 actual is a result of investments made in FY 1999. Since EDA did not begin tracking results until FY 1997 in this format, 9 year results are not available for the years prior to FY 2006.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Jobs created/retained - 6 year totals ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	30,719	28,900
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	49,806	36,000
FY 2006	Exceeded	42,958	28,200
FY 2005	Exceeded	47,374	28,400
FY 2004	Exceeded	68,109	27,000
FY 2003	Exceeded	47,607	25,200

¹ This is the 6 year result measure. FY 2008 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2002. FY 2007 actuals as of investments made in FY 2001 and so on.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Jobs created/retained - 3 year totals ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	14,819	7,227
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	16,274	8,999
FY 2006	Exceeded	11,833	9,170
FY 2005	Exceeded	19,672	11,500
FY 2004	Exceeded	21,901	14,400
FY 2003	Exceeded	39,841	11,300
FY 2002	Exceeded	29,912	11,300
FY 2001	Exceeded	12,898	5,400

¹ This is the 3 year result measure. FY 2008 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2005. FY 2007 actuals as of investments made in FY 2004 and so on.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Improve community capacity to achieve and sustain economic growth (EDA)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding ¹	\$76.7	\$68.8	\$67.3	\$67.3	\$68.0	\$72.1	\$67.1	\$72.3
FTE	89	84	80	80	74	32	33	32

¹ Actuals reflect direct obligations for EDAP and S&E; totals do not include one-time, disaster investments, or reimbursable funding.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of economic development districts (EDD) and Indian tribes implementing economic development projects from the comprehensive economic development strategy (CEDS) that lead to private investment and jobs			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Slightly Below	92%	95%

Performance was not met, because:
Due to reporting schedules, certain quarters may have a low number of reporting Tribes and EDDs. As such, the overall percentages may easily be impacted by those that do not meet goals. In FY 2007, this target was impacted by unusually high numbers of non-reporting Tribes and EDDs.

Strategies for Improvement:
EDA's regional offices are working with these entities to increase their response rate in the future.

Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	95%	95%
FY 2006	Met	96%	95%
FY 2005	Met	97%	95%
FY 2004	Met	95%	95%
FY 2003	Met	99%	95%

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of sub-state jurisdiction members actively participating in the economic development district (EDD) program			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	90%	89-93%

Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	92%	89-93%
FY 2006	Met	90%	89-93%
FY 2005	Met	91%	89-93%
FY 2004	Met	90%	89-93%
FY 2003	Met	97%	89-93%
FY 2002	Met	95%	93%
FY 2001	Met	92%	85%

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of University Center clients taking action as a result of the assistance facilitated by the University Center			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	80%	75%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	84%	75%
FY 2006	Met	76%	75%
FY 2005	Met	79%	75%
FY 2004	Met	78%	75%
FY 2003	Met	78%	75%

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of those actions taken by University Center clients that achieved the expected results			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	84%	80%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	89%	80%
FY 2006	Met	82%	80%
FY 2005	Met	87%	80%
FY 2004	Met	88%	80%
FY 2003	Met	86%	80%

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of Trade Adjustment Assistance Center (TAAC) clients taking action as a result of the assistance facilitated by the TAACs			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	92%	90%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	99%	90%
FY 2006	Met	90%	90%
FY 2005	Met	99%	90%
FY 2004	Met	90%	90%
FY 2003	Met	92%	90%

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of those actions taken by Trade Adjustment Assistance Center clients that achieved the expected results			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	95%	95%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	95%	95%
FY 2006	Met	96%	95%
FY 2005	Met	97%	95%
FY 2004	Met	98%	95%
FY 2003	Met	98%	95%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Strengthen U.S. competitiveness in domestic and international markets (ITA)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual ¹	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$161.0	\$208.5	\$72.7	\$56.0	\$62.6	\$52.8	\$59.7	\$44.6
FTE	1,038	1,236	402	287	264	257	243	236

¹ In FY 2005 ITA reorganized its performance structure, reducing the number of outcomes from four to two outcomes for this strategic objective. FY 2002 actuals shown here reflect the level for the "Strengthen U.S. industries" outcome and the two discontinued outcomes.

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Annual cost savings resulting from the adoption of Manufacturing and Services (MAS) recommendations contained in MAS studies and analysis			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$497M	\$350M
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$413M	\$168M
FY 2006	Not Met	\$287M	\$350M

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of industry-specific trade barriers addressed that were removed or prevented			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	29%	15%

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of industry-specific trade barrier milestones completed			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	73%	55%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Not Met	54%	85%
FY 2006	Slightly Below	81%	85%

* In FY 2006-FY 2008, this outcome was known as "Enhance U.S. competitiveness in domestic and international markets." Prior to FY 2006, this outcome was known as "Strengthen U.S. industries."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of agreement milestones completed			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	0%	100%
<p><i>Performance was not met, because:</i> Target could not be met because planned (target) agreement milestones were based on two agreements (Korea and Malaysia). Work on these agreements was suspended and put "on hold" during FY 2008.</p> <p><i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> ITA intends to continue at its current level of efforts in regard to achieving this measure. ITA's success is highly dependent on the implementation and progress of trade agreements.</p>			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	100%	70%
FY 2006	Exceeded	100%	70%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Increase exports to commercially significant markets including FTA countries, China, and India (ITA)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$23.0
FTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	192
¹ Footnote								

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of imports by China that are exported from the United States			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	7.7% ¹	7.5%

¹ Estimate. Actual will be available in December 2008.

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of imports by India that are exported from the United States			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	4.9% ¹	5.5%

Performance was not met, because:
This percentage figure represents data through August 2008, and will be updated when data for the remainder of the year is available.

Strategies for Improvement:
ITA believes it will achieve the target, however is uncertain at the time of publication.

¹ Estimate. Actual will be available in December 2008.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Broaden and deepen U.S. exporter base (ITA)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$129.0	\$75.3	\$217.7	\$226.4	\$252.7	\$264.1	\$243.4	\$249.0
FTE	858	423	1,290	1,273	1,335	1,338	1,026	1,039

¹ Footnote

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of export successes made as a result of ITA involvement ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	12,659	11,385
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	11,974	11,385
FY 2006	Met	11,919	11,385
FY 2005	Met	12,518	11,385-13,500
FY 2004	Not Met	11,382	14,000-14,500
FY 2003	Met	14,090	13,500
FY 2002	Slightly Below	12,178	12,300
FY 2001	Met	11,160	9,253

¹ Prior to FY 2006, this measure was known as "Number of export transactions made as a result of ITA involvement."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of new-to-market (NTM) export successes ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	3,627	4,760
<i>Performance was not met, because:</i>			
In FY 2008, New-to-Market Export Successes declined by 15 percent below the levels of recent years. This reflects the necessary shift needed to recast the mix between NTE, NTM, and ITM.			
<i>Strategies for Improvement:</i>			
This output measure will be replaced by an outcome measure beginning in FY 2009 that reflects the results of the FY 2008 OMB PART.			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Improved But Not Met	4,229	4,760
FY 2006	Not Met	4,110	4,760
FY 2005	Met	4,888	4,760-5,500
FY 2004	Not Met	4,759	6,200-6,300
FY 2003	Slightly Below	6,278	6,500
FY 2002	Slightly Below	5,740	5,900
FY 2001	Met	5,386	4,540

¹ Prior to FY 2006, this measure was known as "Number of U.S. exporters entering a new market."

* Prior to FY 2006, this outcome was known as "Expand U.S. exporter base."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of increase-to-market (ITM) export successes			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	8,606	5,925
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	6,954	5,925
FY 2006	Met	7,258	5,925

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of new-to-export (NTE) successes ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	426	700

Performance was not met, because:

In FY 2008, New-to-Export Export Successes declined by 25 percent below the levels of recent years. This reflects the necessary shift needed to recast the mix between NTE, NTM, and ITM.

Strategies for Improvement:

This output measure will be replaced by an outcome measure beginning in FY 2009 that reflects the results of the FY 2008 OMB PART.

Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	721	700
FY 2006	Not Met	551	700
FY 2005	Not Met	620	700-850
FY 2004	Not Met	704	880-900
FY 2003	Met	896	800
FY 2002	Not Met	699	800
FY 2001	Met	742	679

¹ Prior to FY 2006, this measure was known as "Number of U.S. firms exporting for the first time."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Dollar value of advocacy cases completed successfully (based on a three year moving average)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	\$30.1B	\$30.0B
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$32.6B	\$22.2B
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$33.2B	\$5.0B

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Commercial diplomacy success (cases) (annual)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	181	160

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Increase access to the marketplace and financing for minority-owned businesses (MBDA)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$27.9	\$28.3	\$29.0	\$28.7	\$29.8	\$29.8	\$29.9	\$28.5
FTE	90	92	92	92	96	94	94	75

¹ Footnote

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Dollar value of contract awards obtained (billions)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	\$0.91	\$0.90
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$1.20	\$0.85
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$1.17	\$0.85
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$1.10	\$0.80
FY 2004	Met	\$0.95	\$0.80
FY 2003	Not Met	\$0.70	\$1.00
FY 2002	Exceeded	\$1.30	\$1.00
FY 2001	Exceeded	\$1.60	\$0.70

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Dollar value of financial awards obtained (billions)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$0.94	\$0.50
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	\$0.55	\$0.45
FY 2006	Not Met	\$0.41	\$0.45
FY 2005	Met	\$0.50	\$0.45
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$0.60	\$0.40
FY 2003	Met	\$0.40	\$0.40
FY 2002	Met	\$0.40	\$0.40
FY 2001	Not Met	\$0.60	\$1.00

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of new job opportunities created			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	4,603	3,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	3,506	2,050
FY 2006	Exceeded	4,254	1,800
FY 2005	Exceeded	2,270	1,800

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent increase in client gross receipts			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	6.0%	6.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	5.0%	5.0%
FY 2006	Met	6.0%	5.0%
FY 2005	Exceeded	15.0%	5.0%

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent increase in American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	4.0%	3.0%
FY 2006	N/A	N/A	N/A
FY 2005	Exceeded	13.0%	5.0%

¹ The ACSI survey occurs only in odd years, so data does not appear in FY 2008 and FY 2006.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.2

Advance responsible economic growth and trade while protecting American security

OBJECTIVE 1.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$126.9	\$157.4	\$164.9	\$168.5	\$192.6	\$205.4	\$199.1	\$201.2
FTE	733	929	940	975	998	986	910	911
¹ Footnote								

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Identify and resolve unfair trade practices (ITA)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$68.0	\$92.8	\$88.1	\$94.6	\$115.8	\$123.3	\$118.2	\$122.7
FTE	360	571	574	610	638	633	544	566
¹ Footnote								

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Percent reduction in trade distorting foreign subsidy programs				
Year	Status	Actual	Target	
FY 2008	Exceeded	1.6%	>0.5%	

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Percent of AD/CVD determinations issued within statutory and/or regulatory deadlines				
Year	Status	Actual	Target	
FY 2008	Met	90%	90%	

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Percent of ministerial errors in IA's dumping and subsidy calculations				
Year	Status	Actual	Target	
FY 2008	Met	10%	< 12%	

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Percentage of market access and compliance cases resolved successfully				
Year	Status	Actual	Target	
FY 2008	Met	39%	35%	
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target	
FY 2007	Exceeded	54%	25%	
FY 2006	Exceeded	46%	25%	

* From FY 2002-FY 2005, this outcome was known as "Ensure fair competition in international trade."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Value of market access and compliance cases resolved successfully			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$12.3B	\$1.5B

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Maintain and strengthen an adaptable and effective U.S. export control and treaty compliance system (BIS)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$53.6	\$58.7	\$68.4	\$67.7	\$71.3	\$73.0	\$70.4	\$70.3
FTE	342	328	336	335	330	309	324	308

¹ Footnote

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of licenses requiring interagency referral referred within 9 days			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	99%	95%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	98%	95%
FY 2006	Met	98%	95%

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Median processing time for new regime regulations (months)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	2.0	3.0
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	2.0	3.0
FY 2006	Met	2.5	3.0
FY 2005	Exceeded	1.0	3.0
FY 2004	Exceeded	2.0	3.0
FY 2003	Not Met	7.0	3.0

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of attendees rating seminars highly			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	93%	85%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	90%	85%
FY 2006	Met	90%	85%

* From FY 2002-FY 2005, this outcome was known as "Advance U.S. national security, foreign policy, and economic interests by enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the export control system."

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of declarations received from U.S. industry in accordance with CWC regulations (time lines) that are processed, certified, and submitted to the State Department in time so the United States can meet its treaty obligations			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	100%	100%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	100%	100%
FY 2006	Met	100%	100%

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of actions that result in a deterrence or prevention of a violation and cases which result in a criminal and/or administrative charge ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	881	675
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	930	450
FY 2006	Exceeded	872	350
FY 2005	Exceeded	583	275
FY 2004	Met	310	250
FY 2003	Exceeded	250	85
FY 2002	Met	82	75
FY 2001	Met	81	70

¹ Prior to FY 2007, this measure was under the outcome "Eliminate illicit export activity outside the global export control and treaty compliance system;" which was discontinued in FY 2007.

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of shipped transactions in compliance with the licensing requirements of the Export Administration Regulations (EAR)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	87%	87%

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of post-shipment verifications completed and categorized above the "unfavorable" classification			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	136 PSVs/93%	215 PSVs/80%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Integrate non-U.S. actors to create a more effective global export control and treaty compliance system (BIS)**

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$1.6	\$1.8	\$4.4	\$2.7	\$1.8	\$2.8	\$4.6	\$2.8
FTE	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	11
¹ Footnote								

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of end-use checks completed ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	490	850
<i>Performance was not met, because:</i> BIS did not complete any Sentinel visits in FY 2008 and with four less staff supporting end-use checks was not able to meet the target.			
<i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> Given the reason why BIS did not meet the target in FY 2008, BIS will investigate as to whether the target should be adjusted in future years.			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	854	850
FY 2006	Exceeded	942	700
¹ Prior to FY 2007, this measure was under the outcome "Eliminate illicit export activity outside the global export control and treaty compliance," which was discontinued in FY 2007.			

* Prior to FY 2006, this outcome was known as "Enhance the export and transit controls of nations seeking to improve their export control systems."

** In FY 2007, BIS eliminated the outcome, "Eliminate illicit export activity outside the global export control and treaty compliance system." The funds that were previously shown for that outcome for FY 2000-FY 2006, have been added to this outcome.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Ensure continued U.S. technology leadership in industries that are essential to national security (BIS)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$3.7	\$4.1	\$4.0	\$3.5	\$3.7	\$6.3	\$5.9	\$5.4
FTE	18	17	17	17	17	31	30	26
¹ Footnote								

BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percent of industry assessments resulting in BIS determination, within three months of completion, on whether to revise export controls			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	100%	100%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	100%	100%
FY 2006	N/A	N/A ¹	100%

¹ No assessments fell within the metric timeframe in FY 2006. BIS completed two industry assessments late in the fourth quarter of FY 2006, thus not meeting the three month window (before the end of the fiscal year) to make a final determination on revising export controls. This was the first year this measure was in place. Industry assessment data will be available in subsequent fiscal years.

* Prior to FY 2006, this outcome was known as "Ensure U.S. industry compliance with the CWC agreement."

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.3

*Advance key economic and demographic data that support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, and the American public**

OBJECTIVE 1.3 RESOURCES <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$1,024.9	\$866.2	\$920.9	\$1,008.9	\$1,097.7	\$1,164.5	\$1,260.0	\$1,708.5
FTE	10,854	8,908	8,223	8,563	8,976	9,321	8,954	9,576
¹ Footnote								

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Provide benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments (ESA/CENSUS)**

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES¹ <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual²	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$967.0	\$799.5	\$846.9	\$930.1	\$1,013.6	\$1,078.9	\$1,173.0	\$958.7
FTE	10,380	8,420	7,729	8,038	8,433	8,778	8,418	5,979
¹ In FY 2008, Census split the outcome, "Meet the needs of policymakers, businesses, non-profit organizations, and the public for current and benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy and governments," into this outcome and performance outcome, "Provide current measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments." Funds for the years prior to FY 2008 are shown in this outcome and reflect both outcomes.								
² Total obligations for performance outcome excludes the Working Capital Fund obligations financed by other Census Bureau funds and are already reflected in the results for the other funds.								

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Correct street features in TIGER (geographic) database - number of counties completed to more effectively support: Census Bureau censuses and surveys, facilitate the geographic partnerships between federal, state, local and tribal governments, and support the E-Government initiative in the President's Management Agenda			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	320	320
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	737	690
FY 2006	Met	700	700
FY 2005	Met	623	610
FY 2004	Met	602	600
FY 2003	Met	250	250

* Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Objective 1.3 was known as "Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, and the American public"

** In FY 2008, Census split the outcome, "Meet the needs of policymakers, businesses, non-profit organizations, and the public for current and benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy and governments," into this outcome and performance outcome "Provide current measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments."

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Complete key activities for cyclical census programs on time to support effective decision-making by policymakers, businesses, and the public and meet constitutional and legislative mandates			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	Some of the planned dress rehearsal activities were cancelled	>89% of key activities completed on time
<i>Performance was not met, because:</i> Some of the fourth quarter planned activities were cancelled due to the paper-based nonresponse follow-up decision.			
<i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> The Census Bureau undertook an in-depth review of the Field Data Collection Automation (FDCA) program. After receiving the review results, the Census Bureau decided to move to a paper-based, nonresponse follow-up operation.			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	>89% of key prep activities completed on time	>89% of key prep activities completed on time
FY 2006	Met	100% of activities completed on time	>89% of key prep activities completed on time
FY 2005	Met	Activities completed on time	Various activities with different dates

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Meet or exceed the overall federal score of customer satisfaction on the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	66.0	73.9
<i>Performance was not met, because:</i> The reason for the drop in score is largely due to the change in customer base and collection methodology. In the past, known census data users were contacted by phone to provide feedback on the Web site, but the new methodology requires users to voluntarily participate in a pop-up survey when visiting the Web site.			
<i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> The Census Bureau is working aggressively to strengthen three of its Web site's primary elements of customer satisfaction and key performance indicators: search, navigation, and look and feel. Working groups within the Web Governance Council are addressing standards and policies, information architecture, technology, and process improvement.			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	74	71
FY 2006	Met	72	71
FY 2005	Met	73	73
FY 2004	Slightly Below	71	72

¹ This measure applies to the second outcome as well, "Provide current measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments."

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Provide current measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments (ESA/CENSUS)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES ¹ (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$661.3
FTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,072

¹ In FY 2008, Census split the outcome, "Meet the needs of policymakers, businesses, non-profit organizations, and the public for current and benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments," into this outcome and performance outcome, "Provide benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments." Funds for the years prior to FY 2008 are shown in the previous outcome and reflect both outcomes.

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Achieve pre-determined collection rates for Census Bureau censuses and surveys in order to provide statistically reliable data to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, and the public			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Met percentages	90% of key censuses and surveys meet/exceed collection rates/levels of reliability
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Met percentages	90% of key censuses and surveys meet/exceed collection rates/levels of reliability
FY 2006	Met	Met percentages	90% of key censuses and surveys meet/exceed collection rates/levels of reliability
FY 2005	Met	Met percentages	Various %s - see FY 2006 APP
FY 2004	Met	Met percentages	Various %s - see FY 2005 APP
FY 2003	Met	Met percentages	Various %s - see FY 2004 APP

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Release data products for key Census Bureau programs on time to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, and the public			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	1) 100% of Economic Indicators released on time 2) >89% of other key censuses and surveys data released on time	3) 100% of Economic Indicators released on time 4) >89% of other key censuses and surveys data released on time
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	1) 100% of Economic Indicators released on time 2) >89% of other key censuses and surveys data released on time	1) 100% of Economic Indicators released on time 2) >89% of other key censuses and surveys data released on time
FY 2006	Met	1) 100% of Economic Indicators 2) 100% of other products	1) 100% of Economic Indicators released on time 2) >89% of other key censuses and surveys data released on time
FY 2005	Met	22 products	22 products
FY 2004	Exceeded	10 products	7 products
FY 2003	Not Met	2 products	3 products

* In FY 2008, Census split the outcome, "Meet the needs of policymakers, businesses, non-profit organizations, and the public for current and benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments," into this outcome and performance outcome "Provide benchmark measures of the U.S. population, economy, and governments."

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Provide timely, relevant, and accurate economic statistics (ESA/BEA)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$57.9	\$66.7	\$74.0	\$78.6	\$84.1	\$85.6	\$87.0	\$88.4
FTE	474	488	494	525	543	543	536	525

¹ Footnote

ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Timeliness: Reliability of delivery of economic data (number of scheduled releases issued on time)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	57 of 58 ¹	58 of 58
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	54 of 54	54 of 54
FY 2006	Met	54 of 54	54 of 54
FY 2005	Met	54 of 54	54 of 54
FY 2004	Met	54 of 54	54 of 54
FY 2003	Met	48 of 48	48 of 48
FY 2002	Met	50 of 50	50 of 50

¹ The Annual Industry Accounts statistical release was rescheduled from December 13, 2007 to January 29, 2008, in order to include important information from the Census 2006 Annual Survey of Manufactures (ASM). By delaying this release, BEA was able to provide a better product for BEA's data users, so this measure is considered "Met."

ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Relevance: Customer satisfaction with quality of products and services (mean rating on a 5-point scale)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	4.2	> 4.0
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	4.3	> 4.0
FY 2006	Met	4.2	> 4.0
FY 2005	Met	4.4	> 4.0
FY 2004	Met	4.3	> 4.0
FY 2003	Met	4.4	> 4.0
FY 2002	Met	4.3	> 4.0

* Prior to FY 2008, this outcome was known as "Promote a better understanding of the U.S. economy by providing the most timely, relevant, and accurate economic data in an objective and cost-effective manner."

ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Accuracy: Percent of GDP estimates correct			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	94%	> 85%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	93%	> 85%
FY 2006	Met	96%	> 85%
FY 2005	Met	96%	> 85%
FY 2004	Met	88%	> 84%
FY 2003	Met	88%	> 84%

ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Improving GDP and the economic accounts ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2006	Met	Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2005	Met	Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2004	Met	Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2003	Met	Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2002	Met	Developed new measures to address gaps and updated BEA's accounts; designed prototype of new quarterly survey of international services; developed new pilot estimates that provide better integration with other accounts	Develop new measures to address gaps and updated BEA's accounts; design prototype of new quarterly survey of international services; develop new pilot estimates that provide better integration with other accounts

¹ The BEA Strategic Plan and a report card of completed milestones are available in "About BEA" on www.bea.gov.

ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Meeting U.S. international obligations ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2006	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2005	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2004	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2003	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones

¹ The BEA Strategic Plan and a report card of completed milestones are available in "About BEA" on www.bea.gov.

ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Budget Related: Preparation of Innovation Accounts ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones
FY 2006	Met	Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of strategic plan milestones

¹ The BEA Strategic Plan and a report card of completed milestones are available in "About BEA" on www.bea.gov.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.4

Position small manufacturers to compete in a global economy

OBJECTIVE 1.4 RESOURCES ¹ (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding ²	\$106.4	\$108.5	\$111.3	\$46.9	\$102.7	\$111.9	\$107.3	\$91.2
FTE	87	89	89	68	71	67	67	69

¹ There is only one outcome for this objective, so a separate Performance Outcome Resources table does not appear.
² Performance actuals for this outcome lagged at least six months. Therefore, beginning with the FY 2005 PAR, NIST shifted to a format in which NIST reports actuals one year later. This data lag, coupled with the timeline for producing the PAR, precludes the reporting of actual FY 2008 data.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Raise the productivity and competitiveness of small manufacturers (NIST)*

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of clients served by Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) centers receiving federal funding			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	28,004 from FY 2007 funding	21,237 from FY 2007 funding
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	24,722 from FY 2006 funding	16,440 from FY 2006 funding
FY 2006	Slightly Below	16,448 from FY 2005 funding	16,640 from FY 2005 funding
FY 2005	Exceeded	16,090 from FY 2004 funding	6,517 from FY 2004 funding
FY 2004	Met	18,422 from FY 2003 funding	16,684 from FY 2003 funding
FY 2003	Not Met	18,748 from FY 2002 funding	21,543 from FY 2002 funding

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Increased sales attributed to Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$5,069 from FY 2007 funding	\$762 from FY 2007 funding
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$3,100 from FY 2006 funding	\$591 from FY 2006 funding
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$2,842 from FY 2005 funding	\$591 from FY 2005 funding
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$1,889 from FY 2004 funding	\$228 from FY 2004 funding
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$1,483 from FY 2003 funding	\$522 from FY 2003 funding
FY 2003	Exceeded	\$953 from FY 2002 funding	\$728 from FY 2002 funding
FY 2002	Not Met	\$636 from FY 2001 funding	\$708 from FY 2001 funding
FY 2001	Met	\$698 from FY 2000 funding	\$670 from FY 2000 funding

* Actuals for this performance outcome lagged at least six months. Therefore, beginning with the FY 2005 PAR, NIST shifted to a format in which they report actuals one year later (i.e., FY 2004 actuals are reflected in the FY 2005 PAR). This data lag, coupled with the timeline for producing the PAR, precludes the reporting of actual FY 2008 data. These data reported in the current year PAR, are an estimate based on three-quarters of actual client reported impacts and one-quarter estimated client impacts.

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Capital investment attributed to Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$1,662 from FY 2007 funding	\$955 from FY 2007 funding
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$1,270 from FY 2006 funding	\$740 from FY 2006 funding
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$2,248 from FY 2005 funding	\$740 from FY 2005 funding
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$941 from FY 2004 funding	\$285 from FY 2004 funding
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$912 from FY 2003 funding	\$559 from FY 2003 funding
FY 2003	Met	\$940 from FY 2002 funding	\$910 from FY 2002 funding
FY 2002	Not Met	\$680 from FY 2001 funding	\$913 from FY 2001 funding
FY 2001	Met	\$873 from FY 2000 funding	\$864 from FY 2000 funding

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Cost savings attributed to Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$1,096 from FY 2007 funding	\$521 from FY 2007 funding
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$1,100 from FY 2006 funding	\$405 from FY 2006 funding
FY 2006	Exceeded	\$1,304 from FY 2005 funding	\$405 from FY 2005 funding
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$721 from FY 2004 funding	\$156 from FY 2004 funding
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$586 from FY 2003 funding	\$353 from FY 2003 funding
FY 2003	Exceeded	\$681 from FY 2002 funding	\$497 from FY 2002 funding
FY 2002	Not Met	\$442 from FY 2001 funding	\$576 from FY 2001 funding
FY 2001	Not Met	\$482 from FY 2000 funding	\$545 from FY 2000 funding

STRATEGIC GOAL 2

*Promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness**

STRATEGIC GOAL 2 TOTAL RESOURCES ¹ (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$1,838.6	\$2,000.7	\$2,130.0	\$2,100.6	\$2,354.1	\$2,607.6	\$3,696.2	\$3,656.3
FTE	9,488	9,979	9,985	9,937	9,951	10,523	11,383	11,965

¹ Prior year amounts differ from previous PARs because the Department and NIST shifted the outcome, "Raise the productivity and competitiveness of small manufacturers (NIST)" from Strategic Goal 2 to Strategic Goal 1 beginning in FY 2008.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.1

*Advance measurement science and standards that drive technological change***

OBJECTIVE 2.1 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$712.6	\$805.0	\$841.5	\$783.2	\$775.8	\$862.3	\$783.7	\$791.4
FTE	3,120	3,142	3,153	3,041	2,867	2,829	2,824	2,799

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Promote innovation, facilitate trade, and ensure public safety and security by strengthening the Nation's measurements and standards infrastructure (NIST)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$502.1	\$579.2	\$614.1	\$576.8	\$621.6	\$762.4	\$662.4	\$768.9
FTE	2,685	2,707	2,725	2,672	2,503	2,550	2,566	2,677

* Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Goal 2 was known as "Foster science and technological leadership by protecting intellectual property, enhancing technical standards, and advancing measurement science"

** Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Objective 2.1 was known as "Develop tools and capabilities that improve the productivity, quality, dissemination, and efficiency of research."

APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Qualitative assessment and review of technical quality and merit using peer review			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
FY 2006	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
FY 2005	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
FY 2004	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
FY 2003	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
FY 2002	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review
FY 2001	Met	Completed	Complete annual peer review

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Citation impact of NIST-authored publications			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	> 1.1 ¹	> 1.1
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	> 1.1	> 1.1

¹ Actual for this measure lags six months. The actual shown here is based on FY 2007 data.

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Peer-reviewed technical publications produced			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	1,271	1,100
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	1,272	1,100
FY 2006	Met	1,163	1,100
FY 2005	Met	1,148	1,100
FY 2004	Not Met	1,070	1,300

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Standard Reference Materials (SRM) sold			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	33,373	31,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	32,614	30,000
FY 2006	Met	31,195	30,000
FY 2005	Met	32,163	29,500
FY 2004	Met	30,490	29,500

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: NIST-maintained datasets downloaded			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	196,500,000	130,000,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	130,000,000	80,000,000
FY 2006	Met	94,371,001	80,000,000
FY 2005	Met	93,305,136	80,000,000
FY 2004	Exceeded	73,601,352	56,000,000

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of calibration tests performed			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	25,944	12,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	27,489	12,000

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Increase public access to worldwide scientific and technical information through improved acquisition and dissemination activities (NTIS)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$34.7	\$27.7	\$27.7	\$19.2	\$15.9	\$27.2	\$27.9	\$22.5
FTE	196	186	181	165	157	144	131	122

¹ Footnote

NTIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of updated items available (annual)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	813,775	725,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	744,322	665,000
FY 2006	Met	673,807	660,000
FY 2005	Met	658,138	530,000
FY 2004	Met	553,235	525,000
FY 2003	Met	530,910	520,000
FY 2002	Met	514,129	510,000

* Prior to FY 2008, this performance outcome was known as "Enhance public access to worldwide scientific and technical information through improved acquisition and dissemination activities."

NTIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of information products disseminated (annual)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	32,267,167	32,100,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	32,027,113	27,100,000
FY 2006	Met	30,616,338	27,000,000
FY 2005	Met	26,772,015	25,800,000
FY 2004	Exceeded	25,476,424	18,000,000
FY 2003	Exceeded	29,134,050	17,000,000
FY 2002	Met	16,074,862	16,000,000

NTIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Customer satisfaction			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	96%	95-98%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	98%	95-98%
FY 2006	Met	98%	95-98%
FY 2005	Met	98%	98%
FY 2004	Slightly Below	96%	98%
FY 2003	Slightly Below	97%	98%
FY 2002	Met	98%	97%

The Department discontinued the following outcome (and its corresponding measures) in FY 2007. However, since the funding amounts factor into the total for this objective and strategic goal, this PAR shows those amounts for informational purposes. Measures and targets for previous years appear in the FY 2007 PAR.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Accelerate private investment in and development of high-risk, broad-impact technologies (NIST)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$175.8	\$198.1	\$199.7	\$187.2	\$138.3	\$72.7	\$93.4	N/A
FTE	239	249	247	204	207	135	127	N/A
¹ Footnote								

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.2

Protect intellectual property and improve the patent and trademark system

OBJECTIVE 2.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$1,008.5	\$1,099.5	\$1,190.9	\$1,233.3	\$1,508.4	\$1,674.4	\$1,766.4	\$1,852.5
FTE	6,149	6,593	6,581	6,627	6,825	7,446	8,291	8,898

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Optimize patent quality and timeliness (USPTO)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$887.3	\$976.6	\$1,019.6	\$1,059.3	\$1,245.8	\$1,347.9	\$1,506.8	\$1,620.6
FTE	5,316	5,720	5,815	5,899	6,021	5,994	7,073	7,877

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Patent allowance compliance rate			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	96.3%	96.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	96.5%	96.0%
FY 2006	Met	96.5%	96.0%
FY 2005	Improved But Not Met	95.4%	96.0%
FY 2004	Not Met	94.7%	96.0%
FY 2003	Not Met	95.6%	96.0%
FY 2002	Met	95.8%	95.0%

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Patent in-process examination compliance rate			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	92.5%	92.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	92.2%	90.0%
FY 2006	Met	90.0%	86.0%
FY 2005	Met	86.2%	84.0%

* Prior to FY 2007, this outcome was known as "Improve the quality of patent products and services and optimize patent processing time."

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Patent average first action pendency (months)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	25.6	26.9
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Not Met	25.3	23.7
FY 2006	Slightly Below	22.6	22.0
FY 2005	Met	21.1	21.3
FY 2004	Met	20.2	20.2
FY 2003	Met	18.3	18.4
FY 2002	Not Met	16.7	14.7
FY 2001	Not Met	14.4	13.9

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Patent average total pendency (months)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	32.2	34.7
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	31.9	33.0
FY 2006	Met	31.1	31.3
FY 2005	Met	29.1	31.0
FY 2004	Met	27.6	29.8
FY 2003	Met	26.7	27.7
FY 2002	Met	24.0	26.5
FY 2001	Met	24.7	26.2

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Patent applications filed electronically			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	72.1%	69.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	49.5%	40.0%
FY 2006	Exceeded	14.2%	10.0%
FY 2005	Improved But Not Met	2.2%	4.0%
FY 2004	Improved But Not Met	1.5%	2.0%
FY 2003	Not Met	1.3%	2.0%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Optimize trademark quality and timeliness (USPTO)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$120.2	\$122.9	\$119.4	\$112.0	\$144.9	\$149.6	\$191.2	\$188.5
FTE	942	873	719	693	730	665	897	881

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Trademark first action compliance rate			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	95.8%	95.5%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	95.9%	95.5%
FY 2006	Met	95.7%	93.5%
FY 2005	Met	95.3%	92.5%
FY 2004	Met	92.1%	91.7%

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Trademark final action compliance rate			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	97.2%	96.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	97.4%	96.0%
FY 2006	Met	96.4%	93.5%
FY 2005	Slightly Below	94.1%	95.0%
FY 2004	Slightly Below	94.2%	95.0%

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Trademark first action pendency (months)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	3.0	2.5-3.5
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	2.9	3.7
FY 2006	Met	4.8	5.3
FY 2005	Met	6.3	6.4
FY 2004	Not Met	6.6	5.4
FY 2003	Not Met	5.4	3.0
FY 2002	Not Met	4.3	3.0
FY 2001	Exceeded	2.7	6.6

* Prior to FY 2007, this outcome was known as "Improve the quality of trademark products and services and optimize trademark processing time."

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Trademark average total pendency (months)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	13.9	16.3
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	15.1	17.3
FY 2006	Met	18.0	18.8
FY 2005	Met	19.6	20.3
FY 2004	Met	19.5	21.6
FY 2003	Improved But Not Met	19.8	15.5
FY 2002	Not Met	19.9	15.5
FY 2001	Met	17.8	18.0

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Trademark applications filed electronically			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	96.9%	95.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	95.4%	90.0%
FY 2006	Met	93.8%	80.0%
FY 2005	Exceeded	88.0%	70.0%
FY 2004	Met	73.0%	65.0%
FY 2003	Improved But Not Met	57.5%	80.0%
FY 2002	Improved But Not Met	38.0%	50.0%
FY 2001	Not Met	24.0%	30.0%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Improve intellectual property and enforcement domestically and abroad (USPTO)*

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	N/A	N/A	\$51.9	\$62.0	\$117.7	\$176.9	\$68.4	\$43.4
FTE			47	102	74	787	321	140

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of instances in which External Affairs (EA) experts review intellectual property (IP) policies/standards			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	595	275
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	461	80
FY 2006	N/A	77	N/A
FY 2005	N/A	61	N/A
FY 2004	N/A	55	N/A

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Improving worldwide IP expertise for U.S. government interests			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	14	12
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	17	10
FY 2006	N/A	8	N/A
FY 2005	N/A	4	N/A
FY 2004	N/A	4	N/A

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of Memoranda of Agreement for IP joint cooperation, plans of action, mechanisms, and support programs initiated or implemented by developing countries as a result of the Office of Intellectual Property Policy and Enforcement (OIPPE) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	18	15
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	14	8
FY 2006	N/A	6	N/A
FY 2005	N/A	2	N/A
FY 2004	N/A	1	N/A

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as "Plans of actions, mechanisms, and support programs initiated or implemented in developing countries."

* Prior to FY 2007, this outcome was known as "Create a more flexible organization through transitioning patent and trademark operations to an e-government environment and advancing intellectual property development worldwide."

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.3

*Advance global e-commerce as well as telecommunications and information services**

OBJECTIVE 2.3 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual ¹	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$117.5	\$96.2	\$97.6	\$84.4	\$69.9	\$70.9	\$1,146.1	\$1,012.4
FTE	219	244	251	269	259	248	268	268

¹ In FY 2007, \$1,070.3 was provided to the newly formed Digital Television and Public Safety Program.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Ensure that the allocation of radio spectrum provides the greatest benefit to all people (NTIA)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$21.5	\$23.4	\$24.5	\$28.5	\$30.4	\$36.8	\$36.8	\$35.8
FTE	133	141	147	159	169	162	168	168

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Frequency assignment processing time (days) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	9	9 or fewer
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	9	9 or fewer
FY 2006	Met	9	9 or fewer
FY 2005	Met	10	12
FY 2004	Met	<12	12
FY 2003	Met	15	15

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as "Timeliness of processing (days)."

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Certification request processing time (months)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	2	2 or fewer
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	4	4 or fewer
FY 2006	Met	4	4 or fewer

* Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Objective 2.3 was known as "Advance the development of global e-commerce and enhanced telecommunications and information services."

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Space system coordination request processing time			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	95%	90% in 14 days or fewer
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	97%	80% in 14 days or fewer
FY 2006	Met	95%	80% in 14 days or fewer

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Spectrum plans and policies processing time			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	13.3 days	Comments in 15 days or fewer
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	11 days	Comments in 15 days or fewer
FY 2006	Met	13 days	Comments in 15 days or fewer

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Milestones completed from the implementation plan of the President's Spectrum Policy Initiative			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	22	22
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	23 out of 29	23 out of 29
FY 2006	Met	18 out of 22	18 out of 22

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Promote the availability, and support new sources, of advanced telecommunications and information services (NTIA)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002¹ Actual	FY 2003¹ Actual	FY 2004¹ Actual	FY 2005¹ Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$96.0	\$72.8	\$73.1	\$55.9	\$39.5	\$34.1	\$1,109.3	\$976.6
FTE	86	103	104	110	90	86	100	100

¹ Amounts for FYs 2002-2004 include those for the discontinued outcome "Increase competition within the telecommunications sector and promote universal access to telecommunications services for all Americans."

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Support new telecom and information technology by advocating Administration views in number of FCC docket filings, and Congressional and other proceedings in which Administration views are advocated			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	11 dockets and proceedings	5 dockets and proceedings
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	8 dockets and proceedings	5 dockets and proceedings
FY 2006	Exceeded	12 dockets and proceedings	5 dockets and proceedings
FY 2005	Met	5 dockets and proceedings	5 dockets and proceedings

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of Web site views for research publications			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	127,000/month	75,000/month
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	105,000/month	75,000/month
FY 2006	Exceeded	94,000/month	75,000/month

STRATEGIC GOAL 3

Promote environmental stewardship*

STRATEGIC GOAL 3 TOTAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 ¹ Actual	FY 2002 ¹ Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$3,254.8	\$3,398.4	\$3,458.6	\$3,802.0	\$4,064.0	\$4,507.3	\$4,321.2	\$4,436.0
FTE	11,473	11,585	11,898	11,868	11,918	12,896	11,933	12,637

¹ In FY 2001, NOAA shifted from seven to four performance objectives. Funding and FTE data for FY 2001 reflect the best approximation of the funding and FTE from the seven objectives as they would correspond to the new, four objectives. In FY 2002, NOAA added a "Mission Support" objective (without any measures), resulting in a significant decrease in the funding in Strategic Objective 3.1 between FY 2001 and FY 2002, and Strategic Objective 3.3 between FY 2003 and FY 2004.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.1

Protect, restore, and manage the use of coastal and ocean resources**

OBJECTIVE 3.1 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$1,504.0	\$1,334.2	\$1,314.9	\$1,268.5	\$1,379.5	\$1,559.3	\$1,418.3	\$1,324.0
FTE	3,913	3,042	3,361	3,611	3,479	3,670	3,029	3,068

¹ Footnote

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Fish stock sustainability index (FSSI) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	535	530.5
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	524	505
FY 2006		501	
FY 2005		481	
FY 2004		456	

¹ NOAA only recently developed the FSSI and therefore did not have any targets prior to FY 2007. NOAA did, however, have data from which they could derive the FSSI index for FY 2004-FY 2006.

* Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Goal 3 was known as "Observe, protect, and manage the Earth's resources to promote environmental stewardship."

** Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Objective 3.1 was known as "Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs." The new Strategic Objective 3.1 was a performance objective under Strategic Objective 3.2 in the FY 2007 PAR.

APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of living marine resources (LMR) with adequate population assessments and forecasts			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	41.1% ¹	41.1%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	40.6%	40.0%
FY 2006	Not Met	38.8%	41.3%

¹ Estimate. Final – December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of protected species designated as threatened, endangered, or depleted with stable or increasing population levels			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	22 ¹	22
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	26	26
FY 2006	Met	26	24

¹ Estimate. Final – December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Number of habitat acres restored (annual/cumulative) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	11,254/49,742	9,000/47,488
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	5,974/38,488	5,000/37,514
FY 2006	Exceeded	7,598/32,514	4,500/29,416
FY 2005	Exceeded	8,333/24,916	4,500/21,083
FY 2004	Exceeded	5,563/16,583	3,700/14,780
FY 2003	Exceeded	5,200/11,020	2,829

¹ Determination of whether target was met or exceeded is based on annual amount, since that is what was done in that year.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Annual number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes ecological characterizations that meet management needs			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	45	45
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	27	27
FY 2006	Met	62	53

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Cumulative number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes issue-based forecasting capabilities developed and used for management			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	38	38
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	35	35
FY 2006	Met	31	31

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of tools, technologies, and information services that are used by NOAA partners/customers to improve ecosystem-based management			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	86%	86%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	85%	85%

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Annual number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes habitat acres acquired or designated for long-term protection			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	6,219	2,000
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	3,020	2,000
FY 2006	Exceeded	> 86,000,000 ¹	200,137

¹ The large FY 2006 actual reflects the new Northwest Hawaiian Islands Marine National Monument.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.2

*Advance understanding of climate variability and change**

OBJECTIVE 3.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$238.8	\$312.0	\$347.5	\$239.5	\$256.9	\$236.1	\$258.7	\$285.0
FTE	693	785	625	603	599	665	457	523

¹ Footnote

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: U.S. temperature forecasts (cumulative skill score computed over the regions where predictions are made)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	25	19
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	29	19
FY 2006	Exceeded	25	18
FY 2005	Met	19	18
FY 2004	Not Met	17	21
FY 2003	Not Met	17	20
FY 2002	Not Met	18	20
FY 2001	Met	20	20

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Uncertainty in the magnitude of the North American carbon uptake ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	0.40 GtC/year	0.40 GtC/year
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	0.40 GtC/year	0.40 GtC/year
FY 2006	Met	0.40 GtC/year	0.40 GtC/year
FY 2005	Met	0.40 GtC/year	0.48 GtC/year
FY 2004	Met	0.50 GtC/year	0.70 GtC/year
FY 2003	Not Met	0.80 GtC/year	0.50 GtC/year

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as "Reduce the uncertainty in the magnitude of the North American carbon uptake."

* Prior to FY 2008, Strategic Objective 3.2 was known as "Enhance the conservation and management of coastal and marine resources to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs." The new Strategic Objective 3.2 was a performance objective under Strategic Objective 3.1 in the FY 2007 PAR.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Uncertainty in model simulations of the influence of aerosols on climate ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	15% improvement ²	15% improvement
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	10%	10% improvement
FY 2006	Met	10%	Establish 10% improvement

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as “Reduce the uncertainty in model simulations of the influence of aerosols on climate.”

² Estimate. Final – December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Determine the national explained variance (%) for temperature and precipitation for the contiguous United States using U.S. Climate Reference Network (USCRN) stations			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Temperature–98.0%, Precipitation–95.1%	Temperature–96.0%, Precipitation–95.0%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Temperature-97.7%, Precipitation-93.8%	Temperature-97.2%, Precipitation-92.6%
FY 2006	Met	Temperature-97.1%, Precipitation-91.9%	Temperature-97.0%, Precipitation-91.4%
FY 2005	Met	Temperature-96.9%, Precipitation-91.4%	Temperature-96.7%, Precipitation-90.0%
FY 2004	Exceeded	Temperature-96.0%, Precipitation-90.0%	Temperature-80.0%, Precipitation-55.0%
FY 2003	Exceeded	Temperature-95.0%, Precipitation-84.0%	Temperature-70.0%, Precipitation-40.0%
FY 2002	Exceeded	Temperature-85.0%, Precipitation-55.0%	Temperature-60.0%, Precipitation-25.0%

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Error in global measurement of sea surface temperature ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	0.50°C	0.50°C
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Not Met	0.53°C	0.50°C
FY 2006	Not Met	0.53°C	0.50°C

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as “Reduce the error in global measurement of sea surface temperature.”

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Ability of society to plan and respond to climate variability and change using NOAA climate products and information ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	37 assessments/evaluations	35 assessments/evaluations
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	32 assessments/evaluations	32 assessments/evaluations
FY 2006	Met	33 assessments/evaluations	32 assessments/evaluations

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as “Improve society’s ability to plan and respond to climate variability and change using NOAA climate products and information.”

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.3

*Provide accurate and timely weather and water information**

OBJECTIVE 3.3 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$1,376.0	\$1,188.8	\$1,284.1	\$883.6	\$898.1	\$929.2	\$900.7	\$1,009.0
FTE	5,997	5,100	4,912	4,760	4,654	4,907	4,708	5,241

¹ Footnote

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Cumulative percentage of U.S. shoreline and inland areas that have improved ability to reduce coastal hazard impacts			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	32%	32%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	32%	32%
FY 2006	Met	32%	32%
FY 2005	Met	28%	28%
FY 2004	Met	17%	17%
FY 2003	Met	17%	17%
FY 2002	Not Met	8%	17%
FY 2001	Met	8%	6%

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Severe weather warnings for tornadoes (storm-based) - Lead time (minutes) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	15 ²	11
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	14	13
FY 2006	Met	13	13
FY 2005	Met	13	13
FY 2004	Met	13	12
FY 2003	Met	13	12
FY 2002	Met	12	11
FY 2001	Not Met	10	13

¹ Prior to FY 2008, these warnings were county-based rather than storm-based. The difference is provided at www.weather.gov/sbwarnings/. Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as "Tornado warnings lead time (minutes)."

² Projected. Final – December 2008.

* Prior to FY 2008, this was a performance objective under Strategic Objective 3.1 in the FY 2007 PAR, known as "Serve society's needs for weather and water information."

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Severe weather warnings for tornadoes (storm-based) - Accuracy (%) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	73% ²	67%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	80%	76%
FY 2006	Slightly Below	75%	76%
FY 2005	Met	76%	73%
FY 2004	Met	75%	72%
FY 2003	Met	79%	72%
FY 2002	Met	76%	69%
FY 2001	Slightly Below	67%	68%

¹ Prior to FY 2008, these warnings were county-based rather than storm-based. The difference is provided at www.weather.gov/sbwarnings/. Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as "Tornado warnings accuracy (%)."

² Projected. Final – December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Severe weather warnings for tornadoes (storm-based) - False alarm rate (%) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	72% ²	74%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	75%	75%
FY 2006	Slightly Below	79%	75%
FY 2005	Slightly Below	77%	73%
FY 2004	Improved But Not Met	74%	70%
FY 2003	Not Met	76%	72%
FY 2002	Slightly Below	73%	71%
FY 2001	Met	73%	73%

¹ Prior to FY 2008, these warnings were county-based rather than storm-based. The difference is provided at www.weather.gov/sbwarnings/. Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as "Tornado warnings false alarm rate (%)."

² Projected. Final – December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Severe weather warnings for flash floods – Lead time (minutes) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	81 ²	48
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	61	48
FY 2006	Met	49	48
FY 2005	Met	54	48
FY 2004	Improved But Not Met	47	50
FY 2003	Not Met	41	47
FY 2002	Met	52	45
FY 2001	Met	46	45

¹ Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as "Flash flood warnings lead time (minutes)."

² Projected. Final – December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Severe weather warnings for flash floods – Accuracy (%) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	92% ²	90%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	91%	89%
FY 2006	Met	89%	89%
FY 2005	Met	89%	89%
FY 2004	Met	89%	88%
FY 2003	Met	89%	87%
FY 2002	Met	89%	86%
FY 2001	Met	86%	86%

¹ Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as "Flash flood warnings accuracy (%)."

² Projected. Final – December 2008.

APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Hurricane forecast track error (48 hours) (nautical miles) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	86 ²	110 ²
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	97	110
FY 2006	Met	97	111
FY 2005	Met	101	128
FY 2004	Exceeded	94	129
FY 2003	Met	107	130
FY 2002	Met	122	142

¹ Beginning in FY 2007, NOAA reported the previous year's results because data is not available until February and good estimates cannot be determined.

² Reflects 2007 target and actual results. 2008 results not available until February 2009.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Accuracy (%) (threat score) of day 1 precipitation forecasts			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	32%	29%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	31%	29%
FY 2006	Met	30%	28%
FY 2005	Met	29%	27%
FY 2004	Met	29%	25%
FY 2003	Met	29%	25%

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Winter storm warnings – Lead time (hours)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	17	15
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	19	15
FY 2006	Met	17	15
FY 2005	Met	17	15
FY 2004	Met	15	14
FY 2003	Met	14	13
FY 2002	Met	13	13
FY 2001	Met	13	13

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Winter storm warnings – Accuracy (%)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Slightly Below	89%	90%
<p><i>Performance was not met, because:</i> Unusual storm patterns in the western states caused frequent storms and weather patterns that had not been seen in many years. As a result the accuracy of 89 percent vs. GPRA goal of 90 percent missed by one percent. In conclusion, forecasters' fell short of high expectations of the new automated verification system.</p> <p><i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> NOAA anticipates meeting this target in the future.</p>			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	92%	90%
FY 2006	Slightly Below	89%	90%
FY 2005	Met	91%	90%
FY 2004	Met	91%	89%
FY 2003	Met	90%	88%
FY 2002	Met	89%	86%
FY 2001	Met	90%	86%

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.4

Support safe, efficient, and environmentally sound commercial navigation*

OBJECTIVE 3.4 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 ¹ Actual	FY 2003 ¹ Actual	FY 2004 ¹ Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$136.0	\$249.9	\$261.6	\$192.8	\$175.0	\$198.7	\$179.4	\$212.0
FTE ¹	870	942	1,004	716	749	774	691	774

¹ In the FY 2004 PAR, the 2002-2004 amounts for the mission support objective were distributed among the four objectives. In this PAR, the 2002-2004 mission support levels were separated out, resulting in lower 2002-2004 levels than as reported in the FY 2004 PAR for the other four objectives.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Hydrographic survey backlog within navigationally significant areas (square nautical miles surveyed per year) ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	2,127	2,500

Performance was not met, because:
Annual performance is lower than plan primarily due to NOAA Fleet Services mechanical and personnel issues on survey vessels FAIRWEATHER and RAINIER. As a result, FAIRWEATHER has lost 77 days at sea and 270 square nautical miles, and staffing shortfalls have also reduced RAINIER productivity. Late contractor awards delayed the start of contracted survey operations deferring results planned for fourth quarter to first quarter FY 2009. This was further impacted by the effects of both Hurricanes Gustav and Ike on Gulf of Mexico contract survey operations.

Strategies for Improvement:
NOAA anticipates meeting the target in the future because it does not anticipate the problems with the fleet in FY 2008 that it had in FY 2007.

Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	3,198	1,350
FY 2006	Met	2,851	2,500
FY 2005	Met	3,079	2,700
FY 2004	Improved But Not Met	2,070	2,290
FY 2003	Not Met	1,762	2,100

¹ Prior to FY 2008, this measure was known as "Reduce the hydrographic survey backlog within navigationally significant areas (square nautical miles surveyed per year)."

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of U.S. counties rated as fully enabled or substantially enabled with accurate positioning capacity			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	60.2%	60.0%

Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	51.6%	49.0%
FY 2006	Met	43.3%	39.0%
FY 2005	Met	32.2%	28.0%

* Prior to FY 2008, this was a performance objective under Strategic Objective 3.2 in the FY 2007 PAR, known as "Support the Nation's commerce with information for safe, efficient, and environmentally sound transportation."

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Marine wind speed accuracy (%) ^{1,2}			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	72%	68%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	73%	68%
FY 2006	Not Met	55%	58%
FY 2005	Met	57%	57%
FY 2004	Met	57%	57%
FY 2003	Met	57%	54%
FY 2002	Met	53%	53%
FY 2001	Slightly Below	52%	53%

¹ In FY 2008 this measure was reworded to what it was prior to FY 2007, "Marine wind speed accuracy (%)." In FY 2007, this measure was known as "Marine wind – percentage of accurate forecasts (%)."

² From FY 2000-2002, this was combined with "Marine wind speed accuracy."

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Marine wave height accuracy (%) ^{1,2}			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	76% ³	73%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	78%	73%
FY 2006	Met	70%	68%
FY 2005	Met	67%	67%
FY 2004	Not Met	67%	69%
FY 2003	Met	71%	66%

¹ In FY 2008 this measure was reworded to what it was prior to FY 2007, "Marine wave height accuracy (%)." In FY 2007, this measure was known as "Marine heights – percentage of accurate forecasts (%)."

² From FY 2000-2002, this was combined with "Marine Wave height accuracy."

³ Projected. Actual due December 2008.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Aviation forecast accuracy for ceiling/visibility (3 mile/1,000 feet or less) (%) ^{1,2,3}			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Slightly Below	62%	63%
<p><i>Performance was not met, because:</i> NOAA was only slightly below the accuracy target score and in fact met the target for the previous year. Accuracy scores were lower in the third and fourth quarters compared with the first and second quarters, bringing down the actual from 63 percent in the first and second quarters.</p> <p><i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> NOAA anticipates meeting this target in the future.</p>			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	62%	62%
FY 2006	Not Met	43%	47%
FY 2005	Met	46%	46%
FY 2004	Slightly Below	45%	46%
FY 2003	Met	48%	45%
FY 2002	Not Met	13%	18%
FY 2001	Not Met	18%	21%
<p>¹ Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as “Accuracy (%) of forecasts of ceiling and visibility (aviation forecasts).”</p> <p>² From FY 2000-2002, NOAA used a different method to calculate accuracy—targets were significantly lower than the current method.</p> <p>³ From FY 2007 on, the aviation measures were redefined to cover the IFR (Instrument Flight Rule) airspace instead of the limited IFR range of 5,000 feet to three miles. This change was to increase the usefulness of the measure to the general and commercial aviation communities. This change required the measures to be re-baselined. While the numbers for accuracy and FAR appear to be reversed when comparing earlier years, they are actually measuring different things.</p>			

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Aviation forecast FAR for ceiling visibility (3 miles/1,000 feet or less) (%) ^{1,2,3}			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	39%	44%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	40%	45%
FY 2006	Met	64%	65%
FY 2005	Met	63%	68%
FY 2004	Met	65%	70%
FY 2003	Met	64%	71%
FY 2002	Met	58%	52%
FY 2001	Met	51%	51%
<p>¹ Prior to FY 2007, this measure was known as “False alarm rate (FAR)(%) of ceiling and visibility (aviation forecasts).”</p> <p>² From FY 2000-2002, NOAA used a different method to calculate false alarm rate—targets were significantly lower than the current method.</p> <p>³ From FY 2007 on, the aviation measures were redefined to cover the IFR (Instrument Flight Rule) airspace instead of the limited IFR range of 5,000 feet to three miles. This change was to increase the usefulness of the measure to the general and commercial aviation communities. This change required the measures to be re-baselined. While the numbers for accuracy and FAR appear to be reversed when comparing earlier years, they are actually measuring different things.</p>			

MISSION SUPPORT OBJECTIVE: Provide critical support for NOAA's mission (NOAA)*

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE RESOURCES <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding		\$313.5	\$250.5	\$1,217.6	\$1,354.5	\$1,584.0	\$1,564.1	\$1,606.0
FTE		1,716	1,996	2,178	2,437	2,880	3,048	3,031
¹ Footnote								

* There are no GPRA measures for the Mission Support objective, since the activities of this objective support the outcomes of the four other NOAA objectives.

MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION GOAL

Achieve organizational and management excellence

MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual ¹
Total Funding	\$60.6	\$70.1	\$71.2	\$72.8	\$70.9	\$71.8	\$72.2	\$68.6
FTE	310	319	326	309	292	295	294	291

¹ Estimate

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Ensure effective resource stewardship in support of the Department's programs (DM)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES ¹ (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	\$40.7	\$49.2	\$49.2	\$51.8	\$49.5	\$49.3	\$49.6	\$37.9
FTE	171	183	186	181	177	177	173	178

¹ In FY 2008, DM split its one performance outcome into three separate outcomes. All funding for FY 2001-FY 2007 is shown in this outcome.

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Provide accurate and timely financial information and conform to federal standards, laws, and regulations governing accounting and financial management ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	The Department closed 70 percent of prior year financial systems audit findings; completed FY 2008 A-123 assessment of internal controls for financial reporting; significant deficiency was not eliminated	Eliminate any significant deficiency within 1 year of determination. Complete FY 2008 A-123 assessment of internal controls.
<i>Performance was not met, because:</i> While the majority of the prior year financial systems findings were closed, it was expected that several more of the prior year findings would have been closed as a result of the CBS Consolidation Project to consolidate the Department's financial management servers (hardware and software) at the Census Data Center (CDC) in Bowie, MD. However, in February 2008, the project was disbanded due to the CDC's inability to host the systems because of the Census Bureau's need to absorb decennial systems. In addition, there are several other prior year findings unrelated to CBS consolidation that cannot be addressed in the short-term due to resource and infrastructure constraints.			
<i>Strategies for Improvement:</i> The CIO/CFO team continues to actively monitor issues and resolve any outstanding corrective actions.			
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Not Met	Completed migration of Commerce Business System; completed assessment of internal controls; significant deficiency was not eliminated	Migrate Commerce Business System (CBS) to an all Web-based architecture. Complete FY 2007 A-123 assessment of internal controls. Complete internal control and document review. Eliminate any significant deficiency within 1 year of determination.
FY 2006	Not Met	Reportable condition not eliminated	Eliminate any reportable condition within 1 year of determination; 95% of management with access to the CBS have financial data/reports by the 15th of month
FY 2005	Not Met	Reportable condition not eliminated	Eliminate any reportable condition
FY 2004	Met	100%	100%
FY 2003	Met	100%	100%
FY 2002	Met	100%	100%
FY 2001	Met	100%	100%

¹ Prior to FY 2005, this measure was known as "Clean Audit Opinion on Department's Consolidated Financial Statements."

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Effectively use commercial services management ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Completed several feasibility studies in FY 2008 and planned several more for FY 2009	Use business process re-engineering, feasibility studies, and/or similar initiatives to identify operational efficiency and effectiveness opportunities
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Bureaus identified FY 2008 feasibility studies which were submitted as part of the Green Plan ²	Update and/or continue to implement FY 2006 plan to conduct feasibility studies of Department commercial functions to determine potential new competitions/studies in the outyears
FY 2006	Met	Green Plan ² submitted to OMB on 9/28/2006	Finalize new green competition plan based on 08/2005 CFO council outcome
FY 2005	Met	Feasibility studies nominated for 168 FTE	Complete feasibility studies for 168 FTE to determine 2005-2006 studies
FY 2004	Met	New FAIR inventory guidance developed	Multi-year plan under development
FY 2003	Not Met	Completed competition on 6.6%	Complete competitions on 10%
FY 2002	Not Met	Completed competition on 1%	Complete competitions on 5%
FY 2001	Met	Commercial inventory – submitted 6/30/2001	Commercial inventory – completed by 6/30/2001

¹ For FY 2005 -FY 2007, this measure was known as “Effectively use competitive sourcing.” Prior to FY 2005, this measure was known as “Expand A-76 competitions and more accurate FAIR Act inventories.”

² Green Plan will lay out the Departmental short and long-range plans to conduct feasibility studies of all major commercial (and available) functions and will identify approved FY 2006-2007 competitions.

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Obligate funds through performance-based contracting (% of eligible service contracting \$)			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Not Met	28%	50%

Performance was not met, because:
The COMMITS program (all performance-based contracts) was transferred to GSA, reducing the Department’s base. Limitations within procurement infrastructure, e.g., significant turnover, made it difficult to reach goal.

Strategies for Improvement:
Making correct coding in FPDS-NG an element in performance appraisals for contract specialists.

Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Not Met	28%	40%
FY 2006	Not Met	30%	50%
FY 2005	Not Met	< 50%	50%
FY 2004	Met	42%	40%
FY 2003	Not Met	24%	30%
FY 2002	Met	31%	25%
FY 2001	Met	25%	10%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Ensure retention of highly qualified staff in mission-critical positions (DM)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES¹ <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$3.4
FTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ In FY 2008, DM split its one performance outcome into three separate outcomes. All funding for FY 2000-FY 2007 is shown in the first outcome "Ensure effective resource stewardship in support of the Department's programs." All FTE is shown in the first outcome.

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Acquire and maintain diverse and highly qualified staff in mission-critical occupations			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	Exceeded the target by delivering a total of 4 competency models for the Economist, Acquisition, Mathematical Statistician, and Chemist series. Exceeded the OPM 45-day time-to-hire standard with an average fill time of 31 days for non-SES vacancies.	Have new competency models in place for 3 mission-critical occupations for use in applicant selections and training and development decisions. Meet or exceed the 45-day hiring goals mandated by OPM.
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Trained post-secondary internship program applicants to increase applicant pools; trained managers to make better hiring decisions; trained employees in project management to close skill gaps	Improve recruitment strategies via targeted activities; assist managers in making better selections; close skill gaps
FY 2006	Met	Marketed job vacancies to organizations via automated hiring system; participated in career fairs and special programs; conducted training of managers and employees	Improve recruitment strategies via targeted activities; assist managers in making better selections; close skill gaps
FY 2005	Met	Improved from 28% to 29%, maintained 30 day fill time	Improve representation in underrepresented groups, maintain 30 day fill-time

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Acquire and manage technology resources to support program goals (DM)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES¹ <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual
Total Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$5.1
FTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ In FY 2008, DM split its one performance outcome into three separate outcomes. All funding for FY 2000-FY 2007 is shown in the first outcome "Ensure effective resource stewardship in support of the Department's programs."

APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Improve the management of information technology			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	Cost/schedule overruns/performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission-critical systems certified and accredited with acceptable, quality documentation in place.	Cost/schedule overruns/performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission-critical systems certified and accredited with acceptable, quality documentation in place.
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	Cost/schedule overruns/performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission-critical systems certified and accredited.	Cost/schedule overruns/performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission-critical systems certified and accredited.
FY 2006	Met	Cost overruns and performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission-critical systems certified and accredited.	Cost/schedule overruns/performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission-critical systems certified and accredited.
FY 2005	Met	Cost overruns and performance shortfalls less than 10%	Cost overruns and performance shortfalls less than 10%

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Promote improvements to Department programs and operations by identifying and completing work that (1) promotes integrity, efficiency, and effectiveness and (2) prevents and detects fraud, waste, and abuse (OIG)

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME RESOURCES <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>								
	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Actual¹
Total Funding	\$19.9	\$20.9	\$22.0	\$21.0	\$21.4	\$22.5	\$22.6	\$22.2
FTE	139	136	140	128	115	118	121	113
¹ Estimate								

OIG PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of OIG recommendations accepted by Departmental and bureau management			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	100%	95%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	96%	95%
FY 2006	Met	96%	95%
FY 2005	Met	99%	90%
FY 2004	Met	98%	90%
FY 2003	Met	97%	90%

APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

OIG PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Dollar value of financial benefits identified by the OIG			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Exceeded	\$113.0M	\$28.0M
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Exceeded	\$51.7M	\$29.6M
FY 2006	Met	\$34.2M	\$30.0M
FY 2005	Exceeded	\$32.0M	\$23.0M
FY 2004	Exceeded	\$26.0M	\$20.0M
FY 2003	Exceeded	\$43.3M	\$20.0M

OIG PERFORMANCE MEASURE			
MEASURE: Percentage of criminal and civil matters that are accepted for prosecution			
Year	Status	Actual	Target
FY 2008	Met	73%	63%
Year	Status	Historical Results	Historical Target
FY 2007	Met	73%	63%
FY 2006	Exceeded	91%	63%
FY 2005	Exceeded	81%	62%
FY 2004	Exceeded	67%	50%
FY 2003	Met	50%	50%

IMPROPER PAYMENTS INFORMATION ACT (IPIA) OF 2002

REPORTING DETAILS

IPIA was enacted to provide for estimates and reports of improper payments by federal agencies. The act requires that federal agencies estimate improper payments and report on actions to reduce them. A review of all programs and activities that the Department administers is required annually to assist in identifying and reporting improper payments. The Department has not identified any significant problems with improper payments; however, the Department recognizes the importance of maintaining adequate internal controls to ensure proper payments, and the Department's commitment to the continuous improvement in the overall disbursement management process remains very strong. Each of the Department's payment offices has implemented procedures to detect and prevent improper payments. For FY 2009 and beyond, the Department will continue its efforts to ensure the integrity of its disbursements.

I. Describe the risk assessment(s) performed subsequent to completing its full program inventory. List the risk-susceptible programs (i.e., programs that have a significant risk of improper payments based on Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance thresholds) identified through its risk assessments. Be sure to include the programs previously identified in the former Section 57 of OMB Circular A-11, *Preparation, Submission, and Execution of the Budget* (now located in OMB Circular A-123, Appendix C, *Requirements for Effective Measurement and Remediation of Improper Payments*).

The Department annually conducts an assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting, in compliance with OMB Circular A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Internal Control*. The FY 2007 assessment included a review of internal controls over disbursement processes, which indicated that current internal controls over disbursement processes are sound.

The results of Departmental assessments revealed no risk-susceptible programs, and demonstrated that overall, the Department has strong internal controls over disbursement processes, the amounts of improper payments by the Department are immaterial, and the risk of improper payments is low.

Each of the Department's bureaus/reporting entities is currently performing, over a one to three-year period (depending on the size of the entity), improper payment risk assessments covering all of its programs/activities, as required by OMB Circular A-123, Appendix C. For many of the reporting entities, these risk assessments will be completed in 2008. These improper payment risk assessments of the entity's programs/activities will also include assessments of the corporate control, procurement, and grants management environments.

II. Describe the statistical sampling process conducted to estimate the improper payment rate for each program identified.

In FY 2008, the Department conducted a sampling process to draw and review random samples of disbursements from a Department-wide universe of disbursements. Each selected sample item was then subjected to a review of original invoices and supporting documentation to determine that the disbursement was accurate, made only once, and that the correct vendor was compensated. The results of the Department's review did not reveal any significant improper payments. The same results were achieved following a similar review in FY 2007. An estimated improper payment rate, accordingly, was deemed not necessary.

III. Describe the Corrective Action Plans (CAP) for reducing the estimate rate and amount of improper payments for each type of category of error. Include in this discussion the corrective action(s) for each different type or cause of error, and the corresponding steps necessary to prevent future recurrence. If efforts are ongoing, it is appropriate to include that information in this section.

The results of Departmental assessments demonstrate that, overall, the Department has strong internal controls over disbursement processes, the amounts of improper payments by the Department are immaterial, and the risk of improper payments is low. While the Department, accordingly, does not have a need for CAPs for improper payments, the Department has, nevertheless, further enhanced its processes and is actively working with each of the Department's payment offices to identify and implement additional procedures to prevent and detect improper payments. In FY 2008, the Department continued with the bureaus' quarterly reporting of improper payments to the Deputy Chief Financial Officer (CFO), along with identifying the nature and magnitude of any improper payments and identifying any necessary control enhancements.

The Department has additionally reviewed all financial statement audit findings/comments, and results of other payment reviews, for indications of breaches of disbursement controls. None of these audit findings/comments or reviews have uncovered any significant problems with improper payments or the internal controls that surround disbursements.

IV. Discuss recovery auditing effort, if applicable, including any contract types excluded from review and the justification for doing so; actions taken to recoup improper payments; and the business process changes and internal controls instituted and/or strengthened to prevent further occurrences.

In September 2008, recovery audits were completed for Departmental Management (DM)/Salaries & Expenses (DM/S&E), DM/Working Capital Fund (DM/WCF), and Economics and Statistics Administration/Bureau of Economic Analysis (ESA/BEA). Contracts/obligations closed after September 30, 2004 greater than \$100 thousand were reviewed. Grants, travel payments, bankcards/purchase cards, all procurement vehicles with other federal agencies, government bills of lading, and gifts and bequests were excluded from review. The Department determined, that, for the above categories of contracts/obligations that were excluded from review, the Department's costs for the recovery audit activities would likely exceed the benefits of a recovery audit. Vendor inquiries were performed for a sample of vendors to determine if the reporting entities had any open credits or debts with vendors. Of the \$68.8 million reviewed, no amounts were identified for recovery. The following table presents a summary of the Department's current year (CY) and prior years (PY) recovery audit results.

(In Thousands)

Reporting Entity(s)	Amount Subject to Review for CY Reporting	Actual Amount Reviewed for CY Reporting	Amounts Identified for Recovery for CY Reporting	Amounts Recovered for CY Reporting	Amounts Identified for Recovery in PYs Reporting	Amounts Recovered in PYs Reporting	Cumulative Amounts Identified for Recovery (CY and PYs Reporting)	Cumulative Amounts Recovered (CY and PYs Reporting)
DM/S&E	\$ 52,200	\$ 42,983	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
DM/WCF	\$ 28,356	\$ 20,036	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
ESA/BEA	\$ 8,381	\$ 5,776	\$ -	\$ -	N/A	N/A	\$ -	\$ -
Census Bureau, NIST, NOAA, and USPTO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 96	\$ 96	\$ 96	\$ 96

V. Describe the steps the agency has taken and plans to take (including time line) to ensure that agency managers (including the agency head) are held accountable for reducing and recovering improper payments.

The Department has not identified any significant problems with improper payments; however, the Department recognizes the importance of maintaining adequate internal controls to ensure proper payments, and its commitment to continuous improvement in disbursement management processes remains very strong. The Department's CFO has responsibility for establishing policies and procedures for assessing Departmental and program risks of improper payments, taking actions to reduce those payments, and reporting the results of the actions to Departmental management for oversight and other actions as deemed appropriate. The CFO has designated the Deputy CFO to oversee initiatives related to reducing improper payments within the Department, and to work closely with the bureau CFOs in this area.

In FY 2008, the Department continued its reporting procedures that required quarterly reporting to the Department by its bureaus on any improper payments, identifying the nature and magnitude of any improper payments along with any necessary control enhancements to prevent further occurrences of the types of improper payments identified. The Department's analysis of the data collected from the bureaus shows that Department-wide improper payments were below one-tenth of one percent in FY 2008, as was the case in FY 2007. The bureau CFOs are accountable for internal controls over improper payments, and for monitoring and minimizing improper payments.

For FY 2009 and beyond, the Department will continue its efforts to ensure the integrity of its disbursements.

VI. Describe whether the agency has the information systems and other infrastructure it needs to reduce improper payments to the levels the agency has targeted.

The Department has ensured that internal controls, manual, as well as financial system, relating to payments are in place throughout the Department, and has reviewed all financial statement audit findings/comments and results of other payment reviews for indications of breaches of disbursement controls. None of these audit findings/comments or reviews have uncovered any significant problems with improper payments or the internal controls that surround disbursements.

VII. Describe any statutory or regulatory barriers which may limit the agencies' corrective actions in reducing improper payments and actions taken by the agency to mitigate the barriers' effects.

The Department has not identified any significant barriers to date, but will notify OMB and Congress of any barriers that inhibit actions to reduce improper payments if they occur.

VIII. Additional comments, if any, on overall agency efforts, specific programs, best practices, or common challenges identified, as a result of IPIA implementation.

The Department's Disbursement Best Practices. The following are some examples of the internal control procedures used by the Department's payment offices:

- Limited/controlled access to vendor files—access to basic vendor information (e.g., name, address, taxpayer identification number, business size, etc.) is available to financial system users; access to banking information, however, is strictly limited by system security to certain Office of Finance staff.

- Controlled access to financial system accounts payable screens—authority to create, edit, approve, process, and amend payment records is limited to certain Office of Finance financial system users. Also, authority to add or revise records in the vendor database is limited to separate Office of Finance financial system users.
- Segregation of duties for financial system data entry and review prior to transmitting disbursement files to Treasury—data entry duties are assigned to technicians in the Office of Finance who do not have authority to review and process payments. Authority to approve and process payments is assigned to accountants in the Office of Finance. Both data entry and approval/processing of payments are separate functions from transmitting disbursement files to Treasury.
- Financial system edit reports that highlight potential items that may result in improper payments (e.g., invoice amount and accrual amount are not the same). There is a daily Invoice Workload Report that displays open amounts (not closed by a payment) on all invoices. This report is reviewed and action is taken to resolve partially open invoices. Furthermore, system settings prevent a payment in excess of the amount of the invoice.
- Daily pre-payment audit of invoices for accuracy, and corrective actions prior to disbursement, thereby preventing improper payments from occurring.
- Financial system edits if the vendor's name on the payment does not agree with that on the obligation, or if the payment amount is greater than the obligation or accrual amount.
- The monthly vendor statement for purchase cards is interfaced into the financial system, thereby reducing data entry error.
- An accountant or supervisor reviews individual payments before releasing for payment, to help ensure that the correct banking information or payment addresses are used, and that the correct amount will be paid.
- Monthly post-payment random sample audits for detection purposes.
- Contracts include a clause requiring the contractor to notify the contracting officer if the government overpays when making an invoice payment or a contract financing payment.

**SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDIT
AND MANAGEMENT ASSURANCES**

Presented below is a summary of financial statement audit and management assurances for FY 2008. Table 1 relates to the Department's FY 2008 financial statement audit, which resulted in an unqualified opinion with no material weaknesses. Table 2 presents the number of material weaknesses reported by the Department under Section 2 of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) –either with regard to internal controls over operations or financial reporting– and Section 4, which relates to internal controls over financial management systems; as well as the Department's compliance with the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA).

The Department had one recurring material weakness under FMFIA, Section 2 relating to information technology (IT) certification and accreditation (C&A). Though significant progress has been made, work still remains on fully implementing corrective actions. Efforts to fully resolve this material weakness are being monitored by the Department's senior management.

Table 1. Summary of Financial Statement Audit

Audit Opinion:	Unqualified				
Restatement:	No				
Material Weaknesses	Beginning Balance	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Ending Balance
No Material Weaknesses	0	0	0	0	0
Total Material Weaknesses	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2. Summary of Management Assurances

EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING (FMFIA § 2)						
Statement of Assurance:	Unqualified					
Material Weaknesses	Beginning Balance	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed	Ending Balance
No Material Weaknesses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Material Weaknesses	0	0	0	0	0	0
EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNAL CONTROL OVER OPERATIONS (FMFIA § 2)						
Statement of Assurance:	Qualified					
Material Weaknesses	Beginning Balance	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed	Ending Balance
IT Certification and Accreditation	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total Material Weaknesses	1	0	0	0	0	1
CONFORMANCE WITH FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS (FMFIA § 4)						
Statement of Assurance:	Systems conform with financial management system requirements					
Non-Conformances	Beginning Balance	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed	Ending Balance
No Non-Conformance Issues	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Non-Conformances	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT (FFMIA)						
	Agency			Auditor		
Overall Substantial Compliance	Yes			Yes		
1. System Requirements				Yes		
2. Accounting Standards				Yes		
3. USSGL at Transaction Level				Yes		

GLOSSARY OF KEY ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATION	TITLE	ABBREVIATION	TITLE
A	ACI American Competitiveness Initiative	CVD Countervailing Duty	
	ACM Asbestos-Containing Materials	CWC Chemical Weapons Convention	
	ACS American Community Survey	CWCIA CWC Implementation Act	
	ACSI American Customer Satisfaction Index		
	AD Antidumping	D	
	AHS American Housing Survey	DART Deep Ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis	
	AML Advanced Measurement Laboratory	DFI Digital Freedom Initiative	
	APP Annual Performance Plan	DHS U.S. Department of Homeland Security	
	AWS Advanced Wireless Service	DM Departmental Management	
		DOD U.S. Department of Defense	
B		DOJ U.S. Department of Justice	
BAS Boundary and Annexation Survey		DOL U.S. Department of Labor	
BDC Business Development Centers		DPAS Defense Priorities and Allocations System	
BEA Bureau of Economic Analysis			
BIS Bureau of Industry and Security		E	
BLS Bureau of Labor Statistics		EA External Affairs	
BNQP Baldrige National Quality Program		EAA Export Administration Act	
		EAR Export Administration Regulations	
C		EDA Economic Development Administration	
C&A Certification and Accreditation		EDAP Economic Development Assistance Programs	
CAP Corrective Action Plan		EDD Economic Development Districts	
CCSP Climate Change Science Program		ELGP Emergency Oil and Gas and Steel Loan Guarantee Programs	
CEDS Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies		ENC Electronic Navigational Chart	
CFO Chief Financial Officer		ENSO El Niño/Southern Oscillation	
CFO/ASA Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration		EPO European Patent Office	
CIO Chief Information Officer		ESA Economics and Statistics Administration	
COA Climate Observations and Analyses			
COOP Continuity of Operations Plan		F	
CPI Consumer Price Index		FAR False Alarm Rate	
CPS Current Population Survey		FCC Federal Communications Commission	
CRADA Cooperative Research and Development Agreements		FDCA Field Data Collection Automation	
CSP Coastal Storms Program		FECA Federal Employees Compensation Act	
CSRS Civil Service Retirement System		FEGLI Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Program	
		FEHB Federal Employees Health Benefit Program	

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY OF KEY ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATION	TITLE	ABBREVIATION	TITLE
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	I IA	Import Administration
FERS	Federal Employees Retirement System	ICANN	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
FFMIA	Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996	IEOS	Integrated Earth Observation System
FICA	Federal Insurance Contributions Act	IFQ	Individual Fishing Quota Direct Loans
FISMA	Federal Information Security Management Act	IOOS	Integrated Ocean Observing System
FMFIA	Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982	IP	Intellectual Property
FMLoB	Financial Management Line of Business	IP	Internet Protocol
FSV	Fisheries Survey Vessel	IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
FTA	Free Trade Agreement	IPIA	Improper Payments Information Act
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent	IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
FVOG	Fishing Vessel Obligation Guarantee Loan Program	IRAC	Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee
FWC	Future Workers' Compensation	IRS	Internal Revenue Service
FY	Fiscal Year	ISOS	Integrated Surface Observing System
G G&B	Gifts and Bequests (a fund that is part of DM)	ISSLoB	Information System Security Line of Business
GAAP	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles	IT	Information Technology
GAO	U.S. Government Accountability Office	ITA	International Trade Administration
GDP	Gross Domestic Product	ITS	Institute for Telecommunication Sciences
GEO	Global Earth Observatory	J JCCT	Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade
GLERL	Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory	JPO	Japan Patent Office
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act of 1993	K KSA	Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities
GPS	Global Positioning System	L LBP	Lead-Based Paints
GSA	U.S. General Services Administration	LPTV	Low-Power Television
GSMFC	Gulf States Marine Fishing Commission	M MAC	Market Access and Compliance
H HCHB	Herbert C. Hoover Building	MAF	Master Address File
HHWS	Heat Health/Warning Systems	MAS	Manufacturing and Services
HR	Human Resources	MBDA	Minority Business Development Agency
		MBDC	Minority Business Development Centers
		MBE	Minority Business Enterprise

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY OF KEY ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATION	TITLE	ABBREVIATION	TITLE
MBNQA	Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards	NTIS	National Technical Information Service
MBOC	Minority Business Opportunity Committee Program	NWLON	National Water Level Observation Network
MED	Minority Enterprise Development	NWS	National Weather Service
MEP	Manufacturing Extension Partnership	O	
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding	OAMFA	Office of Acquisition Management and Financial Assistance
N		OAR	Office of Atmospheric Research
NABDC	Native American Business Development Centers	OB	Office of Budget
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement	OFM	Office of Financial Management
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	OFPP	Office of Federal Procurement Policy
NCEP	National Centers for Environmental Prediction	OHRM	Office of Human Resources Management
NDBC	National Data Buoy Center	OIG	Office of Inspector General
NERR	National Estuarine Research Reserve	OMB	Office of Management and Budget
NESDIS	National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service	OPM	U.S. Office of Personnel Management
NEXRAD	Next Generation Weather Radar System	OS	Office of the Secretary
NGDC	National Geophysical Data Center	OSDBU	Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization
NGS	National Geodetic Survey	OSY	Office of Security
NIDIS	National Integrated Drought Information System	P	
NIH	National Institutes of Health	PAIR	Patent Application and Information Retrieval
NIPA	National Income and Product Accounts	PAR	Performance and Accountability Report
NIPLECC (or NIPC)	National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordination Council	PART	Program Assessment Rating Tool
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology	PCSRF	Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service	PEO	Program Executive Officer
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	PFM	Point Forecast Matrix
NOS	National Ocean Service	PMA	President's Management Agenda
NPV	Net Present Value	PMC	Program Management Council
NRC	National Research Council	PORTS®	Physical Oceanographic Real-time System
NSSL	National Severe Storms Laboratory	PP&E	Property, Plant, and Equipment, Net
NTIA	National Telecommunications and Information Administration	PSIC	Public Safety Interoperable Communications
		PSV	Post-Shipment Verification
		PTFP	Public Telecommunications Facilities Program

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY OF KEY ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATION	TITLE	ABBREVIATION	TITLE
Q QFR	Quarterly Financial Report	Treasury	U.S. Department of the Treasury
R R&D	Research and Development	TRIPS	Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
RF	Radio Frequency	TROR	Treasury Report on Receivables
RFC	River Forecast Center	TSP	Thrift Savings Plan
RLF	Revolving Loan Fund	U UC	University Center
S S&E	Salaries and Expenses	US&FCS	U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service
S&T	Science and Technology	USCRN	U.S. Climate Reference Network
SARSAT	Search and Rescue Satellite-Aided Tracking System	USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
SBA	U.S. Small Business Administration	USPTO	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
SBR	Combined Statement of Budgetary Resources	USTR	Office of the U.S. Trade Representative
SCNP	Consolidated Statement of Changes in Net Position	USWRP	U.S. Weather Research Program
SDDS	Special Data Dissemination Standards	UWB	Ultrawideband
SES	Senior Executive Service	V VCAT	Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology
SFMR	Stepped Frequency Microwave Radiometer	VoIP	Voice over Internet Protocol
SIPP	Survey of Income and Program Participation	W WARN	Wireless Accelerated Responder Network
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprise	WCF	Working Capital Fund
SPD	Survey of Program Dynamics	WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
SRD	Standard Reference Data	WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
SRM	Standard Reference Materials	WTO	World Trade Organization
STEP	Standard for the Exchange of Product Model Data		
STOP!	Strategy Targeting Organized Piracy		
T 3G	Third Generation		
TAA	Trade Adjustment Assistance Program		
TAAC	Trade Adjustment Assistance Center		
TDR	Trademark Document Retrieval		
TIGER	Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing System		
TIP	Technology Innovation Program		
TPCC	Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee		

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



This Performance and Accountability Report was produced with the energies and talents of the Department of Commerce staff. To these individuals we would like to offer our sincerest thanks and acknowledgement.



In particular, we would like to recognize the following organizations and individuals for their contributions:

William Kittredge, Errol Stewart, and Don Smith of EDA, Camelia Carter and Sheryl Williams of Census, Joanne Buenzli of ESA, Kurt Bersani of BEA, Ed Meyer and Dondi Ojeda of ITA, Brad Burke of BIS, Ron Marin of MBDA, Mary Choi of NOAA, Joan Bolton, Maureen Brown, and

Alexandra Engushov of USPTO, Amber Shores of NIST, Teresa Grant of NTIS, Charles Franz and Ed Ryan of NTIA, John Webb of OIG, Karen Gard and Jamie Carlyle of DM, Bill Tatter and Steve Shapiro of the Office of Budget, Systems, Policy and Performance Division, and the many other bureau and Departmental staff, particularly of the Office of Financial Management who contributed to this report.



We offer special thanks to Michael James, Sheri Beauregard, and Don James of The DesignPond for their outstanding contributions in the design and production of this report.

To send comments or obtain additional information about this report, please email Bill Tatter at btatter@doc.gov.



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE WEB ADDRESSES

FOR PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE

Department of Commerce
<http://www.commerce.gov/>

Department of Commerce Strategic Plan, Performance Reports and Performance Plans
http://www.osec.doc.gov/bmi/budget/budgetsub_perf_strategicplans.htm

Economic Development Administration Annual Reports
<http://www.eda.gov/AboutEDA/Annualreport.xml>

International Trade Administration Strategic Plan
http://trade.gov/ITA_stratplan2007.pdf

Minority Business Development Agency Portal/Annual Report
<http://www.mbd.gov>

Bureau of Industry and Security Annual Report
<http://www.bis.doc.gov/>

Census Bureau
<http://www.census.gov>

Economics and Statistics Administration
<http://www.esa.doc.gov/>

Bureau of Economic Analysis
<http://www.bea.gov>

- ◆ BEA's Mission, Vision, Values, and Role
<http://bea.gov/about/mission.htm>
- ◆ BEA Strategic Plan for FY 2008–FY 2012
http://bea.gov/about/pdf/strategic_plan_matrix_2008-2012.pdf
- ◆ Release Dates for 2008
<http://www.bea.gov/bea/newsrelease/2008rd.htm>

National Institute of Standards and Technology

- ◆ NIST Performance Evaluation
http://www.nist.gov/director/planning/impact_assessment.htm
- ◆ NIST Strategic Planning
<http://www.nist.gov/director/planning/strategicplanning.htm>
- ◆ NIST Technology Innovation Program
<http://www.nist.gov/tip/>
- ◆ NIST Manufacturing Extension Partnership – Making a Difference Brochure
<http://www.mep.nist.gov/impacts/making-a-difference.pdf>
- ◆ NIST Baldrige National Quality Program – Program Information and Award Statistics
<http://www.quality.nist.gov/>

National Technical Information Service
<http://www.ntis.gov/>

- ◆ Annual Report
<http://www.ntis.gov/pdf/annrpt2007.pdf>

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
<http://www.uspto.gov>

- ◆ Performance and Accountability Report
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/annual/>
- ◆ President's Budget and Strategic Plan
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/ac/comp/budg/index.html>

National Telecommunications and Information Administration

- ◆ Annual Reports
<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/annreports.html>

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Strategic Planning and Performance
<http://www.ppi.noaa.gov/spo.htm>

Office of Inspector General
<http://www.oig.doc.gov/>

BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE CONTACTS

Departmental Management

Bill Tatter, btatter@doc.gov,
202-482-5979
Steve Shapiro, sshapiro@doc.gov,
202-482-3700

Office of Inspector General

John Webb, jwebb@oig.gov,
202-482-1719

Economic Development Administration

Errol Stewart, estewart@eda.doc.gov,
202-482-3928
William Kittredge, wkittredge@eda.doc.gov,
202-482-5442

Census Bureau

Camelia Carter, camelia.m.carter@census.gov,
301-763-3874
Sheryl Williams, sheryl.a.williams@census.gov,
301-763-3571

Economics and Statistics Administration/Bureau of Economic Analysis

Joanne Buenzli, jbuenzli@doc.gov,
202-482-3038

International Trade Administration

Ed Meyer, ed_meyer@ita.doc.gov,
202-482-3304
Dondi Ojeda, dondi_ojeda@ita.doc.gov,
202-482-5204

Bureau of Industry and Security

Gay Shrum, gshrum@bis.doc.gov,
202-482-1058
Brad Burke, bburke@bis.doc.gov,
202-482-6006

Minority Business Development Agency

Ron Marin, rmarin@mbda.gov,
202-482-3341
Edith McCloud, emcloud@mbda.gov,
202-482-6224

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Mary Choi, mary.choi@noaa.gov,
202-482-2621

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Joan Bolton, joan.bolton@uspto.gov,
571-272-6290

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Amber Shores, amber.shores@nist.gov,
301-975-3649
Francisco Balicao, francisco.balicao@nist.gov,
301-975-4769
Eric Steel, eric.steel@nist.gov,
301-975-3750
Stephanie Shipp, Technology Innovation Program
stephanie.shipp@nist.gov, 301-975-8978

National Technical Information Service

Teresa Grant, tgrant@ntis.gov,
703-605-6472
Mary Houff, mhouff@ntis.gov,
703-605-6611

National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Charles Franz, cfranz@ntia.doc.gov,
202-482-1826

For additional copies of the FY 2008 Performance and Accountability Report, please contact the Department of Commerce, Office of Budget, 202-482-4648, or refer to the people noted above under Departmental Management.