PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

o make the report more useful, this FY 2006 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) reports on targets and measures from the FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan (APP), which more accurately reflects updated targets of each performance measure. Individual bureau-specific APPs can be found on the Department of Commerce 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 Goal.

The system of reporting does not currently allow the Department to report on resources at the performance measure level but it is Commerce's hope to develop this capability in the future. It is important to note that if a performance measure has been exceeded (more than 125 percent of target), a blue circle will appear. If a performance measure has been met (100 percent - 125 percent of target), a green circle will appear. A measure that was slightly below target (95 percent - 99 percent of the target) appears as yellow, while a measure that was definitely not met appears as red. No targets that were ever in the form of text (e.g., a series of milestones met) would ever be considered exceeded since they can't be quantified.

The information in the tables will follow the following format:

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

Note: Unless otherwise noted, measures that do not have targets, are new, or are baseline are not included in any count in this document. Resources for each performance goal are estimates and may be updated in the budget for FY 2008.

Target and performance data are tracked back to FY 1999 where available. If a measure was developed after FY 1999, actual performance data is shown back to the year that the measure first appeared.

STRATEGIC GOAL 1

Provide the information and tools to maximize U.S. competitiveness and enable economic growth for American industries, workers, and consumers

STRATEGIC GOAL 1 TOTAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual							
Total Funding	\$2,548.8	\$5,454.7	\$1,912.7	\$1,704.1	\$1,746.2	\$1,854.0	\$1,888.5	\$1,936.0
FTE ¹	24,186	89,978	13,827	11,827	11,306	11,819	11,877	12,017
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.1

Enhance economic growth for all Americans by developing partnerships with private sector and nongovernmental organizations

OBJECTIVE 1.1 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual							
Total Funding	\$703.7	\$690.8	\$756.9	\$677.5	\$662.2	\$681.4	\$605.8	\$584.0
FTE ¹	2315	2338	2240	1,990	2,288	2,272	1909	1,754
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

Performance Goal: Increase private investment and job creation in economically distressed communities (EDA)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual							
Total Funding ²	\$313	\$312	\$362.3	\$296.6	\$258.3	\$252.4	\$213.9	\$198.5
FTE ¹	170	174	165	155	149	134	134	114

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

² 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.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE: Private investment leveraged - 9 year totals ¹						
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		\$2,331.1	\$1,162.0			

¹ EDA tracks the results of its investments and jobs created / retained at 3, 6 and 9 year periods. The FY 2006 actual is as a result of investments made in FY 1997. 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 ¹							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		\$1,059.0	\$1,020.0					
Year	Status	Historica	al Results					
FY 2005		\$1,781.0						
FY 2004		\$1,740.0						
FY 2003		\$2,475.0						

¹ This is the 6 year result measure. FY 2006 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2000. FY 2005 actuals as a result of investments made in FY 1999 and so on.

	EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Private investment leveraged - 3 year totals ¹								
Year	Status	Actual	Target						
FY 2006		\$1,669.0	\$320.0						
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		\$1,791.0							
FY 2004		\$947.0							
FY 2003		\$1,251.0							
FY 2002		\$640.0							
FY 2001		\$971.0							
FY 2000		\$199.0							

¹ This is the 3 year result measure. FY 2006 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2003. FY 2005 actuals as a result of investments made in FY 2002 and so on.

EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE: Jobs created/retained - 9 year totals ¹						
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		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 2006 actual is as a result of investments made in FY 1997. 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 2006		42,958 28,200						
Year	Status	Historica	I Results					
FY 2005		47,374						
FY 2004		68,109						
FY 2003		47,607						

¹ This is the 6 year result measure. FY 2006 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2000. FY 2005 actuals as a result of investments made in FY 1999 and so on.

	EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Jobs created/retained - 3 year totals ¹							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		11,833	9,170					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		19,672						
FY 2004		21,901						
FY 2003		39,841						
FY 2002		29,912						
FY 2001		12,898						
FY 2000		12,056						

¹ This is the 3 year result measure. FY 2006 actuals are the result of investments made in FY 2003. FY 2005 actuals as a result of investments made in FY 2002 and so on.

Performance Goal: Improve community capacity to achieve and sustain economic growth (EDA)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual								
Total Funding ² FTE ¹	\$78.0 92	\$74.0 94	\$76.7 89	\$68.8 84	\$67.3 80	\$71.9 72	\$71.3 73	\$67.0 50
¹ FTF – Full-Time Fauivalent								

² 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 and Indian tribes implementing economic development projects from the comprehensive economic development strategy that lead to private investment and jobs Year **Status** Actual **Target FY 2006** 96% 95% Year **Status Historical Results** FY 2005 97% FY 2004 95% FY 2003 98.7% FY 2002 New—no target to measure against



	EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEASURE: Percentage of sub-state jurisdiction members actively participating in the economic development district program								
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		90%	89-93%					
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results					
FY 2005		91%						
FY 2004		90.1%						
FY 2003		96.7%						
FY 2002		95.3%						
FY 2001		92%						
FY 2000		91%						
FY 1999		New—no target to measure against						

	EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEASUR	MEASURE: Percentage of University Center clients taking action as a result of the assistance facilitated by the University Center							
Year	Status	Actual Target						
FY 2006		76% 75%						
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		79%						
FY 2004		78.4%						
FY 2003		78.1%						
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against						

	EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percentage of those actions taken by University Center clients that achieved the expected results						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		82%	80%				
Year	Status	Historica	l Results				
FY 2005		87%					
FY 2004		88%					
FY 2003		36%					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					

	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 2006		90%	90%					
Year	Status	Historica	I Results					
FY 2005		99%						
FY 2004		90%						
FY 2003		2%						
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against						

	EDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEASUR	MEASURE: Percentage of those actions taken by Trade Adjustment Assistance Center clients that achieved the expected results							
Year	Status	s Actual Target						
FY 2006		96% 95%						
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results					
FY 2005		97%						
FY 2004		98%						
FY 2003		8%						
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against						

Performance Goal: Enhance U.S. competitiveness in domestic and international markets (ITA)*

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual ²	Actual ²	Actual ²	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$155.0	\$151.0	\$161.0	\$208.5	\$210.7	\$206.3	\$52.5	\$49.7
FTE ¹	1,071	1,079	1,038	1,236	1,064	1,250	255	259

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

² In FY 2005 ITA reorganized its performance structure, reducing the number of goals from four to two goals for this objective. FYs 2002-2004 actuals shown here reflect the level for the strengthen U.S. industries goal and the two discontinued goals.

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEASU	MEASURE: Annual cost savings resulting from the adoption of MAS recommendations contained in MAS studies and analysis						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006							

Performance was not met, because:

The annual cost savings metric was not achieved due to the postponed release of an EPA rule related to one of the MAS studies. The rule was scheduled for release in September and was delayed due to prolonged internal EPA clearance and review. This may put ITA above target for this metric in FY 2007.

Strategies for Improvement:

ITA's MAS program will work closely with agencies to predict rule release dates more accurately to minimize this type of potential externality.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against

^{*} Prior to FY 2006, this goal was known as "Strengthen U.S. industries."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Percent reduction in per unit cost of data distribution							
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target					
FY 2006		12%	12% 10%					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against						

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Percent of agreement milestones completed							
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target					
FY 2006		100%	100% 70%					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against						

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percent of industry-specific trade barrier milestones completed						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006	FY 2006 81% 85%						

Performance was not met, because:

This measure was first reported in FY 2006, however, MAS had prior year information. MAS exceeded 80 percent in FY 2004 and FY 2005. Based on this strong performance MAS set a target of 85 percent in FY 2006. While MAS did not reach its new target, the achievement of 81 percent of industry-specific trade barrier milestones completed exceeds targets of the previous two years.

Strategies for Improvement:

ITA will determine if external factors impact a percentage range of milestones each quarter and assess if 85 percent is a realistic target based on actual baseline trends in FY 2007.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Exports generated annually from public/private partnerships							
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target					
FY 2006		\$446M	\$446M \$267M					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against						

Performance Goal: Broaden and deepen U.S. exporter base (ITA)*

ERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equival	FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percentage of undertaken advocacy cases completed successfully						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006							

Performance was not met, because:

For FY 2006, the Advocacy Center's percentage of cases successfully completed is artificially low because of an unusually large number of cases carried over from FY 2005. This impacts the calculation of the performance metric by maintaining a larger denominator since the total number of cases is usually higher.

Strategies for Improvement:

ITA will examine this measure and determine what actions can be taken to address maintaining a similar number of open advocacy cases from year to year, thus ensuring minimal variation in the annual success rate.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		12%
FY 2004		13%
FY 2003		10%
FY 2002		11.8%
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Number of new-to-market (NTM) export successes ¹						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		4,110	4,760				

Performance was not met, because:

New-to-market (NTM) Export Success (ES) metrics fell short in FY 2006 due to reduced staffing in the domestic field and the application of more stringent controls such as tightening the ES reporting requirements in response to OIG findings.

Strategies for Improvement:

New-to-export (NTE) and NTM successes require a high degree of personalized service. One way to make up for the lack of federal resources is to partner with private sector service providers that can reach potential exporters. ITA will continue to broaden and deepen strategic partnerships and as these partnerships mature, ITA should begin to see more demand for ITA services and more export successes.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		4,888
FY 2004		4,759
FY 2003		6,278
FY 2002		5,740
FY 2001		5,386
FY 2000		New—no target to measure against

¹ From FY 2000 - FY 2005, this measure was "Number of U.S. exporters entering a new market."

^{*} Prior to FY 2006, this goal 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 2006		7,258 5,925					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against					

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of new-to-export (NTE) successes ¹						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		551	700				

Performance was not met, because:

NTE Export Success (ES) metrics fell short in FY 2006 due to reduced staffing in the domestic field and the application of more stringent controls such as tightening the ES reporting requirements in response to OIG findings.

Strategies for Improvement:

NTE and NTM successes require a high degree of personalized service. One way to make up for the lack of federal resources is to partner with private sector service providers that can reach potential exporters. ITA will continue to broaden and deepen strategic partnerships and as these partnerships mature, ITA should begin to see more demand for ITA services and more export successes.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		620
FY 2004		704
FY 2003		896
FY 2002		699
FY 2001		742
FY 2000		New—no target to measure against

¹ From FY 2000 - FY 2005, this measure was "Number of U.S. firms exporting for the first time."

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Number of export successes made as a result of ITA involvement ¹							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		11,919	11,385					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		12,518						
FY 2004		11,382						
FY 2003		14,090						
FY 2002		12,178						
FY 2001		11,160						
FY 2000		New—no target to measure against						

¹ From FY 2000 - FY 2005, this measure was "Number of export transactions made as a result of ITA involvement."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEASURE: Percentage of Commercial Service fee funded programs							
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		3.0%					
Year	Status	Historica	al Results				
FY 2005		2.0%					
FY 2004		2.0%					
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against					

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Dollar value of advocacy cases completed successfully						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		\$33.2B	\$5.0B				

Performance was exceeded because:

The Advocacy Center closed four large cases during the second quarter for Boeing (planes) and GE (engines) with Air India. These four cases, closed at the same time with an estimated \$8.25 billion in U.S. export content. The total for these four successes are high compared to most advocacy successes; although, aerospace cases tend to result in high dollar value successes. Please note: It is challenging to predict when cases will close, as there is are no ways of predicting whether this level of success will be repeated in the future.

Year	Status	Historical Results		
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against		

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹	\$28.7 96	\$29.8 101	\$27.9 90	\$28.3 92	\$29.0 92	\$28.9 92	\$29.5 95	\$29.9 94
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Dollar value of contract awards obtained						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		\$1.1	\$0.85				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		\$0.9					
FY 2004		\$0.95					
FY 2003		\$0.7					
FY 2002		\$1.3					
FY 2001		\$1.6					
FY 2000		\$1.2					
FY 1999		\$0.6					



MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Dollar value of financial awards obtained				
Year	Year Status Actual Target				
FY 2006 \$0.41 \$0.45					

Performance was not met, because:

At the Department's request, MBDA's focus in 2006 was on obtaining contract opportunities for MBEs in support of the Gulf Coast Relief and Recovery.

Strategies for Improvement:

The new MBEC / NABEC programs will focus on access to capital in 2007.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		\$0.5
FY 2004		\$0.6
FY 2003		\$0.4
FY 2002		\$0.4
FY 2001		\$0.6
FY 2000		\$0.2
FY 1999		\$0.7

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Number of new job opportunities created						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		4,000 1,800					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		2,000					
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against	New—no target to measure against				

MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percent increase in client gross receipts					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		7.5%	5%			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		15%				
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against				

	MBDA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of national and regional strategic partnerships ¹						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		235	200				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		220					
FY 2004		210					
FY 2003		8					
FY 2002		6					
FY 2001	FY 2001 New—no target to measure against						
¹ From FY 2002 -	FY 2003. this	s measure did not include regional partnerships.					

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.2

Advance responsible economic growth and trade while protecting American security

OBJECTIVE 1.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)							
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹							
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivale	¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent						

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)						
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual						
Total Funding \$55.0 \$59.0 \$68.0 \$92.8 \$85.8 \$89.5 \$110.7 \$104.9 FTE1 372 375 360 571 341 576 630 589						
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent						

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percentage of AD/CVD proceedings completed within statutory deadlines						
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target				
FY 2006		100%	100%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		100%					
FY 2004		100%					
FY 2003		100%					
FY 2002		100%					
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against					

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of market access and trade compliance cases initiated						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		178 150					
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results				
FY 2005		160					
FY 2004		161					
FY 2003		144					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					

^{*}From FY 2002 - FY 2005, this goal was known as "Ensure fair competition in international trade."

ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE: Percentage of market access and compliance cases initiated for on behalf of small and medium-sized businesses ¹						
Year	Year Status Actual Target					
FY 2006 ¹		28.1% 30%				
Performance was not met, because: This was a new metric. ITA's initial target may require adjustment as baseline data becomes available.						
¹ This is a new measure as of FY 2006, so there are no historical results to present.						

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of market access and compliance cases resolved						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		140	80				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		85					
FY 2004		116					
FY 2003		158					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					

	ITA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Percentage of market access and compliance cases resolved							
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target					
FY 2006		46% / quarter	20% / quarter					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against						

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual							
Total Funding	\$29.6	\$26.5	\$24.0	\$27.6	\$29.8	\$25.8	\$23.8	\$33.4
FTE ¹	185	184	164	156	190	163	148	153
FTE ¹ 1 FTE – Full-Time Equivale		184	164	156	190	163	148	

	BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Percent of licenses requiring interagency referral referred within 9 days							
Year	Status	Actual Target						
FY 2006		98%	95%					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against						

^{*} From FY 2002 - FY 2005, this goal was known as "Advance U.S. national security, foreign policy, and economic interests by enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the export control system." The two measures under the goal "Eliminate illicit activity outside the global export control and treaty compliance system" also apply to this goal.



	BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Median processing time for new regime regulations (months)								
Year	Status Actual Target								
FY 2006		2.5 3.0							
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		1.0							
FY 2004		2.0							
FY 2003		7.0							
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against							

	BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percent of attendees rating seminars highly						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		90%	85%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against					

	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	Actual Target						
FY 2006		100%	100%						
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against							

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Eliminate illicit export activity outside the global export control and treaty compliance system (BIS)*

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)									
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	
	Actual								
Total Funding	\$25.2	\$25.9	\$27.1	\$30.0	\$35.0	\$33.4	\$36.0	\$19.9	
FTE ¹	183	175	178	171	226	214	170	80	
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent									

	BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
١	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								
Year	Status	Actual	Target						
FY 2006		872	350						
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results						
FY 2005		583							
FY 2004		310							
FY 2003		250							
FY 2002		82							
FY 2001		81							
FY 2000		93							
FY 1999		68							

	BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Number of end-use checks completed							
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target					
FY 2006		942	700					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against						

^{*} Prior to FY 2006, this goal was known as "Prevent illegal exports and identify violaters of export prohibitions and restrictions for prosecution." The two measures under this goal also apply to the goal "Maintain and strengthen an adaptable and effective U.S. export control and treaty compliance system."

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹	\$4.2 9	\$4.3 9	\$5.3 9	\$5.5 9	\$6.0 9	\$7.7 9	\$9.9 10	\$22.3 81
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	BIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Number of targeted deficiencies remedied in the export control systems of cooperating countries								
Year	Status	Actual	Target						
FY 2006		40 40							
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		40							
FY 2004		41							
FY 2003		39							
FY 2002		25							
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against							

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)									
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	
	Actual								
Total Funding	New	\$4.2	\$6.5	\$4.5	\$5.9	\$7.0	\$7.3	\$6.6	
FTE ¹	New	30	22	22	29	22	34	39	
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent									

	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 2006		N/A ¹	100%			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against				

¹ No assessments fell within the metric timeframe in FY 2006. Two industry assessments were completed 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 following fiscal years.

^{*} Prior to FY 2006, this goal was known as "Enhance the export and transit controls of nations seeking to improve their export control system."

 $[\]ensuremath{^{**}}$ This goal replaced the goal "Ensure U.S. industry compliance with the CWC agreement."

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.3

Enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, and the American public

OBJECTIVE 1.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$1,731.1	\$4,644.0	\$1,024.9	\$866.2	\$920.9	\$1,009.2	\$1,095.0	\$1,164.9
FTE ¹	21,122	86,867	10,854	8,908	8,223	8,563	8,976	9,321
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

PERFORMANCE GOAL: 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 (ESA/Census)*

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual ²	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$1,676.0	\$4,589.5	\$967.0	\$799.5	\$846.9	\$930.4	\$1,010.9	\$1,079.3
FTE ¹	20,639	86,399	10,380	8,420	7,729	8,038	8,433	8,778

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

² Total obligations for performance goal 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: 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 2006		Met percentages	90% of key censuses & surveys meet/exceed collection rates/ levels of reliability				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		Met percentages					
FY 2004		Met percentages					
FY 2003		Met percentages					
FY 2002		100%					
FY 2001		100%					
FY 2000		100%					
FY 1999		100%					

^{*} In FY 2004, Census combined all their goals into this goal.

9% decrease in time

	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 2006		 1) 100% of Economic Indicators 2) 100% of other products 	 1) 100% of Economic Indicators released on time 2) >89% of other key censuses & surveys data released on time 				
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results				
FY 2005		22 products					
FY 2004		10 products					
FY 2003		2 products	products				
FY 2002		Maintained FY 1999 time					
FY 2001		Maintained FY 1999 time	Naintained FY 1999 time				
FY 2000		Maintained FY 1999 time					

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE

MEASURE: Introduce Census 2000-based samples on time as scheduled so that the household surveys can continue through the next decade and so that policymakers, businesses, and the public can continue to be confident in the major federal socioeconomic indicators these surveys provide

Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		Samples were introduced on schedule 2000-based samples on schedule					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		4 different types of samples					
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against					

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 2006		700	700			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		23				
FY 2004		602 (26.3%)	302 (26.3%)			
FY 2003		250	250			
FY 2002		Prepared plan and systems to measure housing unit coverage				
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against				

FY 1999

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 2006		100% of activities completed on time	>89% of key prep activities completed on time				
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results				
FY 2005		Activities completed on time					
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against					

ESA/CENSUS PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASUR	MEASURE: Meet or exceed the overall federal score of customer satisfaction on the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		72	71.3			
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		73				
FY 2004		71				
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against				

PERFORMANCE GOAL: 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 GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual ²	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$55.1	\$54.5	\$57.9	\$66.7	\$74.0	\$78.8	\$84.1	\$85.6
FTE ¹	483	468	474	488	494	525	543	543
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Timeliness: Reliability of delivery of economic data (number of scheduled releases issued on time)						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		54 of 54	54 of 54				
Year	Status	Historica	I Results				
FY 2005		54 of 54					
FY 2004		54 of 54					
FY 2003		48 of 48					
FY 2002		50 of 50 ¹					
FY 2001		100					
FY 2000		100					
FY 1999		100					

¹ In FY 2002 the format was changed to express the ratio of scheduled releases to those issued on time rather than the percentage of releases successfully released on time.

	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 2006		4.2	Greater than 4.0				
Year	Status	Historica	l Results				
FY 2005		4.4					
FY 2004		4.3					
FY 2003		4.4					
FY 2002		4.3					
FY 2001		N/A ¹					
FY 2000		4.3					
FY 1999		N/A ²					

 $^{^1}$ Due to budget constraints, the FY 2001 survey was postponed until FY 2002. 2 Due to budget constraints, the FY 1999 survey was postponed until FY 2000.

	ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Accuracy: Percent of GDP estimates correct						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		96%	>85%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		96%					
FY 2004		88%					
FY 2003		88%					
FY 2002		83%					
FY 2001		91%					
FY 2000		93%					
FY 1999		New—no target to measure against					

	ESA/BEA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Budget Related: Improving GDP and the economic accounts ¹					
Year	Status	Actual	Target		
FY 2006		Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic accounts	Completion of strategic plan milestones		
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic	accounts		
FY 2004		Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic	accounts		
FY 2003		Completed all major milestones related to improving the economic	accounts		
FY 2002		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.			
FY 2001	7 2001 New—no target to measure against				
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: Accelerating ec	conomic estimates ¹			
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		Completed all major milestones related to accelerating economic estimates	Completion of strategic plan milestones			
Year	Status	Historica	l Results			
FY 2005		Completed all major milestones related to accelerating economic e	estimates			
FY 2004		Completed all major milestones related to accelerating economic e	estimates			
FY 2003		Completed all major milestones related to accelerating economic estimates				
FY 2002 New—no target to measure against						
¹ The BEA Strat	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: Meeting U.S. inter	rnational obligations ¹		
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations	Completion of Strategic plan milestones.		
Year	Status	Historica	l Results		
FY 2005		Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obl	ligations		
FY 2004		Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obl	ligations		
FY 2003		Completed all major milestones related to meeting international obligations			
FY 2002	FY 2002 New—no target to measure against				
The BEA Stra	tegic Plan ar	nd a report card of completed milestones are available in "About BEA	a" on www.bea.gov.		

STRATEGIC GOAL 2

Foster science and technological leadership by protecting intellectual property, enhancing technical standards, and advancing measurement science

STRATEGIC GOAL 2 TOTAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$1,644.0 \$1,912.6 \$1,945.0 \$2,153.7 \$2,241.3 \$2,147.5 \$2,456.8 \$2,719.4 FTE1 9,547 9,578 9,575 10,068 10,074 10,005 10,022 10,582								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.1

Develop tools and capabilities that improve the productivity, quality, dissemination, and efficiency of research

OBJECTIVE 2.1 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$786.5 \$970.0 \$819.0 \$913.5 \$952.8 \$830.1 \$878.5 \$974.2 FTE¹ 3,547 3,351 3,207 3,231 3,242 3,109 2,938 2,896								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002 ²	FY 2003 ²	FY 2004 ²	FY 2005 ²	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$431.5	\$628.5	\$502.1	\$579.2	\$614.1	\$576.8	\$621.6	\$762.4
FTE ¹	2,845	2,760	2,685	2,707	2,725	2,672	2,503	2,550

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

² The TA/US and NIST-Baldrige performance goals were discontinued in FY 2005. FY 2002 - FY 2006 funding amounts are included in this goal.

^{*} Prior to FY 2006, this goal was known as "Promote innovation, facilitate trade, ensure public safety and security, and help create jobs by strengthening the nation's measurements and standards infrastructure."



	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Qualitative assessment and review of technical quality and merit using peer review						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		Completed	Complete annual review				
Year	Status	Historica	al Results				
FY 2005		Completed					
FY 2004		Completed					
FY 2003		Completed					
FY 2002		Completed					
FY 2001		Completed					
FY 2000		Completed					
FY 1999		Completed					

NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Peer-reviewed technical publications produced							
Year	Status	Actual Target						
FY 2006		1,163	1,100					
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results					
FY 2005		1,148						
FY 2004		1,070						
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against						

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Standard reference materials (SRMs) sold ¹						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		31,195	30,000				
Year	Status	Historica	al Results				
FY 2005		32,163					
FY 2004		30,490					
FY 2003		1,214					
FY 2002		1,353					
FY 2001		1,335					
FY 2000		1,292					
FY 1999		1,288					
¹ From FY 1999 ·	¹ From FY 1999 - FY 2003 this was SRMs available.						

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: NIST-maintained datasets downloaded							
Year	Status	Actual Target						
FY 2006		94,371,001	80,000,000					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		93,305,136						
FY 2004		73,601,352						
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against						

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of items calibrated						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		3,026	2,700				
Year	Status	Historic	al Results				
FY 2005		3,145					
FY 2004		3,373					
FY 2003		3,194					
FY 2002		2,924					
FY 2001		3,192					
FY 2000		2,969					
FY 1999		3,118					

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$190.3 \$198.8 \$175.8 \$198.1 \$199.7 \$187.2 \$138.3 \$72.7 FTE1 271 270 239 249 247 204 207 135								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

^{*} Actuals for this performance goal 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 2005 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: Cumulative number of publications							
Year	Status	Actual Target						
FY 2006		1,701 from funding through FY 2005 1,520 from funding through FY 2005						
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		1,462 from funding through FY 2004						
FY 2004		1,245 from funding through FY 2003						
FY 2003		969 from funding through FY 2002						
FY 2002		747 from funding through FY 2001						
FY 2001		565 from funding through FY 2000						
FY 2000		468 from funding through FY 1999						

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Cumulative number of patents								
Year	Status	Actual Target							
FY 2006		1,418 from funding through FY 2005	1,340 from funding throughFY 2005						
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		1,254 from funding through FY 2004							
FY 2004		1,171 from funding through FY 2003							
FY 2003		939 from funding through FY 2002							
FY 2002		800 from funding through FY 2001							
FY 2001		693 from funding through FY 2000							
FY 2000		607 from funding through FY 1999							

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Cumulative number of projects with technologies under commercialization								
Year	Status	Actual	Target						
FY 2006		346 from funding through FY 2005	320 from funding through FY 2005						
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		296 from funding through FY 2004							
FY 2004		271 from funding through FY 2003							
FY 2003		244 from funding through FY 2002							
FY 2002		195 from funding through FY 2001							
FY 2001		166 from funding through FY 2000							
FY 2000		120 from funding through FY 1999							

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

PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE TABLES

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005 ²	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual						
Total Funding	\$131.4	\$104.4	\$106.4	\$108.5	\$111.3	\$46.9	\$102.7	\$111.9
FTE ¹	109	91	87	89	89	68	71	67

¹ FTE - Full-Time Equivalent

² FY 2005 targets were based on FY 2004 consolidated appropriations bill, which included an annual level for MEP of \$39.6 million (which, less rescissions, netted \$38.7 million). Due to the funding cycle of MEP Centers, the MEP system was able (on a one-time basis) to manage the funding decrease in FY 2004 with minimal impact to actual Center funding levels. The MEP system would not be able to sustain the current number of centers in the event of future funding cuts of a similar nature.

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
ME/	MEASURE: Number of clients served by Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) Centers receiving federal funding					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		16,448 from FY 2005 funding	16,640 from FY 2005 funding			

Performance was not met, because:

The number of clients served reflects 99% of the expected number; this is due to MEP encouraging the Centers to transition to engaging U.S. manufacturers in longer-term, technology intensive innovation services. The number of clients served is the only MEP measure that represents actual data; the remaining results are estimates.

Strategies for Improvement

As the program's emphasis shifts towards innovation and technology deployment in line with the Next Generation MEP strategy, MEP's performance evaluation system will be revised to align with program objectives. Outyear targets for number of clients served have been adjusted accordingly.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		16,090 from FY 2004 funding
FY 2004		18,422 from FY 2003 funding
FY 2003		18,748 from FY 2002 funding
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: Increased sales attributed to MEP Centers receiving federal funding								
Year	Status	Actual	Target						
FY 2006		\$2,508 from FY 2005 funding \$591 from FY 2005 funding							
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		\$1,889 from FY 2004 funding							
FY 2004		\$1,483 from FY 2003 funding							
FY 2003		\$953 from FY 2002 funding							
FY 2002		\$636 from FY 2001 funding							
FY 2001		\$698 from FY 2000 funding	398 from FY 2000 funding						
FY 2000		\$425 from FY 1999 funding							

^{*}Actuals for this performance goal 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 2005 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 MEP Centers receiving federal funding							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		\$2,013 from FY 2005 funding	\$740 from FY 2005 funding					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		\$941 from FY 2004 funding						
FY 2004		\$912 from FY 2003 funding						
FY 2003		\$940 from FY 2002 funding						
FY 2002		\$680 from FY 2001 funding						
FY 2001		\$873 from FY 2000 funding						
FY 2000		\$576 from FY 1999 funding						

	NIST PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Cost savings attributed to MEP Centers receiving federal funding							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		\$816 from FY 2005 funding	\$405 from FY 2005 funding					
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		\$721 from FY 2004 funding						
FY 2004		\$586 from FY 2003 funding						
FY 2003		\$681 from FY 2002 funding						
FY 2002		\$442 from FY 2001 funding						
FY 2001		\$482 from FY 2000 funding						
FY 2000		New—no target to measure against						

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Enhance public access to worldwide scientific and technical information through improved acquisition and dissemination activities (NTIS)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual								
Total Funding FTE ¹	\$33.3 322	\$38.3 230	\$34.7 196	\$27.7 186	\$27.7 181	\$19.2 165	\$15.9 157	\$27.2 144
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	NTIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of new items available (annual)						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		673,807 660,000					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		658,138					
FY 2004		553,235					
FY 2003		530,910					
FY 2002		514,129					
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against					

	NTIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Number of information products disseminated (annual)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		30,616,338	27,000,000			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		26,772,015				
FY 2004		25,476,424				
FY 2003		29,134,050				
FY 2002		16,074,862				
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against				

	NTIS PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Customer service					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		98%	95-98%			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		98%				
FY 2004		96%				
FY 2003		97%				
FY 2002		98%				
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against				

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.2

Protect intellectual property and improve the patent and trademark system

OBJECTIVE 2.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$787.5	\$872.2	\$1,008.5	\$1,099.5	\$1,190.9	\$1,233.0	\$1,508.4	\$1,674.4
FTE ¹	5,775	6,007	6,149	6,593	6,581	6,627	6,825	7,446
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Improve the quality of patent products and services and optimize patent processing time (USPTO)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$669.5 \$738.8 \$882.3 \$976.6 \$1,019.6 \$1,059.0 \$1,245.8 \$1,347.9 FTE¹ 4,919 5,136 5,207 5,550 5,815 5,832 6,021 5,994								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Patent allowance error rate					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		3.5%	4.0%			
Year	Status	Historica	l Results			
FY 2005		4.6%				
FY 2004		5.3%				
FY 2003		4.4%				
FY 2002		4.2%				
FY 2001	1	5.4%				
FY 2000		6.6%				
FY 1999		5.5%				
¹ Prior to FY 200	¹ Prior to FY 2002, targets had not yet been developed though USPTO tracked the data.					

USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Patent in-process examination compliance rate					
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		90.0%	86.0%		
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results		
FY 2005		86.2%			
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against			



	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Patent average first action pendency (months)							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		22.6	22.0					
Performance was not met, because: This target was not met because there were more older applications processed than planned. Strategies for Improvement: USPOT expects to meet the goal next year through increased hiring efforts.								
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results					
FY 2005		21.1						
FY 2004		20.2						
FY 2003		18.3						
FY 2002		16.7						
FY 2001		14.4						

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Prior to FY 2000, USPTO had not yet developed targets though it did track data.

13.6

13.8

FY 2000

FY 1999

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Patent average total pendency (months)						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		31.1	31.3				
Year	Status	Historic	al Results				
FY 2005		29.1					
FY 2004		27.6					
FY 2003		26.7					
FY 2002		24.0					
FY 2001		24.7					
FY 2000		25.0					
FY 1999		25.0					

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Patent efficiency					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		\$3,798	\$4,214			
Year	Status	Historica	l Results			
FY 2005		\$3,877				
FY 2004		\$3,556				
FY 2003		\$3,329				
FY 2002	1	\$3,376				
FY 2001		\$3,210				
FY 2000		\$2,917				
FY 1999		\$2,494				
1 Duian ta EV 200	Drive to EV 2002 USDTO had not use developed to roote though it did took date					

¹ Prior to FY 2003, USPTO had not yet developed targets though it did track data.

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Improve the quality of trademark products and services and optimize trademark processing time (USPTO)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$118.0	\$ 133.4	\$ 126.2	\$ 122.9	\$119.4	\$112.0	\$144.9	\$149.6
FTE ¹	856	871	942	873	719	693	730	665
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Trademark final action deficiency rate ¹					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		3.6%	6.5%			
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		5.9%				
FY 2004		5.8%				
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against				

¹ Prior to FY 2006, this measure was known as "Reducing trademark error rate."

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Trademark first action pendency (months)						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		4.8	5.3				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		6.3					
FY 2004		6.6					
FY 2003		5.4					
FY 2002		4.3					
FY 2001		2.7					
FY 2000		5.7					
FY 1999		4.6					

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Trademark average total pendency (months)						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		18.0	18.8				
Year	Status	Historica	al Results				
FY 2005		19.6					
FY 2004		19.5					
FY 2003		19.8					
FY 2002		19.9					
FY 2001		17.8					
FY 2000		17.3					
FY 1999		18.9					

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Trademark first action deficiency rate						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		4.3%					
Year	Status	Historica	al Results				
FY 2005		4.7%					
FY 2004		7.9%					
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against					

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Trademark efficiency					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		\$565	\$635			
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		\$677				
FY 2004		\$542				
FY 2003		\$433				
FY 2002	1	\$487				
FY 2001		\$501				
FY 2000	FY 2000 \$568					
¹ Prior to FY 200	3, USPTO ha	nd not yet developed targets, though it did track data.				

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Trademark average pendency excluding suspended and inter partes cases (months)						
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target				
FY 2006		15.5					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against					

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Create a more flexible organization through transitioning patent and trademark operations to an e-government environment and advancing intellectual property development worldwide (USPTO)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA NA	\$51.9 47	\$62.0 102	\$117.7 74	\$176.9 787
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivale	FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Patent applications filed electronically					
Year	Status Actual Target					
FY 2006		14.1% 10.0%				
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		2.2%	2.2%			
FY 2004		1.5%				
FY 2003		1.3%				
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against				

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Patent applications managed electronically						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		99.9%					
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results				
FY 2005		96.7%					
FY 2004		88.0%					
FY 2003	FY 2003 New—no target to measure against						

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Trademark applications filed electronically						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		93.8%	80%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		88.0%					
FY 2004		73.0%					
FY 2003		57.5%					
FY 2002		38.0%					
FY 2001		24.0%					
FY 2000		New—no target to measure against					



	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Trademark applications managed electronically						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		99.98% 99.0%					
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results				
FY 2005		99.0%					
FY 2004		98.0%					
FY 2003		New—no target to measure against					

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: IP technical activities completed (activities)					
Year	Year Status Actual Target					
FY 2006		239 82				
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		59				
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against				

	USPTO PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: IP technical activities completed (countries)					
Year	r Status Actual Target					
FY 2006		102 77				
Year	Status	Historica	Historical Results			
FY 2005		142				
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against				

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.3

Advance the development of global e-commerce and enhanced telecommunications and information services

OBJECTIVE 2.3 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivale	FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$18.1 \$19.8 \$21.5 \$23.4 \$24.5 \$28.5 \$30.4 \$34.7 FTE¹ 138 135 133 141 147 159 169 154								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE: Timeliness of processing (days)							
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		9 9 or fewer					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		10					
FY 2004		<12	<12				
FY 2003		15					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					

	NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Certification request processing time (months)					
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		4 4 or fewer			
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Space system coordination request processing time					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		95% 80% in 14 days or fewer				
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against				

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Spectrum plans and policies processing time					
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		13 days Comments in 15 days or fewer			
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Milestones completed from the implementation plan of the President's Spectrum Policy Initiative					
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		18 out of 22 18 out of 22			
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002² FY 2003² FY 2004² FY 2005² FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding FTE ¹	\$51.9 87	\$50.6 85	\$96 86	\$72.8 103	\$73.1 104	\$55.9 110	\$39.5 90	\$36.1 86

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

² Amounts for FYs 2002-2004 include those for the discontinued goal "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 FCC docket filings and Congressional proceedings						
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		12 5 dockets and proceedings				
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		5				
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against				

NTIA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Number of Web site views for research publications					
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		94,000/month 75,000/month			
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			

STRATEGIC GOAL 3

Observe, protect, and manage the Earth's resources to promote environmental stewardship

STRATEGIC GOAL 3 TOTAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
FY 1999 ² FY 2000 ² FY 2001 ² FY 2002 ² FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual								
Total Funding FTE ¹	\$2,314.1 12,058	\$2,455.4 10,329	\$3,254.8 11,473	\$3,398.4 11,585	\$3,458.6 11,898	\$3,802.0 11,868	\$4,064.0 11,918	\$4,507.3 12,896

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.1

Advance understanding and predict changes in the Earth's environment to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs

OBJECTIVE 3.1 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)						
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual						
Total Funding FTE ¹						
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent						

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Serve society's needs for weather and water information (NOAA)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)							
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual							
Total Funding \$1,269.4 \$1,260.9 \$1,376.0 \$1,188.8 \$1,284.1 \$883.6 \$898.1 \$929.2 FTE¹ 6,351 5,812 5,997 5,100 4,912 4,760 4,654 4,907							
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

² In FY 2001, NOAA shifted from seven performance goals to four performance goals. Funding and FTE data for FY 1999 - FY 2001 reflect the best approximations of the funding and FTE from the seven goals as they would correspond to the new, four goals. In FY 2002, NOAA added a "Mission Support" goal (without any measures), but with funding, resulting in a significant decrease in funding for the ecosystem goal between FY 2001 and FY 2002, and the weather and water goal between FY 2003 and FY 2004.



	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Tornado warnings lead time (minutes)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target		
FY 2006		12 ¹	13		

Performance was not met, because:

There is a slight risk of not meeting the lead time goals for FY 2006. The lead time value stands at 12.4 minutes, but with very few tornadoes in August and September, this value may not change substantially.

Strategies for Improvement

The Advanced Warning Operations Course (AWOC) will continue to be offered and updated during FY 2006. The inclusion of Federal Aviation Administration Terminal Doppler Weather Radar data in AWIPS Build 0B6 will complement existing WSR-88D data. The Open Radar Data Acquisition (ORDA) platform continues to be deployed. Super Resolution WSR88D data will be added to the ORDA in Build 10 (scheduled for FY 2008). Super resolution data will provide forecasters the capability to view more precise images of tornadic signatures on radar displays, enabling earlier decisions on tornado warning, and reducing false alarms.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		13
FY 2004		13
FY 2003		13
FY 2002		12
FY 2001		10
FY 2000		10
FY 1999		12

¹ Projected. Actuals through July 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Tornado warnings accuracy (%)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		76% ¹	76%			
Year	Status	Historica	I Results			
FY 2005		76%				
FY 2004		75%				
FY 2003		79%				
FY 2002		76%				
FY 2001		67%				
FY 2000		63%				
FY 1999		70%				

¹ Projected. Actuals through July 2006.



	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
	MEASURE: Tornado warnings false alarm rate (%)				
Year	Status	Actual	Target		
FY 2006		79 %¹	75%		

Performance was not met, because:

The FY 2006 FAR Goal of 75 percent will not be met. The current value of 78.5 percent has remained relatively unchanged over the last year. There is a strong statistical relationship between accuracy and FAR using current technology and operational methodology. A higher rate of accuracy results in a higher FAR. National Emergency Managers and media surveys have indicated that higher FAR is tolerable if it results in longer lead times and increased accuracy.

Strategies for Improvement:

The Advanced Warning Operations Course (AWOC) will continue to be offered and updated during FY 2006. The inclusion of Federal Aviation Administration Terminal Doppler Weather Radar data in AWIPS Build 0B6 will complement existing WSR-88D data. The Open Radar Data Acquisition (ORDA) platform continues to be deployed. Super Resolution WSR88D data will be added to the ORDA in Build 10 (scheduled for FY 2008). Super resolution data will provide forecasters the capability to view more precise images of tornadic signatures on radar displays, enabling earlier decisions on tornado warning, and reducing false alarms.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		77%
FY 2004		74%
FY 2003		76%
FY 2002		73%
FY 2001		73%
FY 2000		76%
FY 1999		73%

¹ Projected. Actuals through July 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Flash flood warnings lead time (minutes)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		50 ¹	48			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		54				
FY 2004		47				
FY 2003		41				
FY 2002		52				
FY 2001		46				
FY 2000		43				
FY 1999		44				

¹ Projected. Actuals through July 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEASURE: Flash flood warnings accuracy (%)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target		
FY 2006		88%1	89%		

Performance was not met, because:

For the October-July timeframe, NWS is exceeding the lead time, but slightly below the accuracy for the FY 2006 annual performance goals. As noted above, at this time of year results are expected to fall. It is anticipated that these measures will continue to decline as the convective season progresses.

Strategies for Improvement:

Enhancements to AWIPS, ASOS, NERON, and WSR-88D radar are being made to improve performance.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		89%
FY 2004		89%
FY 2003		89%
FY 2002		89%
FY 2001		86%
FY 2000		86%
FY 1999		83%

¹ Projected. Actuals through July 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Hurricane forecast track error (48 hours) (nautical miles)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		101 ¹	111			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		101				
FY 2004		94				
FY 2003		107				
FY 2002		122				
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against				

¹ Projected. Final data will be available in February 2007. Because of the time lag, and that this measure in the FY 2005 PAR was reported as "N/A" for FY 2005, the updated results for FY 2005 are used for evaluation purposes, giving the performance a "met" result.



	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Accuracy (%) (threat score) of day 1 precipitation forecasts ¹					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		30	28			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		29				
FY 2004		29				
FY 2003		29				
FY 2002		26				
FY 2001		19				
FY 2000		16				
FY 1999	New—no target to measure against					

¹ From FYs 2000 - FY 2002, this was accuracy of 3-day forecast.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Winter storm warnings lead time (hours)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		17	15			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		17				
FY 2004		15				
FY 2003		14				
FY 2002		13				
FY 2001		13				
FY 2000		9				
FY 1999		New—no target to measure against				



NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Winter storm warnings accuracy (%)					
Year	Year Status Actual Target				
FY 2006		89%	90%		

Performance was not met, because:

During the third quarter, the cumulative percentage dropped to 89 percent when rounded from .8944 which is below the FY 2006 goal of 90 percent.

Strategies for Improvement

Enhancements to NERON and models such as Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) are being made to allow more precise and timely warnings.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		91%
FY 2004		91%
FY 2003		90%
FY 2002		89%
FY 2001		90%
FY 2000		85%
FY 1999		New—no target to measure against

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASUR	MEASURE: Cumulative percentage of U.S. shoreline and inland areas that have improved ability to reduce coastal hazard impacts					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		32%	32%			
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		28%				
FY 2004		17%				
FY 2003		17%				
FY 2002		8%				
FY 2001		8%				
FY 2000		8%				
FY 1999		7%				

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Performance Goal: Understand climate variability and change to enhance society's ability to plan and respond (NOAA)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding FTE ¹	*							
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivale	¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
ME	MEASURE: U.S. temperature forecasts (cumulative skill score computed over the regions where predictions are made)					
Year	Status	Actual	Target			
FY 2006		25	18			
Year	Status	Historica	ıl Results			
FY 2005		19				
FY 2004		17				
FY 2003		17				
FY 2002		18				
FY 2001		20				
FY 2000		25				
FY 1999		23.3				

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Reduce the uncertainty in the magnitude of the North American (NA) carbon uptake					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		0.40 GtC/yr	0.40 GtC/yr			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		0.40 GtC/yr	0.40 GtC/yr			
FY 2004		0.50 GtC/yr				
FY 2003		0.80 GtC/yr				
FY 2002		Identified 5 pilot sites and 4 carbon tracks				
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against				

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Reduce the uncertainty in model simulations of the influence of aerosols on climate					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		10%	Establish 10% improvement			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against				

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Determine the national explained variance (%) for temperature and precipitation for the contiguous United States using USCRN stations					
Status	Actual Target				
	Temperature-97.0% Precipitation-91.8%	Temperature-97.0% Precipitation-91.4%			
Status	Historica	l Results			
	Temperature-96.9% / Precipitation-91.4%				
	Temperature-96% / Precipitation-90%				
	Temperature-95%/ Precipitation-84%				
	Temperature-85%/ Precipitation-55%				
	New—no target to measure against				
	Status	MEASURE: Determine the national explained variance (%) for temperature Status Status Actual Temperature-97.0% Precipitation-91.8% Status Temperature-96.9% / Precipitation-91.4% Temperature-96% / Precipitation-90% Temperature-95% / Precipitation-84% Temperature-85% / Precipitation-55%			

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Reduce the error in global measurement of sea surface temperature						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		0.53°C 0.5°C					
	Performance was not met, because: The measure actual is slightly below the target of .5°C, due to drifting buoys not being in the right place at the right time.						
Strategies for Improvement: NOAA will continue to refine the deployment of the buoys to cover these gaps.							
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against					

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE: In	MEASURE: Improve society's ability to plan and respond to climate variability and change using NOAA climate products and information						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		33 assessments/evaluations	32 assessments/evaluations				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against					

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.2

Enhance the conservation and management of coastal and marine resources to meet America's economic, social, and environmental needs

OBJECTIVE 3.2 RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$842.2 \$978.1 \$1,640 \$1,584.1 \$1,576.5 \$1,461.3 \$1,554.5 \$1,758.0 FTE¹ 4,673 4,040 4,783 3,984 4,365 4,327 4,228 4,444								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Protect, restore, and manage the use of coastal and ocean resources through an ecosystem approach to management (NOAA)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$744.7	\$873.6	\$1,504	\$1,334.2	\$1,314.9	\$1,268.5	\$1,379.5	\$1,559.3
FTE ¹	3,795	3,233	3,913	3,042	3,361	3,611	3,479	3,670
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of overfished major stocks of fish						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		411 42					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		42					
FY 2004		422					
FY 2003		423					
FY 2002		45					
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against					

¹ Estimate. Final actual will be available by December 31, 2006.

 $^{^{2}}$ Actual revised from 43 to 42 due to restatement of FY 2003 actual.

³ The baseline was reduced from 46 stocks to 44 due to one stock having mistakenly been listed as overfished in 2000 and two other stocks being merged into one. This reduction is in addition to the previous reduction caused by 10 pacific salmon stocks being listed as endangered and therefore removed from the fishery management regime. This number had been reported erroneously as 43 in the FY 2004 PAR and 44 in the FY 2006 APP. The procedures that led to these errors have been overhauled.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
	MEASURE: Number of major stocks with an "unknown" stock status					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		711	712			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		74 ³				
FY 2004		774				
FY 2003		94				
FY 2002		88				
FY 2001		New—no target to measure against				

¹ This is the 3rd quarter number as of June 30, 2006. The final actual as of September 30, 2006 will be available by December 31, 2006.

⁴ The FY 2004 actual reflects technical changes in the way stocks are reported that reduced the baseline by 10 stocks.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: N	MEASURE: Number of protected species designated as threatened, endangered, or depleted with stable or increasing population levels					
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		24	24			
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against				

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE: Number of stocks of protected species with adequate population assessments						
Year	Status	Actual Target				
FY 2006		60 ¹ 59				
Year	Status	Historical Results				
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against				

¹ Estimate. Final actual will be available by December 31, 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Number of habitat acres restored (annual/cumulative) ¹						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		7,598 / 32,514	4,500 / 29,416				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		8,333 / 24,916					
FY 2004		5,563 / 16,583					
FY 2003		5,200 / 11,020					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					

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

² This is an update of the FY 2005 target of 70 that appeared in the FY 2007 APP as a result of the revision of the FY 2005 actual from 73 to 74. It represents the same 3 stock reduction in the number of stocks of unknown status.

³ This is an update of the estimate for FY 2005 of 73 that appeared in the FY 2005 PAR. The increase was due to unanticipated reversions of stocks from known to unknown status.



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 2006		31 31			
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE				
MEAS	MEASURE: Annual number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes ecological characterizations that meet management needs				
Year	Status	Actual Target			
FY 2006		62 53			
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			

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 2006		>86M¹	200,137		
Year	Status	Historical Results			
FY 2005		New—no target to measure against			
¹ The large FY 2006 actual reflects the new Northwest Hawaiian Islands Marine National Monument.					

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Support the nation's commerce with information for safe, efficient, and environmentally sound transportation (NOAA)

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002 ²	FY 2003 ²	FY 2004 ²	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total Funding	\$97.5	\$104.5	\$136	\$249.9	\$261.6	\$192.8	\$175	\$198.7
FTE ¹	878	807	870	942	1,004	716	749	774

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

² In the FY 2004 PAR, the 2002-2004 amounts for the mission support goal were distributed among the four goals. 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 goals.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
MEASURE:	MEASURE: Reduce the hydrographic survey backlog within navigationally significant areas (square nautical miles surveyed per year) ¹						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		2,851 2,500					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		3,079					
FY 2004		2,070					
FY 2003		1,762					
FY 2002		1,514					
FY 2001		2,963					
FY 2000		1,557					

¹ Prior to FY 2003, NOAA's targets were in the form of percent reduction, not miles. NOAA changed this methodology in FY 2003, but had actual data (shown here) back to FY 2000.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEAS	MEASURE: Percentage of U.S. counties rated as fully enabled or substantially enabled with accurate positioning capacity						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		43.25					
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		32.2					
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against					



NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE MEASURE: Accuracy (%) of forecasts of ceiling and visibility (aviation forecasts) Year Status Actual Target FY 2006 43%² 47%

Performance was not met, because:

Past experience has shown NOAA's ceiling and visibility percentage tends to be negatively impacted when instrument flight rules (IFR) occurrences average less than 200,000 hours a year. The baseline began in 2002, since that time FYs 2002-2004 and FY 2006 have all suffered less than normal IFR occurrences, with normal about 200,000 hours. Decreases as little as seven to 15 percent from the 200,000 average, have all contributed to lower percentage scores. NOAA also knows that its forecasts are heavily linked to guidance. For example, over the past three years NOAA has maintained about a 35 percent improvement over model output statistics (MOS) guidance. This year guidance accuracy was down about seven percent from last year, equating to about a .02-.03 downward direction for NOAA's percentage.

Strategies for Improvement:

The following projects are aimed at enhancing forecast performance all year:

OCWWS and the aviation focal points have increased emphasis on individual verification statistics through Stats-on-Demand. This is leading to increased enrollment in the program as forecasters begin to track their individual verification numbers, and work with the local focal points to assess the information.

OCWWS will continue working with the Regional Aviation Meteorologists (RAMs) to encourage offices to actively improve their local programs and forward their ideas to the regions, which in turn helps the RAMs assess their region's performance.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		46%
FY 2004		45%
FY 2003		48%
FY 2002		13%
FY 2001		18%
FY 2000		15%
FY 1999		New—no target to measure against

¹ From FY 1999 - FY 2002, a different method was used to calculate accuracy and FAR—targets were significantly lower than current method.

² Projected. Actuals through August 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE								
	MEASURE: False alarm rate (FAR) (%) of ceiling and visibility (aviation forecasts) ¹								
Year	Status	Actual	Target						
FY 2006		64%2 65%							
Year	Status	Historical Results							
FY 2005		63%							
FY 2004		65%	65%						
FY 2003		64%							
FY 2002		58%							
FY 2001		51%							
FY 2000		53%							
FY 1999		New—no target to measure							

¹ From FY 1999 - FY 2002, a different method was used to calculate accuracy and FAR—targets were significantly lower than current method.

² Projected. Actuals through August 2006.

NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Marine wind speed accuracy (%) ¹					
Year	Status	Actual	Target		
FY 2006		55%²	58%		

Performance was not met, because:

Marine wind speed forecast scores naturally vary (accuracy +/- four percent per year) due to fluctuations in the number of extreme events measured over NWS marine areas per year. The higher the number of extreme events, the greater opportunity a forecaster has to increase forecast performance/accuracy. Conversely a high number of extreme events also increases the risk a forecaster has to decrease forecast performance/accuracy.

Strategies for Improvement:

- 1) Marine Models: Expand use of local mesoscale models such as Weather Research and Forecast (WRF) model and local versions of WRF to all marine WFOs.
- 2) Marine Observations:
 - (a) Targeted marine observations, expansion of NWLON, PORTS, and NDBC observations that fill in significant data gaps.
 - (b) Display of high resolution satellite derived wind vectors.
- 3) AWIPS: Enhance System on AWIPS for Forecasting and Evaluation of Seas and Lakes (SAFESEAS) to provide a prediction capability tool for marine forecasters.
- 4) Marine Weather Training: Continue development of a series of wind and wave modules.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		57%
FY 2004		57%
FY 2003		57%
FY 2002		53%
FY 2001		52%
FY 2000		51%
FY 1999		New—no target to measure

¹ From FY 1999 - FY 2002, this was combined with Marine Wave Height accuracy.

² Projected. Actuals through August 2006.

	NOAA PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Marine wave height accuracy (%) ¹						
Year	Year Status Actual Target						
FY 2006		70 %²	68%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		67%					
FY 2004		67%					
FY 2003		71%					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure					

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ From FY 1999 - FY 2002, this was combined with "Marine wind speed accuracy. "

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

PERFORMANCE GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual								
Total Funding FTE ¹				\$313.5 1,716	\$250.5 1,996	\$1,217.6 2,178	\$1,354.5 2,437	\$1,584.0 2,880
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivale	¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

² Projected. Actuals through August 2006.

^{*} There are no GPRA measures for the Mission Suppot goal since the activities of this goal support the outcomes of the four other NOAA goals.

MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION GOAL

Achieve organizational and management excellence

MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)								
	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
	Actual							
Total Funding	\$34.7	\$33.0	\$60.6	\$70.1	\$71.2	\$72.8	\$70.9	\$71.8
FTE ^{1,2}	207	185	310	319	326	309	292	295

¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Identify and effectively manage human and material resources critical to the success of the Department's strategic goals (DM)

				CE GOAL RESO rs in Millions)	URCES			
	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Actual	FY 2001 Actual	FY 2002 Actual	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual
Total Funding \$34.7 \$33.0 \$40.7 \$49.2 \$49.2 \$51.8 \$49.5 \$49.3 FTE¹ 207 185 171 183 186 181 177 177								
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent								

	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 2006		Reportable condition not eliminated	Eliminate any reportable condition within 1 year of determ; 95% of management with access to the CRS have financial data / reports by the 15th of month				

Performance was not met, because:

Efforts to eliminate the basis for the MFIA material weakness by improving the quality of system certification and accreditation (C&A) documentation continues Department-wide, largely due to underestimation of the time necessary for adequate testing of system controls and documenting the evidence of control tests and analyses in an acceptable manner.

Strategies for Improvement:

The Department plans to continue the C&A improvement effort and expand C&A training of personnel in FY 2007, with an expectation of removing the basis for the material weakness during calendar year 2007.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		Reportable condition not eliminated
FY 2004		100
FY 2003		100
FY 2002		100
FY 2001		100
FY 2000		100
FY 1999		100

¹ Prior to FY 2005, this was stated as "Clean audit opinion on Department's consolidated financial statements."

² The Office of Inspector General (OIG) was not included in the PAR prior to FY 2001. Therefore, its funding and FTE are not included in FYs 1999 and 2000.

	DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Effectively use competitive sourcing ¹							
Year	Status	Actual	Target					
FY 2006		Green Plan ² submitted to OMB on 9/28/2006 Finalize new green competition plan based on 8/2005 CFO coutcome						
Year	Status	Historical Results						
FY 2005		Feasability studies nominated for I68 FTE						
FY 2004		New FAIR inventory guidance developed						
FY 2003		Completed competition on 6.6%						
FY 2002		Completed competition on 1%						
FY 2001		Commercial inventory - submitted 6/30/2001						
FY 2000		Commercial inventory - submitted 6/30/2000						
FY 1999		Commercial inventory - submitted 7/9/1999						

¹ From FY 1999 to FY 2000 this measure was shown as "Expand A-76 competitions and more accurate FAIR Act inventories".

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

	DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE					
MEASURE: Obligate funds through performance-based contracting						
Year	Year Status Actual Target					
FY 2006		30%1	50%			

Performance was not met, because:

The Department has established a higher target than the government-wide goal of 40 percent because of the belief that performance based service acquisition is a key mechanism in obtaining higher quality services and developing improved partnerships with industry. However, due to staffing shortages, OAMFA has not had the resources to assist the bureaus and program offices with a better understanding of performance based service acquisition.

Strategies for Improvement:

In FY 2007, staff will be realigned to focus on this issue and develop and commence implementation of a plan of action.

Year	Status	Historical Results
FY 2005		< 50%
FY 2004		42%
FY 2003		24%
FY 2002		31%
FY 2001		25%
FY 2000		New—no target to measure against
¹ Estimate.		

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
MEASURE: Obligate contracts to small businesses ¹							
Year	Status	Actual	Actual Target				
FY 2006		48.0%	44.8%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		61.7%					
FY 2004		61.95%					
FY 2003		45%					
FY 2002		51%					
FY 2001		Small Business-50%, Minority-owned Business-18%, Women-owned Business-9%					
FY 2000		Small Business-34%, Minority-owned Business-20%, Women-owned Business-6%					
FY 1999		Small Business-42%, Minority-owned Business-14%, Women-owned	ed Business-5%				

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ From FY 1999 to FY 2001 this measure was split among small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses.

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Acquire and maintain diverse and highly qualified staff in mission-critical occupations						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		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				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		Improved representation in underreported groups from 28 to 29%, maintained 30 day fill time					
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against					

DM PERFORMANCE MEASURE							
	MEASURE: Improve the management of information technology						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		Cost overruns and performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical & mission critical systems certified & accredited in accordance with the Department's IT security policy. Efforts continue to improve the quality of the C&A process and documentation.	Cost/schedule overruns /performance shortfalls less than 10%. All national critical and mission critical systems certified and accredited.				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		Cost overruns and performance shortfalls less than 10%					
FY 2004		New—no target to measure against					

PERFORMANCE GOAL: Promote improvements to Commerce 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 GOAL RESOURCES (Dollars in Millions)							
	FY 1999 FY 2000 FY 2001 FY 2002 FY 2003 FY 2004 FY 2005 FY 2006 Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual						
Total Funding FTE ¹	*						
¹ FTE – Full-Time Equivalent							

	OIG PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percentage of OIG recommendations accepted by departmental and bureau management						
Year	Status	Actual	Target				
FY 2006		96%	95%				
Year	Status	Historica	I Results				
FY 2005		99%					
FY 2004		97.5%					
FY 2003		97%					
FY 2002	1	95%					
FY 2001	1	95%					
FY 2000	1	96%					
10.1							

¹ Prior to FY 2003	OIG had not yet de	eveloped targets.	However, IG did track data.

	OIG PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Dollar value of financial benefits identified by OIG						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		\$34.2M	\$ 30.0M				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		\$32.0M					
FY 2004		\$26.0M	\$26.0M				
FY 2003		\$43.3M					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					

	OIG PERFORMANCE MEASURE						
	MEASURE: Percentage of criminal and civil matters that are accepted for prosecution						
Year	Status	Actual Target					
FY 2006		91%	63%				
Year	Status	Historical Results					
FY 2005		81%					
FY 2004		67%					
FY 2003		50%					
FY 2002		New—no target to measure against					