

PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

**STRATEGIC GOAL 1**

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

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.1**

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

**PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Increase private investment and job creation in economically distress communities (EDA)**

**Performance Measures:**

- *Private investment leveraged*
- *Jobs created/retained*

The actual FY 2007 outcomes reported are the three-year performance results of FY 2004 Public Works and Economic Development and Economic Adjustment Assistance infrastructure and Revolving Loan Fund investments, the six-year performance results of the FY 2001 Public Works and Economic Development and Economic Adjustment Assistance investments, and the nine-year performance results of the FY 1998 Public Works and Economic Development and Economic Adjustment Assistance investments. Based on a study done by Rutgers University, the formula-driven calculation projected investment data at three, six, and nine-year intervals from the investment award. The Economic Development Administration (EDA) initially estimated that 10 percent of the nine-year projection would be realized after three years, and 50 percent after six years. Actual results for FY 1997 and FY 1998 performance measures showed that 20 percent of the nine-year projections was realized within the first three years, so EDA adjusted the three-year target to 20 percent. EDA will continue to analyze actual private investment and job creation/retention results to collect smooth trend data prior to modifying the targets further. Actual results reported here reflect a 25 percent discount to account for the attribution of jobs to dollars and economic conditions other than EDA dollars.

<b>Data Source</b>	Investment Recipient Performance Reports
<b>Frequency</b>	At three-year intervals (typically three, six, and nine years after investment award)
<b>Data Storage</b>	EDA Management Information System
<b>Internal Controls</b>	To validate data, EDA regions contacted recipients, or confirmed with engineers or project officers who had been on site. EDA will perform regional validation on-site visit with some recipients.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Universe—Regular Appropriation for Public Works and Economic Development and Economic Adjustment Assistance implementation and Revolving Loan Fund investments. Private investment may vary along with economic cycles.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	EDA will continue to monitor investment and job creation data.



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

**Performance 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*

This measure indicates whether the CEDS process is market-based and whether EDA helps to create an environment conducive to the creation and retention of higher-skill, higher-wage jobs. FY 2002 research established a baseline measure for subsequent years.

<b>Data Source</b>	Investment Recipient Performance Evaluations and CEDS
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	EDA Management Information System
<b>Internal Controls</b>	EDA will conduct periodic performance reviews and site visits.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	This measure may vary with economic cycles due to limited local resources during downturns for project investments.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	EDA established a baseline from FY 2002 data and will continue to monitor and develop trend data.

**Performance Measure:**

- *Percentage of sub-state jurisdiction members actively participating in the economic development district (EDD) program*

EDDs generally consist of three or more counties that are considered member jurisdictions. Sub-state jurisdiction participation indicates the District's responsiveness to the area it serves and shows that the services it provides are of value. EDA defined active participation as either attendance at meetings or financial support of the EDD during the reporting period. Sub-state jurisdiction members are independent units of government (cities, towns, villages, counties, etc.) and eligible entities substantially associated with economic development, as set forth by the District's by-laws or alternate enabling document.

<b>Data Source</b>	Investment Recipient Performance Evaluations
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	EDA Management Information System
<b>Internal Controls</b>	EDA conducts performance reviews and site visits on approximately one-third of the District and Indian tribe investments per year.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	While an EDD may be effective, members still may not participate for other reasons.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	EDA will continue to monitor compliance with the new definition of sub-state member jurisdictions.

**Performance Measures:**

- *Percentage of University Center clients taking action as a result of the assistance facilitated by the University Center*
- *Percentage of those actions taken by University Center clients that achieved the expected results*
- *Percentage of Trade Adjustment Assistance Center (TAAC) clients taking action as a result of the assistance facilitated by the TAACs*
- *Percentage of those actions taken by Trade Adjustment Assistance Center clients that achieved the expected results*

The first two measures focus on the perceived value added by University Centers and TAACs to their clients. EDA funds 59 University Centers that provide technical assistance and specialized services (e.g., feasibility studies, marketing research) to local officials and communities. This assistance improves the community's capacity to plan and manage successful development

## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

projects. University Centers develop client profiles and report findings to EDA, which evaluates the performance of each center once every three years and verifies the data. EDA funds 11 TAACs that work with U.S. firms and industries adversely impacted as a result of increased imports of similar or competitive goods, to identify specific actions to improve each firm's competitive position in world markets. Taking action as a result of the assistance facilitated means to implement an aspect of the technical assistance provided by the University Center or TAAC in one or several areas. For University Centers it involves economic development initiatives and training session development; linkages to crucial resources; economic development planning; project management; community investment package development; geographic information system services; strategic partnering to public or private-sector entities; increased organizational capacity; feasibility plans; marketing studies; technology transfer; new company, product, or patent developed; and other services. For TAACs, it involves three main types of assistance to firms: help in preparing petitions for certification (which must be approved by EDA in order for the firm to receive technical assistance), analysis of the firm's strengths and weaknesses and development of an adjustment proposal, and in-depth assistance for implementation of the recovery strategy as set forth in the adjustment proposal.

The second two measures are follow-ups to the previous two measures. These measures determine if the assistance provided by the University Center or TAAC is market-based and results in desired outcomes. University Centers develop client profiles and report to EDA, which will evaluate and verify the performance of each University Center once every three years. TAACs conduct client surveys and report findings to EDA.

<b>Data Source</b>	University Center/TAAC client profiles
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	EDA Management Information System
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Performance data will be verified by the University Centers and TAACs. EDA headquarters will annually review profile data.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	While the assistance may be valued, clients may choose not to act for other reasons. Outside mitigating factors such as the local economy may affect the measure.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	EDA established the baseline from FY 2002 data and will continue to monitor and develop trend data.

### PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: Enhance U.S. competitiveness in domestic and international markets (ITA)

#### Performance Measure:

- *Annual cost savings resulting from the adoption of MAS recommendations contained in MAS studies and analysis*

This measure captures the work of Manufacturing and Services (MAS) analysts who evaluate the upstream and downstream impact of various regulations on U.S. manufacturers and service providers with the goal of reducing the cost of regulation.

<b>Data Source</b>	MAS analytical reports and studies
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Chief Financial Officer (CFO) staff will perform analysis to verify results and data sources.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	A number of factors, including U.S. business cooperation, global trade trends, political developments, and other federal regulatory agencies may impact the actual numbers.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A



APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Percent reduction in per unit cost of data distribution***

This measure captures the per unit dollar cost for MAS to distribute economic data electronically. This measure focuses on how efficiently MAS carries out the specific services it provides to U.S. industry.

<b>Data Source</b>	MAS planning staff
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	CFO staff will perform analysis to verify results and data sources.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Percent of agreement milestones completed***

This measure captures the work of MAS industry analysts and trade negotiators who work on multi-year free trade agreements (FTA) that benefit U.S. exporters and are intended to enhance U.S. competitiveness. These milestones ensure that MAS efforts are aligned to the President's American Competitiveness Initiative, as well as to the Department's Standards Initiative. These milestones track the MAS program's progress toward accomplishing key tasks associated with strengthening domestic and international competitiveness.

<b>Data Source</b>	MAS sector analysis
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	CFO staff will perform analysis to verify results and data sources.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	These agreement milestones are occasionally subject to externalities such as delays in trade meetings with foreign governments.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Percent of industry-specific trade barrier milestones completed***

This measure reports on the success of MAS industry analysis staff to target and remove industry-specific trade barriers. MAS tracks its progress in achieving market openings through the removal or prevention of these barriers. MAS tracks key milestones for each barrier. Industry has identified, and MAS program staff assessed, barriers to establish their commercial and strategic value. An example includes MAS efforts to prevent the adoption of wireless encryption standards in China that would adversely affect U.S. manufacturers of wireless devices. MAS anticipates that it will complete an ambitious number of milestones annually.

<b>Data Source</b>	MAS sector analysis
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	CFO staff will perform analysis to verify results and data sources.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	These agreement milestones are occasionally subject to externalities such as delays in trade meetings with foreign governments.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Number of advocacy successes for the fiscal year*

This measure captures information about the effectiveness of Commercial Services advocacy efforts by measuring the percentage of successful advocacy awards made to U.S. firms during a fiscal year. The International Trade Administration's (ITA) Advocacy Center helps U.S. exporters win foreign government procurement contracts, and each contract creates and retains U.S. jobs over the life of each project. The Advocacy Center advances trade promotion and deal making to support three basic U.S. firm needs: (1) access to new markets, (2) entry to markets, and (3) expansion of export activities.

<b>Data Source</b>	U.S. companies that benefit from U.S. government advocacy.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	The Advocacy Center conducts annual verifications with customers to confirm the dollar value of exports generated through the support of U.S. government effort.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	In some cases a host government overturns awards, and the winning U.S. company then loses the project. Quality of data is dependent on client's willingness to provide the data. Some clients elect not to provide information to ITA due to business proprietary concerns. U.S. embassies in some instances do not report all advocacy projects they have worked on in a given fiscal year.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

**Performance Measures:**

- *Number of new-to-market (NTM) export successes*
- *Number of increase-to-market (ITM) export successes*
- *Number of new-to-export (NTE) successes*

The first measure assesses Commercial Services success in assisting U.S. exporters to export into a new overseas market. The second measure gauges the success of ITA in helping U.S. suppliers expand their export transactions in markets where they have already sold U.S. products and services. The third measure focuses on small, export-ready businesses that haven't yet exported. All three of these measures focus on Commercial Services effectiveness in promoting trade.

<b>Data Source</b>	U.S. exporters/firms
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Client Management System and PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	ITA performs quality control, including error checking and elimination of duplicates, and verifies results through peer review of verifiable documentation.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data reported are wholly dependent on a client's willingness to provide such information and underreporting is likely.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measure:

- ***Number of export successes made as a result of ITA involvement***

This performance measure captures information on the number of export transactions executed by U.S. firms that resulted directly from Commercial Services counseling, matchmaking, research, information products, or other export promotion activities. An export transaction occurs when the Commercial Service: facilitates an actual verifiable export sale, a shipment of goods or delivery of services; helps a client identify and sign with an agent or distributor or sign a contract that ensures the expectation of future sales, where there is a direct link between the assistance provided and the resulting outcome; and helps a U.S. firm avoid harm or loss, for example, by helping it obtain payment or resolve some other kind of trade dispute.

<b>Data Source</b>	U.S. exporters/firms
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Client Management System and PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	ITA performs quality control, including error checking and elimination of duplicates, and verifies results through peer review of verifiable documentation.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data reported are wholly dependent on a client's willingness to provide such information and underreporting is likely.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

### Performance Measure:

- ***Dollar value of advocacy cases completed successfully***

This measure provides specific information about the effectiveness of Commercial Services advocacy efforts by determining the associated dollar volume of ITA's success in providing U.S. companies with coordinated, strategic government support. The measure indicates the specific dollar value of U.S. export content of advocacy cases completed successfully as evidenced by a contract award, signed contract or other significant export-related benefit. There are occasions where completed significant advocacy projects cause excessive variance with the annual target.

<b>Data Source</b>	U.S. companies that benefit from U.S. government advocacy.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Client Management System and PBViews
<b>Internal Controls</b>	The Advocacy Center conducts annual verifications with customers to confirm the dollar value of exports generated through the support of U.S. government effort.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	In some cases a host government overturns awards, and the winning U.S. company then loses the project. Quality of data is dependent on client's willingness to provide the data. Some clients elect not to provide information to ITA due to business proprietary concerns. U.S. embassies in some instances do not report all advocacy projects they have worked on in a given fiscal year.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

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

**Performance Measures:**

- *Dollar value of contract awards obtained (billions)*
- *Dollar value of financial awards obtained (billions)*
- *Number of new job opportunities created*
- *Percent increase in client gross receipts*

The Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) accomplishes its performance outcome through the implementation of several business development programs. The success of these programs is reflected in the first measure—the dollar value of contract awards obtained by minority business enterprises (MBE) and facilitated by MBDA's grantees and staff. The certainty that MBEs will realize the proceeds associated with these awards varies from contract to contract. Multiple year contracts with option years are less certain as the options may or may not be exercised. MBDA includes the full potential value of multiple year contract awards obtained in its annual reporting for this performance measure, and discloses the dollar value of option years in a footnote. For indefinite-delivery contracts, only actual dollar values realized or guaranteed are included in the annual reporting of this performance measure. The second measure reflects the cumulative dollar value of transactions that have been approved, verified, and validated for each financial package (loans, lines of credit, surety bonds, etc.) obtained for clients serviced by MBDA-funded projects, Agency staff, or the MBDA portal online tools. The third measure focuses specifically on the number of jobs created within MBEs as a result of contract and financial services provided by MBDA-funded projects and Agency staff. The fourth measure tracks increases in MBE gross receipts to determine the growth in firm size to further achieve entrepreneurial parity. This measure focuses specifically on the increase to individual MBE receipts as a result of the services provided by MBDA-funded projects and staff.

<b>Data Source</b>	Secured Internet transmission to Program Performance System
<b>Frequency</b>	Semi-annual reports
<b>Data Storage</b>	Oracle platform
<b>Verification:</b>	Source verification by regional project managers.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data integrity dependent on Agency verification policy.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Review quarterly by Office of Performance and Program Evaluation (OPPE) staff.

**Performance Measure:**

- *Percent increase in American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)*

Working with the Federal Consulting Group at the Department of Treasury and the University of Michigan, MBDA has developed a program module to measure customer satisfaction and has established an ACSI. This survey is taken in odd numbered years.

<b>Data Source</b>	Contracted survey
<b>Frequency</b>	Two year follow-up Survey
<b>Data Storage</b>	Established model for benchmark
<b>Verification:</b>	Client performance system database for Agency programs.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data integrity dependent on Agency verification policy.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Review quarterly by OPPE staff.



**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1.2**

***Advance responsible economic growth and trade while protecting American security***

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

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Percentage of AD/CVD proceedings completed within statutory deadlines***

The percentage of antidumping/countervailing duty (AD/CVD) cases completed on time is a reflection of the vigilance of ITA staff to complete its casework within the statutory timeframe. Domestic industry generates AD/CVD cases, and the timeliness of case activity is a critical factor for delivering customer satisfaction and essential for upholding the integrity of the AD/CVD laws as a credible and fair legal mechanism to address unfair trade actions by foreign interests. The timely completion of these cases may have a direct correlation to the ability of petitioning U.S. firms to remain viable when a firm may be subjected to unfair trading practices. Ensuring expedient completion of cases offers firms the best timeframe for determining if they are being injured by an unfair trading practice. The stated target reflects management's prioritization of adherence to statutory requirements. ITA is required to complete these cases within the time limits set forth in law.

<b>Data Source</b>	Import Administration (IA) cases completed in accordance with the statutory deadline.
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	IA cases completed in accordance with the statutory deadline.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Each case is supported by final determinations, including Federal Register notices.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

**Performance Measures:**

- ***Number of market access and trade compliance cases initiated***
- ***Number of market access and compliance cases resolved***
- ***Percentage of market access and compliance cases resolved successfully***
- ***Percentage of market access and compliance cases that have an action plan within 10 days of initiation***
- ***Percentage of market access and compliance cases initiated for on behalf of small and medium-sized businesses***

Market access cases arise from complaints received by ITA from U.S. companies encountering overseas barriers to U.S. exports, which are not covered by trade agreements. Compliance cases rise from complaints received by ITA from U.S. companies regarding failures by foreign governments to implement trade agreements negotiated by the United States and through monitoring efforts by ITA compliance officers. The first measure assesses the extent of ITA's efforts to monitor trade agreements, identify and initiate market access and compliance (MAC) cases on behalf of U.S. businesses, and work to their resolution. The second measure addresses ITA's efforts in obtaining market access for U.S. exporters and achieving foreign-government compliance with trade agreements. The number of MAC cases resolved is based on the number of cases processed by ITA where no further action by ITA is warranted. The third measure is a subset of the number of MAC cases resolved. A success is determined via collaborative effort between the MAC team working on the case and the company/industry that initiated the case. Examples of successes include prompting a country to remove or suspend a trade barrier, ensuring U.S. concerns are incorporated into a trade agreement or foreign regulation, and prompting a foreign government to adopt an internationally recognized standard or legal statute that



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

either encourages fair trade or prevents restrictive trade barriers. The fourth measure gauges ITA's effectiveness in developing a timely and actionable plan with the client to resolve a case and looks at the percentage of cases over a longer period of time, as well as on an annual basis to encourage more rapid action. The action plan must include a list of specific measures or actions to be taken by either the U.S. government or the company in order to resolve the trade problem. This measure also assesses ITA's ability to communicate with the client and manage the client relationship between ITA and the company.

<b>Data Source</b>	Petitions from U.S. firms encountering trade barriers and compliance by foreign governments with U.S. negotiated international trade agreements. ITA Compliance and Market Access Management System database, which contains data on U.S. firms encountering foreign trade barriers.
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Data from the ITA compliance activity database maintained by the Trade Compliance Center (TCC) are stored in Client Management System and PBViews.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Records support each case and many of the cases have been highlighted in the Secretary of Commerce's Monthly Compliance Case Report. MAC ensures the integrity of the ITA-wide Compliance and Market Access Case Management System. The Compliance and Market Access Case Management System is updated daily. Performance data are monitored and certified internally.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	A number of factors, including U.S. business cooperation, global trade trends, political developments, and the extent to which foreign governments create barriers or act inconsistently with trade obligations (an exogenous factor) will impact the actual numbers.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

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

#### **Performance Measure:**

- ***Percent of licenses requiring interagency referral referred within 9 days***

The Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) administers dual-use commodity export controls. Dual-use commodities include any product that may have both civilian and military applications. To export dual-use commodities outside the United States, companies must apply for an approval license from BIS. Generally, dual-use commodity license applications fall into two categories: (1) referred licenses (approximately 85 percent of applications), including those licenses that require an opinion from another agency (e.g., Departments of State and Energy, Central Intelligence Agency, etc.); and (2) non-referred licenses, license requests that BIS may review/approve without being referred to any other federal agency. Executive Order 12981 stipulates that BIS refer 100 percent of the licenses needing referral within nine days. However, the licensing process is subject to uncontrollable delays. Therefore, BIS used historical data to set a target of 95 percent. This measure focuses on the effectiveness of BIS meeting the target of referring 95 percent of those licenses requiring referral within nine days.

<b>Data Source</b>	Export Control Automated Support System (ECASS)
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	ECASS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Export Administration will verify ECASS reports by running similar reports to determine if they produce the same results.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measure:

- Median processing time for new regime regulations (months)

BIS routinely issues new and amended regulations to effectuate its responsibilities under the Export Administration Act (EAA). Whether regulations liberalize or restrict industry activity, their prompt promulgation benefits the United States from a trade, economic, and national security perspective. Regulatory changes can, for example, reduce the number of license requirements imposed on U.S. exporters, close loopholes in the regulations, implement international agreements, adapt controls to geopolitical developments, or address new export control challenges. The majority of BIS regulations issued implement changes agreed to in the four multilateral control regimes in which the United States participates: Wassenaar Arrangement (conventional arms and related sensitive dual-use goods), Nuclear Suppliers Group, Missile Technology Control Regime, and the Australia Group (chemical and biological controls). This measure tracks the length of time it takes BIS to issue a draft regulation after regime changes have been received and analyzed. There is a significant amount of time that is spent analyzing each regime resolution before actual drafting of a regulation can begin.

<b>Data Source</b>	Paper records and Webcims (BIS internal document tracking system)
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Export Administration office files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	BIS will verify the information used to report on this performance measure against supporting documentation.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measure:

- *Percent of attendees rating seminars highly*

BIS advances trade while promoting national security with an industry outreach program to facilitate compliance with U.S. export controls. Seminars include one-day programs on the major elements of the U.S. dual-use export control system and intensive two-day programs that provide comprehensive presentation of exporter obligations under the Export Administration Regulations (EAR). BIS conducts special topic seminars, such as exporter obligations, doing business with key trading partners, or key technologies. This metric focuses on overall effectiveness of the export control outreach seminar program. The target is for at least 85 percent of the seminar attendees to give the seminar an overall rating of at least 4 (out of a 5 level scale).

<b>Data Source</b>	Seminar evaluations
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Export Administration office files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	BIS will verify the information used to report on this performance measure against supporting documentation.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data are dependent on the voluntary responses of seminar participants and are based on respondent opinion. Opinions may or may not be a factual indicator of performance.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance 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***

The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) establishes a verification regime for weapons-related toxic chemicals and precursors that have peaceful applications. BIS's CWC regulations require U.S. industry exceeding certain chemical activity thresholds to submit declarations and reports. BIS processes, validates, and aggregates the declarations and reports to develop the U.S. CWC industrial declaration, which is forwarded to the Department of State in time to submit it to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, within established time frames mandated under the CWC. This measure is designed to measure the rate of U.S. industry in complying with the declaration provisions of the CWC regulations.

<b>Data Source</b>	Paper records of declarations
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Export administration office files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	BIS will verify the information used to report on this performance measure against supporting documentation.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance 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***

This measure captures the actual number of Export Enforcement leads and cases that result in a deterrence or prevention of a violation. Prevention may be accomplished by an investigative lead which results in agent outreach to a business, a freight forwarder, or any party to an export, and deters or prevents an unauthorized export. This measure will reflect the actual number and type of preventive enforcement actions conducted, including detentions of suspect exports, seizures of unauthorized shipments, industry outreach and issuance of warning letters for first time and/or minor export offenses, screened licenses targeted for enforcement concerns, recommended denials of license applications based on diversion or false statement indicators, recommended placement of parties on the Unverified List and denials on visa requests, detection of violations of license conditions, and other preventive actions that identify and prevent suspect transactions. The implementation of this measure allows BIS to gauge its overall effectiveness in terms of successful prosecutions and preventive enforcement. BIS monitors and enhances compliance with license conditions by detecting and prosecuting violations of such conditions.

<b>Data Source</b>	Export Enforcement Investigation Management System (IMS)
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	IMS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	The Office of Export Enforcement and the Office of Antiboycott Compliance will both perform two types of checks to ensure data are entered where they should be (system integrity) and to ensure that the data are accurate and valid.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None



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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Number of end-use checks completed*

BIS conducts end-use verification checks with a primary means being Sentinel visits conducted under the Sentinel Program. During Sentinel trips, BIS agents attempt to verify bona fides of consignees named on a BIS license, and confirm that the equipment is being used in conformance with conditions on the license. Each trip requires a team of two special agents for nearly six weeks to perform target analysis, pre-departure technical training, actual travel, and the subsequent post-trip briefings and final report. The end-use check workload is likely to increase significantly.

<b>Data Source</b>	ECASS and IMS
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	ECASS and IMS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	BIS will both perform two types of checks to ensure data are entered where they should be (system integrity) and to ensure that the data are accurate and valid. Export Administration will verify ECASS reports by running similar reports to determine if they produce the same results.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Percent of industry assessments resulting in BIS determination, within three months of completion, on whether to revise export controls*

BIS assesses the current status of technologies employed in U.S. industries whose products are subject to export controls to determine: (1) if those technologies have changed in such ways that existing controls should be revised or new controls should be imposed, and (2) if the control criteria remain pertinent and relevant or should be altered so the controls achieve the greatest possible beneficial effect and avoid unintended consequences. BIS anticipates that such assessments will be of such importance to its decision-making concerning revising existing or imposing new controls that 100 percent of the export control-focused industry assessments BIS conducts will be instrumental in determining whether—and, if so, how—to revise existing or establish new export controls.

<b>Data Source</b>	Paper records
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Export Administration office files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	BIS will verify the information used to report on this performance measure against supporting documentation.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**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***

**PERFORMANCE 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 (ESA/CENSUS)**

**Performance 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***

This measure focuses on the reliability of census data in that maintaining a high level of response for both demographic and economic surveys ensures that information from the Economics and Statistics Administration's (ESA) Census Bureau surveys and censuses is always reliable and widely accepted by customers over the long term. Reliability of Census Bureau statistics is essential for the Census Bureau to enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, the American public, and others.

<b>Data Source</b>	Census Bureau censuses and surveys are the initial collection source. Internal control files and systems are the source of the response rate data.
<b>Frequency</b>	Response rates are tied to data collection. Frequency varies by survey or census.
<b>Data Storage</b>	All data are stored in Census Bureau databases and are published in public press releases.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Quality assurance analyses, Automated Data Processing (ADP) routines, and peer reviews.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data that are released must adhere to Title 13 requirements to protect respondents' confidentiality.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue quarterly reviews of performance data.

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Release data products for key Census Bureau programs on time to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses, and the public***

Ensuring that data products are released on schedule is essential for the Census Bureau to enhance the supply of key economic and demographic data to support effective decision-making of policymakers, businesses and the American public. The Census Bureau acknowledges an important distinction between release of the Economic Indicators and the other survey and census data products. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Statistical Directive Number 3 requires that data for the principal economic indicators be released within prescribed time periods. The impact of not meeting release dates for the economic indicators is much more serious, so two separate targets are noted.

<b>Data Source</b>	Actual data releases by Census Bureau programs.
<b>Frequency</b>	The frequency of data releases varies. Release dates are often published in advance.
<b>Data Storage</b>	Data release information is stored in Census Bureau systems and public data releases.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Performance data are verified by comparing actual release dates with scheduled release dates. Methodological standards for surveys are publicly reported.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data that are released must adhere to Title 13 requirements to protect respondents' confidentiality.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue quarterly reviews of performance data.



APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Correct street features in the 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***

Correctly locating every street in the Master Address File and Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing System (MAF/TIGER) is integral to providing geographic products and services that meet the accuracy expectations of the 2010 Census field data collection staff, the Census Bureau’s data product customers, and the needs of the U.S. Geological Survey/ The National Map. Many local and tribal governments that participated in the Census 2000 geographic partnership programs and many potential customers for MAF/TIGER geographic products indicated that they would not consider future geographic partnerships or use without substantial improvements in location accuracy. Investing in the identification and correct location of new housing units and streets or roads in small towns and rural areas will ensure uniform address and street coverage in the MAF/TIGER database and in the Census Bureau’s data products, both for the American Community Survey (ACS) and the 2010 Decennial Census. The global positioning system (GPS) alignment will not be done for some remote areas of Alaska where handheld computers will not be used for the census. Alaska officials have been informed of these plans.

<b>Data Source</b>	MAF/TIGER activity schedule
<b>Frequency</b>	As scheduled
<b>Data Storage</b>	Census Bureau MAF/TIGER database
<b>Internal Controls</b>	The Census Bureau compares actual completion dates with scheduled dates.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue quarterly reviews of performance data.

**Performance 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***

Due to the cyclical nature of these programs, it is important to track annual key activities that support the programs. Census tracks the internal activities that are considered to be the most important in meeting the long-term goals of the cyclical census programs.

<b>Data Source</b>	Activity schedules kept by each of the cyclical census programs.
<b>Frequency</b>	Ongoing, based on activity schedules
<b>Data Storage</b>	The Census Bureau program offices maintain activity schedules and performance data.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	The Census Bureau compares actual completion dates with scheduled dates. Performance data are reviewed quarterly.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue quarterly reviews of performance data.

**Performance Measure:**

- **Meet or exceed the overall federal score of customer satisfaction on the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)**

The University of Michigan conducts the ACSI in cooperation with other groups. It tracks trends in customer satisfaction and provides benchmarks that can be compared across industries and between the public and private sectors. The Census Bureau traditionally focuses on key communications, services, and products: data products, Web products, and overall customer service as these relate to customers' perceived quality, expectations, overall customer satisfaction, complaints, and loyalty. Results from the ACSI are available during the first quarter of the fiscal year.

<b>Data Source</b>	Census Bureau data users at State Data Centers, Business Information Data Centers, Census Information Centers, and Regional Federal Depository Libraries.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	Primary storage system is a mainframe computer at the Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Data are collected electronically and cross-tabulated. Interviewers are continuously monitored with supervisors randomly listening in on interviews. The computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system will not accept wild scores, out of range of allowable scales.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Sample size determines the limits of statements that can be made based on the data. All Census Bureau-related ACSI reports are careful to report confidence intervals.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue quarterly reviews of performance data.

**PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: 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:**

- **Timeliness: Reliability of delivery of economic data (number of scheduled releases issued on time)**

The importance of ESA's Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) data as an ingredient for sound economic decision-making requires BEA to deliver data into the hands of decisionmakers on schedule. BEA has made significant improvements in its information processing systems so as to continue to post its principal economic indicators on the BEA Web site at release time, as well as upload volumes of supporting documentation and tables that were previously unavailable until days after the release. In addition, BEA established an e-mail subscription service that allows users to sign up to receive prompt e-mail delivery of gross domestic product (GDP), international trade, state personal income, gross state product, local area personal income, and other major economic measures at the time of their release.

<b>Data Source</b>	A schedule of release dates for the calendar year is published each fall in the <i>Survey of Current Business</i> and is posted on the BEA Web site. BEA maintains a record of subsequent actual release dates.
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	BEA maintains the schedule of future release dates and the record of actual release dates. Both sets of information are available on the BEA Web site.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Scheduled and actual release dates are a matter of public record and can be verified via the Internet at <a href="http://www.bea.gov">www.bea.gov</a> .
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Not all releases may be included in the published annual schedule because their release dates cannot be established that far in advance.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	FY 2008 target will be added when the schedule is made available to OMB and published in the <i>Survey of Current Business</i> in the fall of the preceding year.



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measure:

- **Relevance: Customer satisfaction with quality of products and services (mean rating on a 5-point scale)**

Customer satisfaction is a critical measure of BEA's success in accomplishing its mission. Achieving the targets of this measure requires BEA to provide the types of data that are relevant, accurate, and needed by users. To measure levels of satisfaction, BEA conducts a regular online survey of users. The survey asks respondents about their satisfaction with BEA products and services.

<b>Data Source</b>	BEA customer satisfaction survey conducted online at BEA's Web site, <a href="http://www.bea.gov">www.bea.gov</a> .
<b>Frequency</b>	Continually
<b>Data Storage</b>	BEA conducts the survey, compiles the results, and retains records of raw data and computations that lead to the final results. A report is written and made available to the public at <a href="http://www.bea.gov">www.bea.gov</a> .
<b>Internal Controls</b>	BEA provides a copy of the survey results to OMB, the Department Budget Office, and ESA. The report is made available on the BEA Web site.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	The customer satisfaction survey is an ongoing, voluntary survey conducted via the Web site. As a voluntary survey, responses are representative of those who choose to respond.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Survey is continually conducted with results collected after the end of the fiscal year.

### Performance Measure:

- **Accuracy: Percent of GDP estimates correct**

This measure tracks the ability of BEA to accurately estimate its most important statistic, GDP. The measure is a composite index of six indicators of accuracy that are readily available to the public. These six indicators measure the accuracy of the GDP estimate with respect to: (1) whether the economy is expanding or contracting, (2) whether the economy is growing faster or slower, (3) whether the economy is strong or weak, (4) the trend GDP growth rate, (5) the average quarterly GDP growth rate, and (6) the level of current-dollar GDP. These indicators are applied using three-year rolling averages to develop a single measure of the correctness of the GDP estimate. Three-year rolling averages were chosen because (1) at least 12 quarters of estimates are needed for statistical reliability, (2) BEA's annual revisions cover three years, (3) the impact of statistical improvements occur over time, and (4) reasonable balance must be struck between statistical reliability and a measure of current performance.

<b>Data Source</b>	Data used for this measure are produced by BEA and made available in press releases; BEA's monthly publication, the <i>Survey of Current Business</i> ; and the Web site <a href="http://www.bea.gov">www.bea.gov</a> . Background research studies are published in the <i>Survey of Current Business</i> .
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	The <i>Survey of Current Business</i> is published monthly and available online.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	The Department has evaluated this measure and BEA has submitted a <i>Validation and Verification</i> report. The <i>Survey of Current Business</i> is a matter of public record and can be verified via the Internet or hardcopy.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	The measure is the best single point estimation of the accuracy of GDP. Economic conditions, rather than statistical practices, could dramatically change the measure. In benchmark years, the calculation of the GDP revision is delayed until December.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Research to calculate the new measure will be conducted, following the completion of the annual revisions, in August 2007.



**Performance Measures:**

- ***Budget-Related: Improving GDP and the economic accounts***
- ***Budget-Related: Accelerating economic estimates***
- ***Budget-Related: Meeting U.S. international obligations***

BEA must continually update its economic accounts to keep pace with the increasingly complex and rapidly changing U.S. economy. The GDP, the balance of payments, state personal income, and other data series must be as timely, relevant, and accurate as possible to inform the decisions made by public and private leaders. The 5-year Strategic Plan lays out ambitious steps that BEA will take to achieve quality improvements in all of its accounts. Based on the Strategic Plan milestones, specific budget initiatives have been proposed for improving the accounts. The Strategic Plan tracks BEA's progress toward achieving the milestones established for new initiatives and provides public accountability.

The second measure tracks BEA's progress toward accelerating the release of its major economic estimates in order to meet the demands of public and private sector data users. BEA has completed an accelerated release schedule for some of the Nation's most widely relied upon economic statistics, including international trade in goods and services, GDP by industry, the annual input-output accounts, state personal income, and an experimental acceleration in GDP by state. The third measure introduced in FY 2003, monitors BEA's progress in meeting milestones related to international commitments and provides accountability for a multiyear initiative. BEA is responsible for making its data series conform to standards agreed to by the U.S. government with international organizations and other countries. Meeting these commitments is important to maintaining U.S. leadership in economic measurement. Also, the statistical information required for these international commitments is useful to U.S. policymakers.

<b>Data Source</b>	The BEA 5-year Strategic Plan provides annual milestones for this budget-related measure. At the end of each fiscal year, BEA evaluates and reports its progress in achieving the scheduled milestones.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	BEA compiles and maintains data annually via the BEA Scorecard, available on the BEA Web site.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Internal review and analysis by BEA.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	BEA's annual review and update of its Strategic Plan could result in changes to the milestones.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Milestones will be adjusted as necessary to match the BEA Strategic Plan.



## STRATEGIC GOAL 2

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

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.1

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

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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Qualitative assessment and review of technical quality and merit using peer review*

Since 1959, the National Research Council (NRC) has annually reviewed the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) Laboratories. The annual NRC Board on Assessment (BOA) of NIST programs review is independent, technically sophisticated, and extensive. The assessment process focuses on the quality, relevance, and technical merit of the NIST Laboratories program to ensure it is developing and promoting the infrastructure tools and measurement standards needed by industry, academia, and other government agencies. The review board consists of approximately 150 scientists and engineers organized into seven panels (one for each of the seven NIST Laboratories), plus two sub-panels for specialized programs. Each year the laboratory-specific panels conduct a two to three-day on-site review of each laboratory’s technical quality. This measure simply reflects whether NRC conducted the review.

<b>Data Source</b>	On-site interviews and discussions with NIST management and research staff by independent external scientific and technical experts, managed by the NRC.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual reviews, biennial reports
<b>Data Storage</b>	NRC
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Oversight of laboratory-specific expert review panels provided by the NRC BOA of NIST programs.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data are qualitative in nature.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- *Peer-reviewed technical publications produced*

Technical publications represent a way NIST transfers the results of its research and provides measurements and standards to those in industry, academia, and other government agencies. Each year, NIST produces between 2,000 and 2,200 manuscripts and publications with approximately 50 to 60 percent appearing in prestigious scientific peer-reviewed journals. This measure is a direct count of NIST technical manuscripts that have been reviewed and approved for publication in peer-reviewed journals by the NIST Editorial Review Boards at both the Gaithersburg and Boulder sites, and the number of approved manuscripts published in peer-reviewed journals in that fiscal year. A peer-reviewed journal is a publication in which articles are formally reviewed by the journal’s editors and/or a panel of experts and respected researchers in a specific field of study before being accepted for

## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

publication. This measure reflects in part the quality and demand for NIST publications. In addition to peer-reviewed journals, NIST publishes its measurement methods and standards through conference proceedings, NIST interagency reports, and special publications.

<b>Data Source</b>	NIST Office of Information Services
<b>Frequency</b>	Ongoing
<b>Data Storage</b>	Publications data are gathered and maintained by NIST Office of Information Services.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Data represent direct and verifiable counts of NIST technical manuscripts to be published in peer-reviewed journals and have been cleared for publication by the internal Washington and Boulder Editorial Review Boards. Internal controls include verification using random checks of review paper work with approved publications by the Intelligent Systems Division (ISD) staff and data review by the NIST Director's Office.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Output only
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measures:

- ***Standard Reference Materials (SRM) sold***
- ***NIST-maintained datasets downloaded***
- ***Number of calibration tests performed***
- ***Citation impact of NIST-authored publications***

These four measures share the same methods of validation and verification. SRMs are the definitive source of measurement traceability in the United States; all measurements using SRMs can be traced to a common and recognized set of basic standards that provides the basis for compatibility of measurements among different laboratories. SRMs are certified in the NIST Laboratories for their specific chemical and material properties. Customers use SRMs to achieve measurement quality and conformance to process requirements that address both national and international needs for commerce and trade and public safety and health.

NIST provides online access to over 80 scientific and technical databases. These databases cover a broad range of substances and properties from a variety of scientific disciplines. Some datasets, such as the NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Physical Reference Data Systems, and the NIST Ceramics WebBook, are comprehensive and contain a large number of databases, while others serve very specific applications. Industry, academia, other government agencies, and the general public use NIST's online data systems with this measure representing another method NIST uses to deliver its measurements and standards tools, data, and information. This measure is a direct count of the average annual number of downloads of NIST-maintained data.

NIST offers more than 500 different types of physical calibrations in areas as diverse as radiance temperature, surface finish characterization, and impedance. NIST calibration services provide the customer with direct traceability to national and international primary standards. This measure illustrates the quantity of physical measurement services provided by NIST for its customers, including calibration services, special tests, and Measurement Assurance programs. The output data represent a direct count of calibration tests performed.

The citation impact measure demonstrates that NIST consistently produces relevant scientific and technical publications. Citation impact reflects the utility and relevance of NIST research and is outcome-oriented. Citation impact has remained consistently above average for the past 26 years (1981–2006).



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

<b>Data Source</b>	NIST Technology Services
<b>Frequency</b>	Ongoing
<b>Data Storage</b>	NIST Technology Services
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Data represent direct and verifiable counts of: (1) the number of SRMs sold to customers, (2) the number of times a NIST-maintained dataset has been downloaded, and (3) items of calibration tests performed by the NIST Laboratories. Internal controls include verification and review by NIST Technology Services and the NIST Director's Office and Budget Division.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data provide information on output levels only. NIST measure "NIST-maintained datasets downloaded" reflects the number of users accessing these datasets; it does not reflect unique users or capture how the data were used.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

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

#### Performance Measures:

- *Cumulative number of publications*
- *Cumulative number of patents*
- *Cumulative number of projects with technologies under commercialization*

These three measures reflect the outcomes of the Advanced Technology Program (ATP). Publications indicate the diffusion of technical knowledge that results from ATP investment in the development of new technologies, and participants in more than half of ATP-funded projects have published and presented papers in technical professional journals. The cumulative count of publications generated by all ATP-funded research through the close of a given fiscal year represents a major channel for the diffusion of technical knowledge that results from ATP funding.

Patents focuses on the creation of new knowledge resulting from ATP-funded projects, tracking the cumulative direct count of the number of patents filed by all ATP-funded research project participants through the close of a given fiscal year.

Projects under commercialization tabulates the cumulative number of projects with new technologies under commercialization that are traceable to all ATP-funded projects through the close of a given fiscal year. The measure indicates the extent to which ATP-funded research and development has either leveraged or catalyzed new products or services, which in turn improve the prospects for technology-led economic growth.

<b>Data Source</b>	Data are gathered from the portfolio of ATP project participants (funded since 1993) through company filings of patent information to the NIST Grants Office (a legal requirement) and an electronic survey instrument under ATP's Business Reporting System (BRS). Separate portfolio-based telephone surveys are conducted of project participants funded prior to 1993 and for post-project data collection.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual over the course of ATP funding for projects funded since 1993; intermittent for projects funded prior to 1993; every two years (up to six years) after ATP funding ends.
<b>Data Storage</b>	ATP's Office of Economic Assessment maintains BRS data in an integrated set of databases covering both descriptive information about the funded organizations and survey responses for all participants in ATP-funded research projects.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	All ATP reports using BRS data and patent reports filed through the NIST Grants Office are monitored closely by ATP for research quality and are subject to extensive NIST-wide review and critique prior to being issued.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	The BRS electronic survey and other telephone survey instruments represent a standardized reporting system. Standard sources of uncertainty include variation in interpretation of specific questions, variation in the estimation techniques used in response to specific questions, variation in the quality of industry data, and missing values.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

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

**Performance Measures:**

- *Number of clients served by Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding*
- *Increased sales attributed to Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding*
- *Capital investment attributed to Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding*
- *Cost savings attributed to Hollings MEP centers receiving federal funding*

The Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) works with the Nation's small manufacturing firms to provide assistance to overcome barriers to productivity growth and competitiveness. These measures provide quantitative indicators of the bottom-line impacts MEP services provide. The number of clients represents the annual number of new and repeat clients served by MEP centers who received training, technical, and business assistance ranging from informational seminars and training classes to in-depth technical assistance in areas such as lean implementation, ISO 9000, and quality improvement practices. Increased sales, capital investment and cost savings indicate changes that are positively associated with productivity growth and competitiveness—two factors that are crucial for U.S. manufacturers to manage and succeed in the rapidly changing manufacturing environment. Data are collected through an annual survey of clients receiving services from MEP centers.

<b>Data Source</b>	The client impact survey is administered by a private firm, Synovate, located in Arlington Heights, IL.
<b>Frequency</b>	The survey is conducted four times per year, and clients are selected based on when they completed the first project with an MEP center in the previous year. For example, a client that completed a project with an MEP center in February 2004 was surveyed in January/February 2005. This process is used to reduce respondent burden, raise overall response rates, and improve data quality. Clients are asked to estimate how the group of MEP-provided services over the previous two years has affected their business performance in the 12-month period prior to the survey date.
<b>Data Storage</b>	Survey data are sent directly to MEP for analysis. MEP reviews and stores survey data received from Synovate.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Internal controls include review of the Synovate data by MEP staff. Criteria are in place for identifying outliers in the data. Centers verify the outlier and if necessary, the data are revised based on the center review.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Sources of uncertainty include variation in interpretation of specific questions, variation in the estimation techniques used in response to specific questions, variation in the quality of industry data, missing values, and other common survey problems. Synovate uses standard survey techniques to clean the data, ensure accuracy and reliability, and improve the response rate. Reported data reflect the impact of MEP services primarily on small manufacturing establishments; on some occasions, centers may elect to serve establishments with over 500 employees.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Number of updated items available (annual)*

The number of items available for sale to the public from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) includes scientific, technical, and engineering information products added to the permanent collection, as well as items made available through online electronic subscriptions. Each publication added to the permanent collection is abstracted, catalogued, and indexed so that it can be identified and merged into the permanent bibliographic database for future generations of researchers and the public who may benefit from this valuable research. Other information products are available as full text documents in electronic format through numerous NTIS online information services. This material is acquired primarily from U.S. government agencies,



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

their contractors and grantees, and also from international sources. The number of new information products available each year from NTIS is approximately 665,000, but the number largely depends on input from other government agencies.

<b>Data Source</b>	NTIS operates and maintains internal systems for collecting acquisition statistics.
<b>Frequency</b>	Data are available daily. Reports are produced monthly.
<b>Data Storage</b>	All data are stored within NTIS systems.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NTIS accounting and budget offices analyze and report performance data to management. Data verification is provided through regular internal independent auditor reporting.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Output only
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measure:

- **Number of information products disseminated (annual)**

This measure represents information disseminated and includes compact discs, diskettes, tapes, online subscriptions, Web site pages, as well as traditional paper and microfiche products. The shift in information dissemination practices from traditional paper copy to electronic-based dissemination has improved NTIS's ability to provide quality products, increase the number of products distributed, and increase the number of customers that have access to valuable scientific and technical information.

<b>Data Source</b>	NTIS records every transaction using a commercial order processing system modified to meet its specific needs together with a standard Web analysis software package used by industry.
<b>Frequency</b>	Internal management activity reports are produced daily, summaries are produced monthly.
<b>Data Storage</b>	All data are stored within NTIS systems.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NTIS accounting and budget offices analyze and report performance data to management. Data verification is provided through regular internal independent auditor reporting.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Output only
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measure:

- **Customer satisfaction**

This measure represents the percentage of NTIS customers who are satisfied with the quality of their order, the ease of order placement, and the timely processing of that order. Orders are received by phone, fax, mail, and online, and are filled in a variety of formats. The percentage of satisfied customers is derived from the number of customer complaints compared to the total number of orders taken. It does not take into account inquiries about the status of an order or other general questions.

<b>Data Source</b>	NTIS operates and maintains internal systems for processing collected information. NTIS records every transaction using a commercial order processing system modified to meet its specific needs.
<b>Frequency</b>	Internal management activity reports are produced daily, summaries are produced monthly.
<b>Data Storage</b>	All information is stored within NTIS systems.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NTIS accounting and budget offices analyze and report performance data to management. Data verification is provided through regular internal and independent auditor reporting.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.2**

***Protect intellectual property and improve the patent and trademark system***

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

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Patent allowance compliance rate***

This measure assesses product quality as measured by the internal quality review processes. The quality of patent examination decisions are measured by the reopening rate or similar internal quality measures.

<b>Data Source</b>	Office of Patent Quality Review Report
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	Automated systems, reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Manual reports and analysis
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Patent in-process examination compliance rate***

This measure assesses patent examination process quality by the internal quality review of office actions from first action on the merits to issue or abandonment. The quality of patent examination decisions will be measured by the ratio of office actions that do not include a deficiency that has a significant impact on the ability of the applicant to advance the prosecution on the merits of the application, to the total number of office actions reviewed. The results of these reviews will be used as part of a continuous quality improvement program to identify problem areas and determine appropriate training needs and other corrective actions.

<b>Data Source</b>	Office of Patent Quality Review Report
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	Automated systems, reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Manual reports and analysis
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measures:

- *Patent average first action pendency (months)*
- *Patent average total pendency (months)*

These two measures reflect the time it takes to grant a patent. The first measure tracks the timeliness of first office actions on patent applications. It measures the time from the application filing date to the date of mailing the first office actions. The second measure identifies the timeliness related to issuance of the patent or abandonment of the application. It measures the average time from the application filing date to the date of issue or abandonment.

<b>Data Source</b>	PALM system
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	PALM, automated systems, reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Accuracy of supporting data is controlled through internal program edits in the PALM system. Final test for reasonableness is performed internally by patent examiners, supervisors, and program management analysts.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

### Performance Measure:

- *Patent efficiency (cost per patent production unit)*

The labor productivity measure is generally defined as production output divided by labor input. It measures the overall effectiveness of labor deployment at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) in terms of patent production. The measure is in the form of a ratio so that production output relative to labor input can be tracked and analyzed. It is designed to incorporate the widest possible labor input from USPTO employees in all work areas, both directly and indirectly supporting the Patent organization, and from contractor staff on the same basis.

Indirect labor is assigned to patent support on the basis of cost accounting distributions. All labor hours include actual work hours, excluding annual leave, sick leave, and holidays. In addition, contractor labor for significant one-time projects, such as space acquisition, is excluded. Production is measured in terms of production units. The productivity measure viewed over time serves to provide a helpful insight into changes in the effectiveness of labor deployment throughout USPTO.

<b>Data Source</b>	PALM system
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	PALM, Data Warehouse, Activity Based Management (ABM) system
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Accuracy of supporting data is controlled through internal program edits in the PALM, Momentum, and ABM system. Quality control review of data by Activity Based Cost Accounting (ABC) system and program business teams.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A



**Performance Measures:**

- *Patent applications filed electronically*
- *Patent applications managed electronically*

These two measures show USPTO's progress in moving toward operating in a fully electronic environment. Applications filed electronically indicate USPTO's support of, and applicants' willingness to operate in, an e-government environment and identifies the percent of basic applications filed electronically. USPTO has instituted an aggressive outreach program to hopefully see significant growth in the number of patent applications filed electronically over the next few years. Applications managed electronically reflect how all incoming and outgoing paper documents are captured electronically in the system and any remaining pending paper applications were scanned into the system by the end of the first quarter of FY 2005, with the electronic version of an application now considered the official file.

<b>Data Source</b>	PALM system
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, weekly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	PALM and automated systems
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Accuracy of supporting data is controlled through internal program edits in the PALM system and cross checks against other automated systems.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Trademark first action compliance rate*

This measure assesses product quality as measured by the internal quality review processes. The quality of trademark examination decisions will be measured by the reopening rate or similar internal quality measures.

<b>Data Source</b>	Office of Trademark Quality Review Report
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	Automated systems, reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Manual reports and analysis
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

**Performance Measure:**

- *Trademark final action compliance rate*

This measure assesses trademark examination process quality by the internal quality review of office actions from first action on the merits to issue or abandonment. The quality of patent examination decisions will be measured by the ratio of office actions that do not include a deficiency that has a significant impact on the ability of the applicant to advance the prosecution on the merits of the application, to the total number of office actions reviewed. The results of these reviews will be used as part of a continuous quality improvement program to identify problem areas and determine appropriate training needs and other corrective actions.



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

<b>Data Source</b>	Office of Trademark Quality Review Report
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	Automated systems, reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Manual reports and analysis
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

### Performance Measure:

- ***Trademark efficiency (cost per trademark production unit)***

The labor productivity measure is generally defined as production output divided by labor input. It measures the overall effectiveness of labor deployment at USPTO in terms of trademark production. The measure is in the form of a ratio so that production output relative to labor input can be tracked and analyzed. It is designed to incorporate the widest possible labor input from USPTO employees in all work areas, both directly and indirectly supporting the Trademark organization, and from contractor staff on the same basis.

Indirect labor is assigned to trademark support on the basis of cost accounting distributions. All labor hours include actual work hours, excluding annual leave, sick leave, and holidays. In addition, contractor labor for significant one-time projects, such as space acquisition, is excluded. Production is measured by disposals. The productivity measure viewed over time serves to provide a helpful insight into changes in the effectiveness of labor deployment throughout USPTO.

<b>Data Source</b>	TRAM system, Momentum, ABM system
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, quarterly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	TRAM, Data Warehouse, ABM system
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Accuracy of supporting data is controlled through internal program edits in the TRAM, Momentum, and ABM system. Quality control review of data done by ABC system and program organization teams.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

### Performance Measures:

- ***Trademark average first action pendency (months)***
- ***Trademark average total pendency (months)***
- ***Trademark average pendency excluding suspended and inter partes cases (months)***

These three measures reflect the time it takes to grant a trademark. The first measure determines the timeliness of Trademark first office actions. It measures the time from the application filing date to the date of mailing the first office actions. The second measure identifies the timeliness related to office disposals. It measures the average time from the application filing date to the date of registration, notice of allowance, or abandonment.

<b>Data Source</b>	TRAM system
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, monthly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	TRAM, automated systems, reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Accuracy of supporting data is controlled through internal program edits in the TRAM system. Program management performs final test for reasonableness.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measures:

- *Trademark applications filed electronically*
- *Trademark applications managed electronically*

These two measures show USPTO's progress in moving toward operating in a fully electronic environment. The first measure indicates the USPTO's support of and applicants' willingness to operate in an e-government environment and is measured by the percent of initial applications for the registration of trademarks that are filed electronically. The second measure reflects the extent to which USPTO is fully automated in the trademark area. Trademarks now has a complete text and image file record that includes the initial application, and applicant and office correspondence for more than 500,000 pending applications.

<b>Data Source</b>	TRAM system and Trademark Image Capture and Retrieval system database reports
<b>Frequency</b>	Daily input, weekly reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	TRAM and automated systems
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Accuracy of supporting data is controlled through internal program edits in the TRAM system and cross checks against other automated systems.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A

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

#### Performance Measures:

- *Number of instances in which External Affairs (EA) experts review intellectual property (IP) policies/standards*
- *Improving worldwide IP expertise for U.S. government interests*
- *Plans of actions, mechanisms, and support programs initiated or implemented in developing countries*

These three measures reflect the work USPTO is conducting in the area of IP enforcement. The first measure tracks the work that EA experts do by providing advice and guidance to other countries and organizations to improve IP practices by reviewing and commenting various policies, laws, etc. The second measure represents the number of placements USPTO has made in other countries as well as an estimate of other assistance provided in terms of full time equivalents. The third measure tracks the actual agreements, provisions, and procedures that are implemented in those countries and regions by the attachés that promote and enforce IP rights.

<b>Data Source</b>	EA reports and databases
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly input and reporting
<b>Data Storage</b>	Reports
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Manual reports and analysis
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	N/A



## STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.3

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

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

**Performance Measures:**

- *Timeliness of processing (days)*
- *Certification request processing time (months)*

These two measures reflect the time that (1) the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) authorizes the federal agency use of the frequency spectrum in a timely manner so they can operate their radio communications and (2) NTIA certifies in a timely manner that spectrum will be available in the future for federal agency planned radio communications. NTIA ensures that each assignment approved does not cause interference to other spectrum users nor will it receive harmful interference from other spectrum users and that each assignment complies with the rules, regulations, and standards within NTIA's manual. NTIA's approval prevents an agency from developing communications in the wrong frequency band that could cause or receive interference from other spectrum users that could result in being unable to implement the system and the loss of all the funding that was necessary to develop the communication system. These measures contain the planned average target time to obtain approval, the number of requests for a frequency assignment, the average time it took to provide approval, and a comparison of actual time for approval versus the target.

<b>Data Source</b>	Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) Support Branch, Office of Spectrum Management (OSM)
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly, Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	OSM, Computer Services Division
<b>Internal Controls</b>	ADP routines
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Classified information is not included in public data.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Collection of data

**Performance Measure:**

- Space system coordination request processing time

NTIA provides approval and coordination domestically and internationally in a timely manner for an agency to operate its planned satellite communications. Coordination with other satellite spectrum users is essential to prevent interference to each other in light of the high costs of developing and implementing satellite communication systems. The performance measure contains the planned average target time to obtain approval for coordination actions within the Space Systems Subcommittee process, the number of space systems coordination actions requested, and the percentage of actions meeting target approval time.

NTIA also provides coordination to foreign satellite spectrum users to ensure that their systems do not interfere with U.S. satellite and terrestrial spectrum users. The performance measure contains the target percentage of responses to other countries meeting the ITU required timeframes, the number of space systems coordination requested, and the percentage of coordination actions completed on time.

## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

<b>Data Source</b>	IRAC Support Branch, OSM
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly, Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	OSM, Computer Services Division
<b>Internal Controls</b>	ADP routines
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Classified information is not included in public data.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Collection of data

### Performance Measure:

- ***Spectrum plans and policies processing time***

Most of the frequency spectrum is shared between the private sector and the federal government. As such, there are constant changes in the spectrum allocations, rules, and regulations developed and maintained by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and NTIA to address access by new telecommunication technologies and services to ensure interference free operation between all spectrum users and a level playing field to promote competition. The FCC accomplishes this task on behalf of the private sector through public rulemaking and NTIA does this through advice of the IRAC,. NTIA and the FCC have agreed in a memorandum of agreement that they would mutually perform the necessary coordination on rulemakings within 15 days or less. This agreement prevents unnecessary delays in gaining access to the spectrum, thus ensuring that the costs of regulatory processes on technology and services deployment are minimized. This performance measure contains the planned average target time to obtain NTIA coordination, the number of requests, the average time it took to provide coordination and a comparison of the actual time for coordination versus the target.

<b>Data Source</b>	IRAC Support Branch, OSM
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly, Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	OSM, Computer Services Division
<b>Internal Controls</b>	ADP routines
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Classified information is not included in public data.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Collection of data

### Performance Measure:

- ***Milestones completed from the implementation plan of the President's Spectrum Policy Initiative***

NTIA was directed by the President on November 30, 2004 to implement his Spectrum Policy Initiative by implementing 24 recommendations contained in two reports submitted by the Secretary of Commerce and coordinated with federal agencies in the OMB coordination process. The recommendations call for improvements in the spectrum management process to meet the goals in Performance Goal 1 above. NTIA has prepared an implementation plan with 136 milestones to be completed over the next five years as shown in Appendix 1. The performance measure contains the planned target of the number of milestones required to satisfy the 24 recommendations for each fiscal year until completed and for each of the four major goals in the President's Spectrum Policy Initiative. The actual number of milestones completed will be compared with the target.

<b>Data Source</b>	OSM
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly, Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	OSM, Associate Administrator
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NTIA document clearance process, OMB/interagency clearance process
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None



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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Support new telecom and info technology by advocating Administration views in number of FCC docket filings, and Congressional and other proceedings in which Administration views are advocated*

This measure reflects NTIA's work in fulfilling its policy-setting role. It involves participating on behalf of the Administration in FCC and Congressional proceedings on telecommunications policies, including the development of appropriate regulatory treatment for broadband services deployment.

<b>Data Source</b>	Activities are reflected on NTIA Web site, weekly reports to the Secretary of Commerce, annual report to Congress.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Office of Policy Coordination and Management
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Inspection
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data are not quantitative but rather a qualitative assessment of current policy directions and plans.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- *Number of Web site views for research publications*

NTIA measures the number of Web site hits of its online research publications. This measure indicates the reception and utility of research results within the spectrum research and engineering community. Many government agencies and private sector organizations use these research publications to improve effectiveness in the planning, procurement, and configuration of systems. This basic research directly benefits the U.S. public through promotion of advanced telecommunications and information infrastructure development in the United States, enhancement of domestic competitiveness, improvement of foreign trade opportunities for U.S. telecommunications firms, and facilitation of more efficient and effective use of the radio spectrum.

<b>Data Source</b>	ITS
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	ITS, Web server
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Inspection
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Collection of data

## STRATEGIC GOAL 3

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

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.1

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

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: Serve society’s needs for weather and water information (NOAA)**

**Performance Measures:**

- *Severe weather warnings for tornadoes (county based) – Lead time (minutes)*
- *Severe weather warnings for tornadoes (county based) – Accuracy (%)*
- *Severe weather warnings for tornadoes (county based) – False alarm rate (%)*

The lead time for a tornado warning is the difference between the time the warning was issued and the time the tornado affected the area for which the warning was issued. The lead times for all tornado occurrences within the continental United States are averaged to get this statistic for a given fiscal year. This average includes all warned events with zero lead times and all unwarned events. Accuracy is the percentage of time a tornado actually occurred in an area that was covered by a warning. The difference between the accuracy percentage and 100 percent represents the percentage of events without a warning. The false alarm rate (FAR) is the percentage of times a tornado warning was issued but no tornado occurrence was verified.

<b>Data Source</b>	National Weather Service (NWS) field offices
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NWS headquarters and the Office of Climate, Water, and Weather Services (OCWWS)
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Verification is the process of comparing the predicted weather to reported event. Warnings are collected from every NWS office, quality controlled, and matched to confirmed tornado reports. Reports are validated by Weather Forecast Offices (WFO) using concise and stringent guidelines outlined in NWS Instruction 10-1605. From these data, verification statistics are computed. OCWWS monitors monthly performance throughout NWS, and the regional headquarters monitor performance within their respective regions. All data are reported on to NWS and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) leadership on a monthly basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Only confirmed tornado reports are used to verify tornado warnings. Radar reports are not used. If a tornado occurs but is not reported, it doesn’t go into the database for verification. Therefore, it is possible for tornadoes to be underreported, especially in sparsely populated areas. While long-term performance has shown a steady increase in forecast accuracy, interannual scores tend to fluctuate due to varying weather patterns from year to year. Some weather patterns are more difficult to forecast than others. Forecasters perform better during large outbreaks due a high level of situational awareness, well defined tornadic radar images, and increased confidence based on tornado reports which verify warnings during these large scale events. These three factors lead to longer lead times, higher accuracy, and lower FARs. The peak level of tornadic activity occurs April through June each year. A secondary peak activity time period is October and November in the southeastern United States.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Review all warnings and storm data after each event to learn from past experiences. Use the information learned to improve forecast skill and product quality in the future.

**Performance Measures:**

- *Severe weather warnings for flash floods – Lead time (minutes)*
- *Severe weather warnings for flash floods – Accuracy (%)*

The lead time for a flash flood warning is the difference between the time the warning was issued and the time the flash flood affected the area for which the warning was issued. The lead times for all flash flood occurrences within the continental United



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

States are averaged to get this statistic for a given fiscal year. This average includes all warned events with zero lead times and all unwarned events. Accuracy is measured by the percentage of times a flash flood actually occurred in an area that was covered by a warning. The difference between the accuracy percentage figure and 100 percent represents the percentage of events without a warning.

<b>Data Source</b>	NWS field offices
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NWS headquarters and OCWWS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Verification is the process of comparing the predicted weather to reported event. Warnings are collected from each NWS office, quality controlled, and matched to confirmed flash flood reports. Reports are validated by WFOs using concise and stringent guidelines outlined in NWS Instruction 10-1605. OCWWS monitors monthly performance throughout NWS, and the regional headquarters monitor performance within their respective regions. All data are reported on to NWS and NOAA leadership on a monthly basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	While long-term performance has shown a steady increase in forecast accuracy, interannual scores tend to fluctuate due to varying weather patterns from year to year. Some weather patterns are more difficult to forecast than others. Typically, first and second quarters have higher lead times, while the third and fourth quarters, during the convective season, bring the annual average down. Spring/summer mesoscale events (e.g., thunderstorms) are more difficult to predict than larger synoptic scale systems; hence lower scores are expected in the third and fourth quarters.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Review all warnings and storm data after each event to learn from past experiences. Use the information learned to improve forecast skill and product quality in the future.

### Performance Measure:

- ***Hurricane forecast track error (48 hours) (nautical miles)***

The public, emergency managers, government institutions at all levels in the United States and abroad, and the private sector use NOAA hurricane and tropical storm track forecasts to make decisions on life and property. This measure calculates the difference between the projected location of the center of these storms and the actual location in nautical miles for the Atlantic basin. The actual is computed by averaging the differences (errors) for all the 48-hour forecasts occurring during the calendar year. This measure can show significant annual volatility. Projecting the long-term trend, and basing outyear targets on that trend, is preferred over making large upward or downward changes to the targets each year.

<b>Data Source</b>	NWS/Tropical Prediction Center (TPC)
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	TPC
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Hurricane storm verification is performed for hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions regardless of whether these systems are over land or water. TPC issues track and intensity forecasts throughout the life of a hurricane. The actual track and intensity are verified through surface and aircraft measurements. NOAA calculates the average accuracy of the TPC track and intensity forecasts for the Atlantic basin at the end of each hurricane season. Reported errors are for hurricane and tropical storm stages only because of a more limited historical verification record for tropical depressions. All data are reported to NWS and NOAA leadership on an annual basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Verification of actual track and intensity versus forecast is very accurate. However, actual annual scores vary up to 20 percent in some years due to the type and location of the hurricane events. Some types of systems can be more accurately forecasted than others. For example, hurricanes that begin in the northern sections of the hurricane formation zone tend to be much harder to accurately forecast. Outyear measures depend on a stable funding profile and take into account new satellites, improved forecast models, new and continued research activities of the U.S. Weather Research Program (USWRP), and investments in critical observing systems.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	NOAA will report on the tracking of forecasts at 24, 48, and 72-hour intervals.



**Performance Measure:**

- **Accuracy (%) (threat score) of day 1 precipitation forecasts**

This performance measure tracks the ability of the weather forecasters of NOAA's Hydrometeorological Prediction Center (HPC) to predict accurately the occurrence of one inch or more of precipitation (rain or the water equivalent of melted snow or ice pellets) 24 hours in advance across the contiguous United States. Through this measure, HPC focuses on relatively heavy amounts of precipitation, usually a half inch or more in a 24-hour period (short-term flood and flash flood warnings), because of the major safety and economic impacts such heavy precipitation can have in producing flooding, alleviating drought, and affecting river navigation. These forecasts indicate how much precipitation is expected across the United States, not just whether it will rain or snow. HPC tracks the accuracy of these forecasts using a metric with the statistical name of "threat score" or equivalently "critical success indicator." This accuracy metric ranges from zero percent, indicating no skill, to 100 percent for a perfect forecast. For example, in verifying the accuracy of a forecast of one inch or more of precipitation for day 1 (the next 24 hours), HPC first determines everywhere in the United States where an inch or more actually fell and was observed by rain gauges. On a given day this occurs only over a very small percentage of the country (although a one inch or more precipitation event is significant for the inhabitants of that particular area). HPC then compares these observed areas of at least one inch of precipitation with the forecasted areas of at least one inch, counting only those points in the United States where HPC forecasted and observed at least an inch as being an accurate forecast. (These points are called "hits.") Thus, if HPC forecasts one inch to fall at the point representing Washington, DC, and it observed only three-quarters of an inch actually had fallen in that specific area, the forecast is then rated as a miss, even if an inch of rain was observed to have fallen at the points nearby. The overall accuracy score for the country for that particular day 1 forecast is then determined by dividing the total number of correctly forecast points (hits) by the total number of points where HPC had either forecast at least one inch of liquid precipitation or one inch of liquid precipitation had actually occurred. Thus this measure takes into consideration those areas where one inch or more of precipitation was correctly forecast, where it was forecasted but did not occur, and where it occurred but had not been forecasted. To earn a high accuracy score, HPC has to forecast the time, place, and amount of precipitation very well.

<b>Data Source</b>	HPC and state agencies
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	World Weather Building
<b>Internal Controls</b>	HPC has produced Quantitative Precipitation Forecasts since the early 1960s and has kept verification statistics related to the Quantitative Precipitation Forecast program since that time. HPC forecasters work under the supervisory control of the Senior Branch Forecaster (SBF), who is responsible for the quality and content of all products issued during the shift. The SBF having the additional duty of 24-hour precipitation forecast verification verifies the precipitation forecasts. All data are examined for accuracy and quality control procedures are applied, as described in the Description of Measure section. Verification is the process of comparing the predicted precipitation amounts to the observed amounts over the conterminous United States. All data are reported on to NWS and NOAA leadership on a monthly basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	The 40-year record of performance indicates there can be considerable variation in the performance measure from year to year. This variation is heavily dependent on the variation of weather regimes over the course of a year and from year to year. Scores are usually lower, for example, in years with considerable summertime precipitation not associated with tropical cyclones.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	NOAA will implement planned weather observation and numerical modeling improvements along with ongoing research projects. The Hydrometeorological Test Bed will be expanded to accelerate the transition of research advancements into the operational prediction of precipitation.



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measures:

- **Winter storm warnings – Lead time (hours)**
- **Winter storm warnings – Accuracy (%)**

A winter storm warning provides NOAA customers and partners advanced notice of a hazardous winter weather event that endangers life or property, or provides an impediment to commerce. Winter storm warnings are issued for winter weather phenomena like blizzards, ice storms, heavy sleet, and heavy snow. These measures reflect advance warning lead time and the accuracy of winter storm events. Improving the accuracy and advance warnings of winter storms enables the public to take the necessary steps to prepare for disruptive winter weather conditions.

<b>Data Source</b>	NWS field offices
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	The regional headquarters, NWS headquarters, and OCWWS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Verification is the process of comparing predicted weather to a reported event. Warnings are collected from each NWS office, quality controlled, and matched to confirmed winter storm reports. Reports are validated by WFOs using concise and stringent guidelines outlined in NWS Instruction 10-1605. OCWWS monitors monthly performance throughout NWS, and the regional headquarters monitor performance within their respective regions. All data are reported on to NWS and NOAA leadership on a quarterly basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	While long-term performance has shown steady increase in forecast accuracy, interannual scores tend to fluctuate due to varying weather patterns from year to year. Some weather patterns are more difficult to forecast than others.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Review all warnings and storm data after each event to learn from past experiences. Use the information learned to improve forecast skill and product quality in the future.

### Performance Measure:

- **Cumulative percentage of U.S. shoreline and inland areas that have improved ability to reduce coastal hazard impacts**

This measure tracks improvements in NOAA's ability to assist coastal areas by estimating the risks of natural hazards. Activities are underway to develop a coastal risk atlas that will enable communities to evaluate the risk, extent, and severity of natural hazards in coastal areas. The risk atlas will help coastal communities make more effective hazard mitigation decisions to reduce impacts to life and property. Through the coastal risk atlas, National Ocean Service (NOS) provides a mechanism for coastal communities to evaluate their risks and vulnerabilities to natural hazards and improve their hazard mitigation planning capabilities.

<b>Data Source</b>	NOS Coastal Services Center; National Satellite, Data, and Information Service (NESDIS); National Coastal Data Development Center; and other federal and state agencies
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	NOS and NESDIS will collect information, conduct assessments, and store data.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	This measure tracks the cumulative percent of shoreline and inland areas with improved ability to reduce the impact of coastal hazards. In the past, the types of projects included in the reported results differed from one year to the next; therefore, the potential for counting a portion of the shoreline more than once existed. For example, one year a project may improve an area's ability to reduce the impacts of hurricanes, and then another year a separate project may improve the same area's ability to reduce the impacts of another coastal hazard, such as inland flooding. To avoid confusion, this measure currently only tracks the development and implementation of the Coastal Risk Atlas. All data used in the Coastal Risk Atlas are quality controlled and the risk assessment methodologies have been peer reviewed with quarterly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	This measure tracks the development and implementation of the Coastal Risk Atlas as an indicator of improved ability to identify the extent and severity of coastal hazards. Reaching these targets will depend on the activities of other federal and state agencies with management responsibilities in this area.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: Understand climate variability and change to enhance society’s ability to plan and respond (NOAA)**

**Performance Measure:**

- *U.S. temperature forecasts (cumulative skill score computed over the regions where predictions are made)*

Accurate temperature forecasts are critical to many sectors of the national economy, including agriculture and energy utilities. This measure compares actual observed temperatures with forecasted temperatures from areas around the country. For those areas of the United States where a temperature forecast (warmer than normal, cooler than normal, near-normal) is made, this score (Heidke Skill Score) measures how much better the forecast is than the random chance of being correct. Areas where no forecast for surface temperature is made (i.e., areas designated as “equal chance” on the Climate Prediction Center (CPC) seasonal forecast maps) are not included in the computation of this score. The Heidke Skill Score is the metric used for this measure to compare actual and observed temperatures and is one of several accepted standards of forecasting in the scientific community.

The Heidke Skill Score is based on a scale of -50 to +100. If forecasters match a random prediction, the skill score is zero. Anything above zero shows positive skill in forecasting. Given the difficulty of making seasonal temperature and precipitation forecasts for specific locations, a skill score of 20 is considered quite good and means the forecast was correct in almost 50 percent of the locations forecasted.

<b>Data Source</b>	Forecast data, observations from WFOs, and from a cooperative network maintained by volunteers across the Nation.
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NWS National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP)
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NOAA performs quality control on the observed data (for example, error checking, elimination of duplicates, and inter-station comparison) both at the CPC and WFO level. In June 2005, NOAA also implemented an objective verification procedure to minimize the impact of human errors in the computation of skill score; monthly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Because of natural (and unpredictable) variability of climate regimes, the skill score can fluctuate considerably from one season to another. For example, for the periods influenced by a strong El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO) forcing, Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) measure tends to be high. Lower scores occur during the periods when ENSO is in its neutral phase.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- *Reduced the uncertainty in the magnitude of the North American carbon uptake*

This measure tracks the uncertainty of atmospheric estimates of the North American carbon uptake by half, assuming a full network of 36 stations has been established and monitored. The uncertainty is estimated on an annual basis, to track progress toward a goal of +/- 0.3 total carbon dioxide emissions (GtC) per year by FY 2009. The baseline uncertainty is +/- 0.6 GtC per year (as determined in 2000). Reducing the uncertainty by 50 percent will allow resolution of the interannual variability in the North American carbon flux and U.S. regional GtCs and uptake.

Carbon dioxide is the most important of the greenhouse gases that are undergoing changes in abundance in the atmosphere due to human activity. On average, about one-half of all the carbon dioxide emitted by human activity is taken up by the oceans and the terrestrial biosphere (trees, plants, and soils), also known as carbon sinks. The variation in the uptake from year to year is very large and poorly understood. A large portion of the variability is thought to be related to the terrestrial biosphere in the Northern Hemisphere, and quite likely North America itself. NOAA needs to assess and quantify the source of this variability if it is to provide scientific guidance to policymakers who are concerned with managing emissions and sequestration of carbon dioxide.



APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

<b>Data Source</b>	NOAA's Global Carbon Cycle Research Program
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Quality assurance and calibration against known standards performed by NOAA.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Number of tall tower/aircraft sites and NOAA's ability to incorporate these data into advanced carbon models.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- *Reduced the uncertainty in model simulations of the influence of aerosols on climate*

Aerosols are liquid or solid particles suspended in the atmosphere. They force changes in the climate system by (1) directly absorbing and scattering of radiation from the sun, and (2) by changing the way clouds reflect back solar radiation. While greenhouse gases warm the atmosphere, aerosols and clouds can both counteract greenhouse gases by reflecting incoming solar radiation and cooling the atmosphere, or, under different conditions, some aerosols can absorb solar radiation and some clouds can trap heat, thus heating the atmosphere. The role of aerosols, clouds, and climate is deemed to be the largest single uncertainty in the prediction of how human activities influence climate change (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2001). This GPRA measure now addresses the first of the two factors. In later years the second factor will also be included.

Annual targets quantitatively score the success of each of the individual research tasks in preceding years. Success in each of these preceding steps is necessary for success in meeting the 10 percent improvement of uncertainty associated with the 2007 goal and the 15 percent improvement in uncertainty for the 2008 goal.

The desired outcome is an improved science-vetted set of options for changing the impact of North American aerosols on climate, which can be considered by governments, the private sector, e.g., transportation and energy production, and the public. Reductions in the uncertainties surrounding aerosols relate directly to the confidence with which model simulations can support policy decisions on the climate issue. Furthermore, since aerosols are also a human-health, air quality issue, there is the opportunity to quantify "win-win" opportunities of how decisions made to improve air quality may also contribute to reduce the forcing of climate change.

<b>Data Source</b>	NOAA's Atmospheric Composition and Climate Program
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Quality assurance and comparisons against 2001 international assessments by leading experts in the aerosol climate community.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Number of monitoring sites for vertical distribution of aerosols, process studies that include intensive field campaigns and laboratory-based data, and NOAA's ability to include these in global models.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Determine the national explained variance (%) for temperature and precipitation for the contiguous United States using USCRN stations***

This measure addresses the significant shortcomings in past and present observing systems by capturing 98 percent of the long-term changes in the national annual average surface air temperature and 95 percent of the long-term changes in the national annual average precipitation throughout the contiguous United States using the U.S. Climate Reference Network (USCRN). Inadequacies in the present observing system increase the level of uncertainty when government and business decisionmakers consider long-range strategic policies and plans. The USCRN, a benchmark climate-observing network, provides the Nation with long-term (50 to 100 years) high quality climate observations and records with minimal time-dependent biases affecting the interpretation of decadal to centennial climate variability and change.

<b>Data Source</b>	NOAA's National Climatic Data Center
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NOAA's National Climatic Data Center
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Monte Carlo simulations based on operation stations, monthly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Number of stations commissioned in the USCRN.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Reduced the error in global measurement of sea surface temperature***

This measure documents progress in accurately measuring the global sea surface temperature. The unit of measure is potential satellite bias error (in degrees Celsius) of global sea surface temperature. Bias error is due to a systematic difference between multiple types of observing instrumentation (e.g., satellites and in situ buoys, ships, etc.). The current satellite bias error is 0.53°C (2006). The sea surface, covering over 70 percent of the Earth surface, has a tremendous influence on global climate. It is where the atmosphere responds to the ocean, via the transfer of heat either to or from the atmosphere. Warmer than normal sea surface temperatures in the tropical Pacific is a dominant characteristic of the El Niño phenomenon, and predictive climate models for El Niño must be initialized using the most precise observed surface temperature possible to produce accurate forecasts. Since sea-surface temperature is measured by buoys, ships, and satellites, this performance measure is well-suited as an indicator of the effectiveness of NOAA's Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS). This performance measure also reflects how improvements in ocean observations will decrease the uncertainty in global sea surface temperature measurements, which will ultimately play a role in calculations of the ocean-atmosphere exchange of heat and the heat storage in the global ocean. More accurate estimates of sea surface temperature and ocean heat content will improve ability to respond to changes in the climate system.

<b>Data Source</b>	NOAA's Office of Climate Observations
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Quarterly reporting mechanism on uncertainty in sea surface temperature measurements, quarterly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Number of deployed observing platforms in the global ocean.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None



APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

**Performance Measure:**

- *Improve society's ability to plan and respond to climate variability and change using NOAA climate products and information*

This measure documents the success in working with stakeholders to develop and enhance a suite of climate data, monitoring, and prediction products that are valuable to customers and stakeholders. The unit of measure is: regionally-focused climate impacts and adaptation studies communicated to decisionmakers. NOAA currently provides state of the art science and discovery information products to a range of decisionmakers, from water resource managers and regional forecast offices, to national and international assessments. These information summaries highlight important deliverables such as reducing uncertainty in climate forcing models, and in seasonal, interannual, and decadal climate forecasts. These deliverables form the basis of NOAA's emerging climate products and services. NOAA requires stakeholder input and feedback for product development and improvement. These interactions are facilitated by both interdisciplinary research and NOAA operations, bridging the gap between research and production, and decisionmakers. By increasing the interactions between NOAA and the users of climate information, NOAA ensures that climate products and services reach the key decision-making sectors.

<b>Data Source</b>	NOAA's Office of Global Programs
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	NOAA's Climate Program Office
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Annual examination of grants awarded and research activities undertaken that result in various outputs (e.g. peer review publications, workshops) showing evidence of research-based interactions with decisionmakers.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Challenge of systematically collecting research-based outputs showing evidence of interactions with stakeholders to communicate risks of climate variability and change and to develop means of coping with impacts.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3.2**

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

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

**Performance Measure:**

- *Number of protected species designated as threatened, endangered, or depleted with stable or increasing population levels*

This measure tracks progress at achieving partial recovery of endangered, threatened, or depleted protected species under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) from a baseline of 65 species established as of January 1, 2004. Protected species are defined as all marine mammal stocks (except walruses, polar bears, and manatees) and those domestic non-marine mammal species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act that are under the jurisdiction of NMFS. Marine mammal species included in this measure are those listed as "depleted" under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), which includes any listed under Endangered Species Act. Recovery of threatened, endangered, or depleted protected species is very slow and can take decades. While it may not be possible to recover or delist a species in the near term, progress can be made to stabilize or increase the species. For some, it is trying to stop a steep decline (right whales, stellar sea lions);

## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

for others it is trying to increase their numbers/abundance (Ridley turtles). NOAA's protected species management efforts are focused on halting declines and conserving species while still allowing human activities to continue.

<b>Data Source</b>	MMPA stock assessment reports and Endangered Species Act status reviews
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Excel spreadsheet maintained by NMFS's Office of Protected Resources.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Results are reported quarterly in a signed memo from the Protected Species Program Manager to the NMFS CFO and are housed and made available in a database managed by NMFS; quarterly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	MMPA stock assessment reports are updated only once a year and Endangered Species Act status reviews are updated only every one to five years depending on priority and fund availability.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Discussions are ongoing to include protected species in the NMFS Stock Information System (SIS).

### Performance Measure:

- ***Number of habitat acres restored (annual/cumulative)***

Habitat restoration and long-term protection are critically needed to help maintain the function of important coastal and marine ecosystems. Under NOAA's legislative mandates, NOAA protects and restores key habitats that provide critical ecosystem functions that support the health of endangered or threatened species, essential fish habitat, as well as provide a number of other societal or economic benefits. NOAA restores habitat areas lost or degraded as a result of development and other human activities, as well as specific pollution incidents and sources. Activities are geared toward NOAA trust resources found across the marine environment and supportive of anadromous fish species. This measure summarizes or projects the geographic area over which ecosystem function has been or will be improved as the direct result of habitat restoration efforts.

<b>Data Source</b>	Interim and final progress reports from each project
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Restoration Center Database (RCDB)
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Results are reported quarterly in a signed memo from the Habitat Program Manager to the NMFS CFO and are housed and made available in a database managed by NMFS; quarterly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Data are primarily provided by grantees.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measures:

- ***Cumulative number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes issue-based forecasting capabilities developed and used for management***
- ***Annual number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes ecological characterizations that meet management needs***

Sound management of coastal and ocean ecosystems requires scientifically based information on their condition. NOAA is developing methods to scale up from the site characterizations it currently produces to ecosystem characterizations. Characterization includes identification of the physical location, spatial extent, and biological, chemical, and physical characteristics. Site characterizations improve understanding of the history, current state, and future condition of ecosystems, and ecosystem characterizations will be the cornerstones to ecosystem-based management and the basis for many coastal, marine, and Great Lakes management tools, including forecasts, assessments, and management plans. NOAA decides what to characterize based on: user community priorities, adequacy of indicators, significance of issue, and consequences of management action/inaction. Characterization of an ecosystem site (and in the future, a defined subecosystem) is measured as uncharacterized, substantially characterized,



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

or adequately characterized. NOAA has initiated a process to divide each of the large marine ecosystems into subecosystems; ecosystem sites are being used as a proxy unit of measurement until that effort is completed. (At that point, NOAA will measure the cumulative number of ecosystems adequately characterized for management. Currently the measure tracks the progress of 13 National Marine Sanctuaries (NMS) and 26 National Estuarine Research Reserve Systems (NERRS) in completing monitoring and assessment to characterize the sites for ongoing management and long-term protection.

<b>Data Source</b>	Characterizations focus on ecosystem sites: NMS, NERRS, coral reef ecosystems, the coastal zone, Great Lakes, essential fish habitat, ecological species units, and unexplored areas.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Metadata from all contributing sources to the measure are maintained by managers for the coastal and marine resources and ecosystem research programs and stored in an Excel database with limited access. The final performance data reported in quarterly and annual performance reports are managed in a secure NOS database for annual milestones and annual and long-term performance measures. Changes to reporting data require approval by the NOS administrator (managed by an email workflow approval system).
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Results are reported monthly to the Ecosystems Research Program (ERP) program manager and NOAA CFOs; quarterly reports on performance data are submitted to the NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	NOAA focuses on protected areas or areas where NOAA has a clear management mandate. NOAA works to identify key parameters for characterizing their conditions and develop assessments of their present health. Characterizations from all contributors are being tracked in this new measure in addition to criteria defining the indicator of what meets management needs for each ecosystem site because characterizations vary temporally and geographically.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measure:

- ***Annual number of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes habitat acres acquired or designated for long-term protection***

NOAA maintains the health of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes habitats by designating and managing important areas for long-term conservation and by providing support to state and local governments to protect additional key habitats by purchasing land from willing sellers. This measure tracks the number of acres acquired with NOAA funds by state or local government agencies from willing sellers for long-term protection of important coastal habitats, or the number of acres designated for long-term protection by NOAA or by state partners. The protected acres are the actual number of acres newly protected in a fiscal year. The cumulative total represents acres acquired or designated to date for NERRS, National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP), and Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program. The goal for the long-term protection indicator is variable, as the yearly target can vary from hundreds to thousands of acres each year. For example, the initial designation or acquisition for a new reserve or sanctuary may add hundreds of thousands of acres in one year, while in other years acquisition may result in several hundred or thousand acres protected.

<b>Data Source</b>	The cumulative total represents data on acres from the NERRS program, NMSP, and the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually by each program manager.
<b>Data Storage</b>	Metadata from all contributing sources to the measure are managed by the Coastal and Marine Resources Program (CMRP) Manager and stored in an Excel spreadsheet with limited access. The final performance data reported annually in performance reports are managed in a secure NOS database for annual milestones and annual and long-term performance measures. Changes to reporting data require approval by the NOS administrator (managed by an email workflow approval system).
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Results are reported annually to the contributing NOAA CMRP and NOAA CFOs for approval; monthly reports on performance data are submitted to the NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	The goal for the long-term protection indicator is variable, as the yearly target can vary from hundreds to thousands of acres each year. For example, the initial designation or acquisition for a new reserve or sanctuary may add hundreds of thousands of acres in one year, while in other years acquisition may result in several hundred or thousand acres protected. Other limitations are the timeliness of reporting by grant recipients, accuracy of conversion from hectares to acres for some data, and the time delay between funding and completion.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Since this measure does not capture all NOAA's activities to protect habitat, NOAA seeks to expand the measure in the future. NOAA is looking at the feasibility of further harmonizing methodologies used among contributing program components.



**Performance Measure:**

- ***Fish stock sustainability index (FSSI)***

The FSSI replaces the measure "Number of Overfished Major Stocks of Fish." The index tracks the outcome of building and maintaining fish stocks at productive levels while also capturing the critical components of NOAA's efforts to get to that outcome, i.e., managing fish harvest rates and increasing knowledge about the status of fish stocks. The measure provides a much more complete picture than the old measure of NOAA's success at fisheries management. The FSSI is calculated by assigning a total score between 0 and 4 to each of 230 priority fish stocks (see below). Each stock receives one point if:

- NOAA has determined whether or not (1) the stock is overfished (one-half point) and (2) the stock is subject to overfishing (one-half point); i.e., scientific knowledge is available about the stock;
- NOAA's management measures are succeeding at ensuring that fishing does not remove too many fish (i.e., level of fishing mortality does not exceed the threshold for overfishing);
- The stock is managed at an acceptable level (i.e., biomass is above the level defined as overfished for the stock);
- The stock is rebuilt or is at its "optimal" level, the ultimate long term end state for a stock (i.e., biomass is within 80 percent of that required to achieve maximum sustainable yield).

The FSSI is the sum of the scores of the individual stocks. The highest possible score for a stock is four and for the index is 920, since the FSSI is based on a set of 230 priority fish stocks selected for their importance to commercial and recreational fisheries. Criteria for selection of stocks include whether they are major stocks (landings greater than 200,000 pounds), whether they are overfished or subject to overfishing, whether they have assessments scheduled, whether they have previously been identified as important, or other factors as appropriate. These stocks represent about 90 percent of all commercial landings in the United States. NOAA plans for this set of stocks to be tracked over a five-year period.

<b>Data Source</b>	Stock assessments and status determinations
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NMFS SIS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Results will be reported quarterly in a signed memo from the Fishery Management Program Manager to the NMFS CFO and are housed and made available in a database managed by NMFS; monthly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Results can only be reported when the SIS is updated with new information from the field.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Percentage of living marine resources (LMR) with adequate population assessments and forecasts***

This measure tracks the percent of priority fish stocks and protected species stocks that have adequate population assessments and forecasts available and useful to resource managers. The priority fish stocks consist of 230 stocks selected for their importance to commercial and recreational fisheries. They are the same stocks tracked under the FSSI. Protected species stocks tracked for this measure are those listed under the MMPA and/or Endangered Species Act, which happen also by coincidence to total 230. There are thus 460 stocks tracked under this measure. This measure combines the number of stock assessments for priority fish stocks and the number of stock assessments and forecasts for protected species to produce a percentage of LMR that tracks the scientific basis for supporting and for evaluating the impact of LMR management actions. The standard of "adequate" is in reference to improving the level of scientific information on a LMR stock to Tier II as described in the Fisheries and Protected Species Stock Assessment Improvement Plans (SAIP) developed by NMFS. To reach this standard, assessments would have to



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

be based on recent quantitative information sufficient to determine current stock status (abundance and mortality) relative to established reference levels and to forecast stock status under different management scenarios.

<b>Data Source</b>	Stock assessments reports and Endangered Species Act status reviews
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NMFS SIS and Excel spreadsheet maintained by NMFS's Office of Protected Resources
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Results will be approved by the NMFS Chief Science Advisor and reported quarterly in a signed memo from the Ecosystem Observations Program Manager to the NMFS CFO and are housed and made available in a database managed by NMFS; quarterly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Results can only be reported when the SIS is updated with new information from the field.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Discussions are ongoing to include protected species in the NMFS SIS.

### Performance Measure:

- ***Percentage of tools, technologies, and information services that are used by NOAA partners/customers to improve ecosystem-based management***

This measure tracks NOAA's success in translating or synthesizing research findings into information, tools, and technology that improve the use and management of coastal, ocean, and Great Lakes ecosystems. Tracking the accessibility and use of information by target audiences will allow NOAA to identify and expand its most effective programs and products. NOAA partners and customers include federal, state, local, and tribal authorities who make decisions that affect the state of resources in the U.S. coastal zone, and other users whose actions impact the condition of coastal ecosystems (e.g., private industry, school children). Examples of tools include coastal population change data, land cover data, benthic habitat maps, and environmental sensitivity index maps. Technologies refer to the transfer of new or underused approaches for addressing coastal management (e.g., remote sensing, biosensors, Autonomous Underwater Vehicles (AUV), genetic markers for fishery stocks) and resource development (e.g., culture systems for aquaculture, marine pharmaceuticals). This includes the application of technology to coastal resource management through synthesis, integration, training, and the development of new management tools. Information services would include technical assistance, education materials and curricula, extension, and training. Tools or techniques used for modeling or forecasting are measured elsewhere and excluded here.

<b>Data Source</b>	NOAA's line offices (the Office of Atmospheric Research [OAR] and NOS) executing the NOAA programs through the Strategic Plan goal/program structure.
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Each line office has an internal secure system for tracking the data contributions.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Use values will be reported by program offices as the number of tools, technologies, and information services (TTIS) used out of the number of TTIS provided. Each line office will report total annual values to a central repository where a single percentage value will be determined and archived in a secure repository. Data are managed in a decentralized system by contributing line offices with validation and verification on any partner for TTIS to ensure no double counting of data.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	NOAA needs to ensure tracking systems are secure and data are validated and verified.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	A secure central NOAA repository for matrixed measures is under development for improved management and tracking purposes.

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE: Support the Nation’s commerce with information for safe, efficient, and environmentally sound transportation (NOAA)**

**Performance Measure:**

- **Reduce the hydrographic survey backlog within navigationally significant areas (square nautical miles surveyed per year)**

NOAA conducts hydrographic surveys to determine the depths and configurations of the bottoms of water bodies, primarily for U.S. waters significant for navigation. This activity includes the detection, location, and identification of wrecks and obstructions with side scan and multi-beam sonar technology and GPS. NOAA uses the data to produce traditional paper, raster, and electronic navigational charts for safe and efficient navigation. In addition to the commercial shipping industry, other user communities that benefit include recreational boaters, the commercial fishing industry, port authorities, coastal zone managers, and emergency response planners. Ships traversing U.S. coastal waters rely on charts based on sounding data that are more than 50-years-old in many places. NOAA has identified approximately 510,000 square nautical miles of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone as navigationally significant and in need of resurvey. Since 1994, NOAA has focused primarily on surveying and reporting its accomplishments in the highest priority areas, many of which carry heavy commercial traffic, are less than 30 meters deep, and change constantly. However, this critical area constitutes only a small portion (eight percent) of the entire navigationally significant area used by large commercial vessels and recreational boaters. The square nautical miles reflect data collected within all areas designated as navigationally significant. NOAA’s surveying activities balance in-house resources with private sector contracts and use the latest full-bottom coverage sounding technologies to survey the Nation’s coastal areas for navigation. Weather, mechanical failure, and level of surveying difficulty are variables for both NOAA and its contractors, and therefore variances from the targets of +/- 50 square nautical miles per vessel are to be expected in a normal field season.

<b>Data Source</b>	Progress reports on data collected from hydrographic survey platforms.
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NOS maintains hydrographic survey performance data at NOAA’s Hydrographic Surveys Division.
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NOS applies its established verification and validation methods. The measure has a +/- 50 square nautical mile variance. Targets are set annually based on resources available; monthly reports on performance to the NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	NOAA-owned ships and contractor survey assets can be affected by changes in vessel availability or condition. Weather can also affect scheduled surveys.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	NOS maintains hydrographic survey performance data at NOAA’s Hydrographic Surveys Division.

**Performance Measure:**

- **Percentage of U.S. counties rated as fully enabled or substantially enabled with accurate positioning capacity**

This tracks the progress of NOAA’s Geodesy Program in facilitating the capacity of state and local governments and the private sector to utilize accurate positioning information. NOAA will track county level use of its Online Positioning User Service (OPUS) to determine how well state and local governments are enabled with accurate positioning capacity. Assessing state and local government and private sector usage at the county level is the most appropriate geographic unit. County level assessments offer entire U.S. coverage and an existing infrastructure for addressing spatial issues. Utilizing OPUS is the right indicator for how well a county is enabled with accurate positioning capacity, because its usage requires a high level of positioning sophistication. Further, OPUS is a necessary step in obtaining accurate positions. The level of capacity varies across the Nation. This variation is measured as deficient, sufficiently enabled, and enabled. Deficient capacity to conduct accurate positioning indicates that the county has not demonstrated it has the NOAA-enabled infrastructure, tools, and local capacity needed for accurate positioning. Substantially enabled capacity to conduct accurate positioning indicates the county has demonstrated it has the NOAA-enabled



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

infrastructure, tools, and local capacity needed for accurate positioning. Enabled capacity indicates the county has validated NOAA-enabled infrastructure, tools, and local capacity needed for accurate positioning. This is indicated by having local interaction through, for example, a submitted and accepted OPUS project for inclusion in the NOAA's geodetic database.

<b>Data Source</b>	OPUS
<b>Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Data Storage</b>	Automated database at NOS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	NOAA will validate a county's capacity for local positioning through direct coordination with localities, such as OPUS project acceptance by NOAA. By assessing the user needs of county surveyors, counties, and their associations through successive limited distributions of a county scorecard, NOAA will validate that the geodesy program is meeting local positioning needs; quarterly reporting on performance to NOAA Deputy Under Secretary.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	OPUS customer data are limited and will be expanded through Paperwork Reduction Act-approved surveys of customers.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

### Performance Measures:

- **Aviation forecast accuracy of ceiling/visibility (1 mi/500 feet to less than 3 mi/1,000 feet) (%)**
- **Aviation forecast FAR for ceiling/visibility (1 mi/500 feet to less than 3 mi/1,000 feet) (%)**

This measure is based on a 1,000-foot ceiling and three miles of visibility for both accuracy and FAR, and is related to Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) conditions. Visibility and cloud ceiling forecasts are critical for the safety of aircraft operations. Accurately forecasting the transition between Visual Flight Rule and IFR conditions significantly improve general and commercial aviation flight planning capabilities, improving both flight safety and efficiencies.

<b>Data Source</b>	NWS field offices
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NWS headquarters and OCWWS
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Forecasts and observations are collected from each airport for which NWS issues a forecast. OCWWS stores and quality controls all data, compares forecasts to observations, and computes verification statistics. Forecasters within each WFO are able to stratify verification statistics to his/her personal scores on specific days to learn from recent experience. WFO managers regularly monitor forecast performance. The regional headquarters and OCWWS monitor performance monthly for their respective management areas. All data are reported on to NWS and NOAA leadership on a monthly basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Due to the largest volume of data gathered and computed, documentation for this measure cannot be finalized until well into the following fiscal year. Outyear measures depend on a stable funding profile and take into account improved use of the Weather Surveillance Radar 88 Doppler (WSR-88D), new satellites, improved forecast models, new and continued research activities of the USWRP, and investments in critical observing systems and implementation of Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System (AWIPS). Interannual scores tend to fluctuate due to varying weather patterns. Some patterns are more difficult to forecast than others. Year to year variability is +/- 3 percent for both accuracy and FAR. Typically, third and fourth quarter scores during the convective season have lower accuracy scores and increased FARs than the first and second Quarter cool season months.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Forecasters within each WFO will continue to monitor their recent past forecast performance to learn from experience. The regional headquarters and OCWWS will continue to monitor performance monthly for their respective management areas. The original measure, Aviation Forecast Accuracy of Ceiling/Visibility (1 mi/500 ft to less than 3 mi/1,000ft); will be changed to Aviation Forecast Accuracy of Ceiling/Visibility Forecasts (3 mi/1,000 ft or less). Similarly, the original measure, "Aviation Forecast False Alarm Rate for Ceiling/Visibility (1 mi/500 ft to less than 3 mi/1,000ft)," will be changed to "Aviation Forecast False Alarm Rate for Ceiling/Visibility (3 mi/1,000 ft or less)."

## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

### Performance Measures:

- *Marine wind – percentage of accurate forecasts (%)*
- *Wave heights – percentage of accurate forecasts (%)*

These measures were originally a “combined accuracy forecast for marine wind and wave.” The measure was revised to reflect the individual wind speed and wave height components. These measures track the accuracy of wind and wave forecasts, which are important for marine commerce.

<b>Data Source</b>	NWS field offices
<b>Frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Data Storage</b>	NWS and NCEP’s Ocean Modeling Branch
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Verification is the process of comparing the predicted weather with the actual event. Forecasts and observations are collected from each marine zone for which NWS issues a forecast. OCWWS stores and quality controls all data, compares forecasts to observations, and computes verification statistics. WFO managers regularly monitor forecast performance. The regional headquarters and OCWWS monitor performance monthly for their respective management areas. All data are reported to NWS and NOAA leadership on a monthly basis.
<b>Data Limitations</b>	Due to the large volume of data gathered and computed, documentation for the accuracy of forecast for wind and waves cannot be finalized until well into the following fiscal year. Outyear measures depend on a stable funding profile and take into account improved use of the WSR-88D, new satellites, improved forecast models, new and continued research activities of the USWRP, and investments in critical observing systems and implementation of AWIPS. Interannual scores tend to fluctuate due to varying weather patterns. Some patterns are more difficult to forecast than others. Marine wind speed and wave height forecasts scores naturally vary (accuracy +/- 4 percent per year) due to fluctuations in the number of extreme events measured over NWS marine areas per year.
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	NOAA will deploy enhanced versions of AWIPS, upgrade new forecast models, implement new wave forecast models, and improve communication and dissemination techniques to marine users. In FY 2008, the Marine Wind Speed Forecast Accuracy metric (FY 2008 target of 58 percent) will be replaced by a new Marine Wind Forecast Accuracy metric, Percentage of Accurate Forecasts, with a target of 68 percent. In FY 2008, the Marine Wave Height Forecast Accuracy metric (FY 2008 target of 68 percent) will be replaced by a new Marine Wind Forecast Accuracy metric, Percentage of Accurate Forecasts, with a target of 73 percent.

## MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION GOAL

### *Achieve organizational and management excellence*

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

### Performance Measure:

- *Provide accurate and timely financial information and conform to federal standards, laws, and regulations governing accounting and financial management*

This measure ensures that the Department is accountable to the American people, and that no reportable conditions (i.e., deficiencies in the design or operation of internal controls) remain unaddressed. To determine if financial information is being provided in a timely and accurate manner, the Department will assess whether those individuals who can best use the information are receiving it within timeframes that render it relevant and useful in their day-to-day decisions.



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

<b>Data Source</b>	Consolidated financial statements and Office of Inspector General (OIG) reports
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Bureau or Department financial systems
<b>Internal Controls</b>	OIG audits
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue to comply with Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (FFMIA).

### Performance Measure:

- *Effectively use competitive sourcing*

The Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act requires all federal agencies to provide OMB with a timely inventory of the activities performed by government employees that could be carried out by commercial sources. The Department developed an annual reporting process that meets this requirement. In FY 2001 and FY 2002, goals were established by OMB for competing these commercial activities between government's most efficient organizations and private sector providers in order to put taxpayers' dollars to the best use. This element measures the Department's success in competing commercial activities in accordance with the FAIR Act.

<b>Data Source</b>	FAIR Act inventory and Competitive Sourcing Management Plan
<b>Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Data Storage</b>	Departmental Management (DM) chronology files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Executive Secretariat
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Request update quarterly.

### Performance Measure:

- *Obligate funds through performance-based contracting (% of eligible service contracting \$)*

Federal agencies have begun changing the way in which the procurement process is conducted, moving toward performance-based contracting—a method of procurement in which the federal government defines the results it is seeking rather than the process by which those results are to be attained—is part of that effort. With performance-based contracting, the government also defines the standards against which contractor performance will be measured and identifies the incentives that may be used.

<b>Data Source</b>	Department procurement data system
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	Department procurement data system
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Supervisory audit
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	None

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Obligate contracts to small businesses***

It is important that all segments of U.S. society have an opportunity to compete for the business that is contracted out by federal agencies. This measure monitors the Department's ability to increase opportunities for small businesses to participate in Department acquisitions. Historically, this has included small, disadvantaged, 8(a), and women-owned businesses. In FY 2001, three new categories were added. These are HUBZone, veteran-owned, and service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses (a subset of veteran-owned small businesses). Every two years, the Small Business Administration (SBA) negotiates procurement goals with each federal agency in an effort to increase contract and subcontract awards to small businesses. Through FY 2001, DM reported under GPRA on the percentage of contracts awarded in each of three categories: (1) small businesses; (2) women-owned businesses; and (3) minority-owned businesses, which included small disadvantaged and 8(a) businesses. To avoid making this measure overly cumbersome by adding categories, beginning with FY 2002, the Department simplified the method used to track its GPRA progress. It now reports on the percentage of procurement funds awarded to the umbrella group described as small businesses.

<b>Data Source</b>	SBA, the Department's Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU), General Services Administration (GSA)
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	OSDBU and GSA federal procurement data systems (FPDS)
<b>Internal Controls</b>	OSDBU and GSA FPDSs
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue outreach efforts.

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Acquire and maintain diverse and highly qualified staff in mission-critical occupations***

This measure represents a combination of indicators focusing on strategic recruitment, training and development, and the Department's efforts to achieve and maintain a diverse workforce. These indicators permit a comprehensive assessment of the Department's efforts to strategically manage its human capital. Such an assessment is critical if the Department is to ensure that it has the right people in the right place at the right time to carry out the Department's work for the American people.

<b>Data Source</b>	Inventory transmittal letters; Department plan for strategic employee training and development
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	Office chronology files; Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM) bureaus
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Executive Secretariat
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Measure trends over time.

**Performance Measure:**

- ***Improve the management of information technology***

The Department's significant annual investment in information technology (IT) requires careful management and monitoring as part of the overall program to effectively manage IT resources to meet the mission needs of the Department and to fulfill its obligation to the taxpayer. Through the use of Earned Value Management and Operational Analysis, systems in the development



## APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS

and/or operational phases are monitored to ensure the required functionality is delivered on the schedule and at the cost projected. Program offices regularly report on the progress and status of their efforts against the cost, schedule, and performance goals, a process that provides early warning signals for corrective actions. Where needed, program managers are required to develop and implement corrective actions to meet the program goals. The successful implementation of each program critical to the Department's missions depends in some way on the adequacy and security of the IT systems that operate throughout the Department. If security of any of these systems were to be compromised, the effective accomplishment of the Department's mission would be in jeopardy. To ensure that these systems are adequately protected (and the Nation reaps the benefits of the Department's work), certification and accreditation requirements have been established. Certification represents the complete testing of all management, operational, and technical controls that protect a system. These controls are documented in the security plan. By approving the plan, the system owner warrants that the controls provide adequate protection for the system. Certification verifies the adequacy of these controls and also validates that the controls are implemented and functioning effectively. Accreditation is the senior program official's acknowledgement of the risk of operating the system. It provides official approval to run the system in the operational environment. Recertification and reaccreditation follow updates of risk assessments and security plans every three years or upon major system modification.

<b>Data Source</b>	Bureau IT offices
<b>Frequency</b>	Annually
<b>Data Storage</b>	Bureau IT offices, bureau files, and DM Chief Information Officer (CIO) files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Departmental and outside reviews
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Review bureau processes to assess need for action; review security plans for completeness and conformance with NIST SP 800-18.

**PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: 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 Measure:

- *Percentage of OIG recommendations accepted by Departmental and bureau management*

Many of the improvements to Department operations and programs come through recommendations made in various OIG work products. A measure of the OIG's effectiveness is the extent to which it offers useful, practical recommendations for improvements. A measure of the usefulness and practicality of the OIG's recommendations is the extent to which they are accepted by DM.

<b>Data Source</b>	OIG audit and inspection process
<b>Frequency</b>	As conducted
<b>Data Storage</b>	OIG files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	OIG review
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue collecting the measure.



**Performance Measure:**

- *Dollar value of financial benefit identified by the OIG*

A key measure of the value of the OIG’s work is its dollar return on investment. Financial benefits include: (1) questioned costs agreed to by management; (2) funds put to better use; and (3) administrative, civil, and criminal recoveries.

<b>Data Source</b>	OIG audit and inspection process
<b>Frequency</b>	As conducted
<b>Data Storage</b>	OIG files
<b>Internal Controls</b>	OIG review
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue collecting the measure.

**Performance Measure:**

- *Percentage of criminal and civil matters that are accepted for prosecution*

The OIG investigative work that helps prevent waste, fraud, and abuse results in either civil or criminal legal issues that are referred for prosecution. Thus, the percentage of investigative work that results in civil or criminal referrals for prosecution is a measure of the quality of OIG investigative work.

<b>Data Source</b>	Investigative Case Data System (CDS) database
<b>Frequency</b>	Updated as investigations completed.
<b>Data Storage</b>	OIG database
<b>Internal Controls</b>	Investigative review process
<b>Data Limitations</b>	None
<b>Actions to be Taken</b>	Continue collecting the measure.