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Executive Summary

Beginning in the early 1970s, US states began to deploy international business development programs to attract foreign investment and expand their constituent business community’s export capabilities. Through the 1980s, growing economic pressures brought about by international competition and a growing national trade deficit prompted many state governors and legislatures to call for more support of their state’s export sectors. Many understood the limits of federal export promotion programs to fulfill all of the educational and transactional needs of their existing and potential exporting businesses, so steps were taken by a large number of states to institutionalize export promotion programs of their own. This typically comprised teams of export specialists both at home and abroad, as well as training, research and finance programs to supplement the staff resources to expand the number, reach and capacity of their state’s exporters.

Over the last 35 years, the investments and initiatives brought about through state-sponsored export promotion programs have expanded and contracted due to a variety of causes, including general economic conditions, state budget capacity, and shifting interests and priorities at the political and programmatic levels. Volatility in funding and political support for these programs, and a lack of consensus and common voice among the exporting community in defense of such programs has hampered program effectiveness and continuity, resulting, in some cases, in lackluster performance records and an inability to demonstrate meaningful and measurable economic benefit given the state investments made in such programs.

Like most state-funded, discretionary programs, trade promotion will never be insulated or isolated from the economic cycles and the impact of the states’ ability to invest in them. What can be done though is to establish programs that clearly demonstrate the return on a state’s investment and ensure political and business leaders understand the effectiveness, reach and impact of a state-sponsored export assistance program. Since 2005, Pennsylvania’s Center for Trade Development (CTD) has developed and continues to refine such a system. We are submitting CTD’s Performance Metrics Regimen for Export Promotion Program as a candidate for the Council of State Government’s 2009 Innovation Awards.
Background

When Pennsylvania’s Department of Community and Economic Development decided to revamp their Center for Trade Development’s export promotion activities and the performance metrics criteria, changes to the system had to accommodate one of the country’s largest international trade networks, comprising a three-tiered structure including 10 staff in Harrisburg responsible for coordinating and monitoring the program; 25 contract staff in 10 organizations across the state serving as local contacts and outreach to exporters in their respective communities; and 30 contractual staff in 24 overseas offices located throughout Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Europe, which delivered the market research, partner search and on-the-ground assistance that the large volume of PA exporters were requesting. See Addenda 1 and 2, “Regional Export Network Partners Map” and “PA Authorized Trade Representatives Map”.

In addition to a quantitative-based metrics performance system that would eventually drive CTD’s operations, the methodology had to have the following qualities:

Objective: To measure a spectrum of activities from volume of export promotion activities undertaken through final impact on the clients’ bottom-lines.

Flexible: PA needed to account for and measure the activities and effectiveness of trade promotion partners serving business communities in the wide variety of PA’s economic landscapes: rural, suburban and urban, as well as gauge the operations of 24 overseas offices located in well-developed and developing markets.

Scalable: Like most state programs, if the performance metrics program was to survive the inevitable program funding expansion and contraction cycles, and prove viable over the long-term, CTD had to develop a viable metrics system that could be scaled up or down without major disruption to ongoing trade activities (scalability is also necessary if this program is to be of any relevance to other states—all with their own unique budget and resource considerations and challenges).

Divisible: Once annual system-wide goals for CTD’s program were agreed upon, each metric or goal had to be divided and distributed among 10 in-state regional partners, as well as 24 overseas contractors.

Understandable: There was no point in developing a complex program that could not be easily grasped by our stakeholders: the Governor’s Office, state legislators, department management, our working partners, clients and the general public. Though the objective is not to have all stakeholders understand all aspects of the trade promotion program’s operational efficiency and economic impact, it must offer each group the opportunity to grasp and appreciate some aspects of the program’s value based on their perspective and interests.

With these objectives in mind, the CTD developed a program that has served the needs and requirements of all our stakeholders and has continued to function well over the last four years in spite of past and recent volatility affecting the program’s expansion, contraction, but not its mission and perceived value to the business community.
Application

1. **Program Name:** A Performance Metrics Regimen for State Export Promotion Programs

2. **Administering Agency:** Pennsylvania Department of Community & Economic Development

3. **Contact Person:** Peter C. O’Neill
   Executive Director, Center for Trade Development
   Office of International Business Development

4. **Address:**
   Department of Community & Economic Development
   Office of International Business Development
   400 North Street, 4th Floor, Harrisburg, PA 17120-0225

5. **Telephone Number:** 717-214-5453

6. **Fax Number:** 717-772-5106

7. **E-Mail Address:** peoneill@state.pa.us

8. **Website Address:** www.newpa.com/trade

9. **Program Description**

   a. **Metrics Definitions** CTD’s performance metrics system consists of five system-wide goals, measuring inputs, outputs and outcomes of the programs and services delivered to our client exporting companies. The five metric categories and definitions are as follows:

   i. **Number of Active Clients / New Clients**

   *Definition:* A Pennsylvania-based firm that has requested and been provided with export counseling or services by one of CTD’s 10 Regional Export Network partners. A firm is counted as an Active Client once during the fiscal year.

   *Purpose:* Measures the sheer number of Pennsylvania companies coming into contact with a program representative over the 12-month fiscal year. Serves as a low-threshold gauge of general program activity and client engagement and awareness.

   *Example:* For Fiscal Year 2008-2009, CTD’s goal is 1,156 Active Clients, with sub-goal of 15% (173 clients) of the total client pool that are entirely new to the program.
Tracking Source: Logged and date-stamped entry of company in XPDiT outlining REN contact/assistance rendered

ii. **Number of Work Orders Filed**

*Definition:* A formal request for trade assistance filed by a REN on behalf of a client company and forwarded to an overseas office for action. A Work Order can be a request for trade counseling, market research, or on-the-ground assistance in instances where the client will visit the foreign market.

*Purpose:* Monitors the performance of the Regional Export Network partner to engage clients, identify actionable needs, and generate export assistance requests that are subsequently forwarded to an overseas office for action.

*Example:* For Fiscal Year 2008-2009, CTD’s goal is 2,312 Work Orders to be filed by the REN to Overseas Offices.

*Tracking Source:* Actual number of Work Orders entered into the XPDiT client management system.

iii. **Number of Export Actions**

*Definition:* A defined, measurable and significant action taken by an Active Client, indicating an investment of time and/or funds intended to expand the client’s export opportunities. A creditable action is undertaken at the suggestion or with the direct support of a representative of a REN, ATR, or CTD staff.

*Note:* A Work Order is not required to report an Export Action.

*Examples of Creditable Export Action:*

- Trade Show Participation
  - Catalog or Exhibitor
  - Catalog Plus, Walkabout
- Trade Mission Participation
- Scheduled, face-to-face meeting with an ATR in-country
- Scheduled, face-to-face meeting with Candidate Representative
- Meeting face-to-face with Prospective Foreign Buyer
- Conclusion of Foreign Distributor/Agent Agreement
- Establishment of Foreign-Based Representative Office
- Response to RFP or RFQ issued by a foreign government tender
- Establishment of a Joint Venture or Licensing Agreement
- Subscription/Renewal to PA’s Envoy Program
- Approval of a trade finance package (CTD, SBA, EXIM)
- Subscription to Certification Program (CITRA, CE Mark, ISO, CSA)
- Subscription to USDOC/USFCS Service (Gold Key, ADS, ICP)
- Application and Award of CTD Market Access Grant
- Assistance with application for foreign trademark or patent
Purpose: This is considered the key indicator of the program and signals the client’s willingness to accept the counsel of our export specialists by investing their own time and/or funds to move forward an export promotion initiative. Though not the export sale itself, it is an important and significant step that can lead to a sale. An export action, as defined, is viewed as the “turning point” in which the client assumes increased control and responsibility for the export transaction, and the point at which the PA team subsequently assumes a supporting role to see a trade transaction through to its successful conclusion. Example: For Fiscal Year 2008-2009, CTD’s goal is 3,220 Export Actions.

Tracking Source: Logged and verified Export Actions per XPDĪT client records

iv. Number of Exporting Companies

Definition: A company reporting an export sale to their respective REN within the fiscal year as a result of assistance provided by a REN through submittal of an Export Sales Confirmation (ESC) form to be forwarded to CTD. See Addendum 3 for a sample ESC.

Purpose: Measures the “conversion rate”, i.e., how efficient is the program converting the client from “prospective” to “actual” exporter.

Example: For Fiscal Year 2008-2009, CTD’s goal is 289 Exporting Companies, or a conversion rate of 25%. (Based on 1,125 Active Clients)

Tracking Source: Sales logged in XPDĪT and ESC hard copy forwarded to CTD.

v. Value of Facilitated Export Sales

Definition: The client-stated dollar value of exported goods and services as reported during the fiscal year by an Active Client and as documented through filing of ESC or e-mail equivalent.

Example: For Fiscal Year 2008-2009, CTD’s goal is $350 million in Export Sales, with a sub-goal of $140 million of all sales to be attributed to overseas offices’ assistance.

Tracking Source: Logged Export Sales Confirmations in XPDĪT and verified by ESC hard copy on file with CTD.

b. Dividing and Distributing System-Wide Goals

Based on these goals, we divide and distribute the system-wide goals among our 10 Regional Export Network Partners, as show in the following table:
## Table 1: PERFORMANCE GOALS FOR REGIONAL EXPORT NETWORK, FY 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>ACTIVE CLIENTS</th>
<th>NEW CLIENTS</th>
<th>EXPORT ACTIONS</th>
<th>EXPORTING COMPANIES</th>
<th>EXPORT SALES</th>
<th>WORK ORDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$74,164,508</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$54,453,864</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$51,344,660</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$33,231,405</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$30,010,954</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$26,706,925</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24,626,325</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$20,912,395</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$19,279,920</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$15,269,046</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>$350,000,000</td>
<td>2,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of system-wide goals assigned to each Regional Export Network Partners is determined by the percentage of the total grants budget that DCED provides to the REN system. That is, if Region 5 receives 10% of the Department’s budget for in-state counseling and outreach operations, it is expected that Region 5 will fulfill 10% of the system-wide goals.

(It should be noted that a similar goals division and distribution exercise is undertaken annually with regard to Pennsylvania’s overseas offices. We are omitting this aspect of the program from the application for brevity’s sake).

c. **Weighting and Capping**

In order to add flexibility to the performance measuring system, and to ensure the system could be easily grasped by stakeholders who may not be intimately familiar with CTD’s polices and operations, additional steps are taken to refine and “distill” metrics scoring. To this end, we developed a single “Performance Score” for each REN where a score of “100” would equate to optimal performance over the course of a year’s operations.

The “Performance Score” is derived by applying a weights and caps to each of the quantitative goals as outlined below in Table 2. **Weighting** assigns a value in percentage terms to each of the five metrics, and, in aggregate, totals 100%. **Weighting** each metric allows CTD to signal to the REN partners what we believe are the most challenging and significant aspects of the outreach effort and the impact of those efforts.

**Capping** serves to limit the allowable accrual of points for each performance metric, thereby encouraging REN to meet the goals of all five metric categories. The calculations used to derive the final Performance Score for a sample REN, Region 5, are displayed below in Table 2:
### Table 2: PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR REGION 5, FY 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Goals</th>
<th>Active Clients</th>
<th>New Clients</th>
<th>Export Actions</th>
<th>Exporting Companies</th>
<th>Export Sales</th>
<th>Work Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,211,016</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,834,491</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$197,898</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,459,655</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,008,296</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Metrics</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,711,357</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining to Goal</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-163</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,299,597</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **(A) % of Goal Met**: 83% n/a 159% 68% 59% 52% = 100
- **(B) Total Point Goal**: 15 n/a 20 15 30 25
- **(A)x(B)=Points Earned YTD**: 8 n/a 32 10 18 13
- **Point Cap Limit (113%)**: 112 n/a 312 28 **$33,912,378**
- **Points Weighted & Capped**: 8 n/a 22 10 18 13 71

In Table 2, Region 5’s performance metrics are posted halfway through the fiscal year. In this example, Region 5 has a goal to serve 99 Active Clients. Through December, Region 5 served 82 clients (17 remaining to reach the annual goal). CTD assigned a “weight” of 10 points (or 10%) and a “cap” of 13 points (or 13%) to the Active Clients metric. This signals several instructions to the REN:

a. Assigned a weight of only 10%, **Active Clients**, while crucial to success, is a low value metric relative to other metrics.
b. If Region 5 achieves the 99 Active Client goal, 10 points will be credited to the 100-point Performance Score.
c. If Region 5 exceeds the 99 Active Client goal, the cap allows them to accrue points up to a maximum of 112 clients (13% above the target goal). This permits Region 5 to offset underperformance in another metric with extra credit accrued in this metric.
d. Exceeding the **Export Actions** Goals by more than 113% of assigned goal does not contribute any further credit to the Performance Score as the cap places a ceiling on its contribution.

Each REN’s performance score is calculated, graphed and published in CTD’s monthly progress report so that all stakeholders are aware of each partners’ progress, and where action is needed. CTD can assist any REN in need of additional outreach, promotion, etc. See Table 3, **REN YTD Performance Scores**.
10. How long has this program been operational?
The underpinnings of CTD’s export metrics program were instituted in July 2005, and have been periodically expanded and refined since then.

11. Why was the program created?
In spite of having an extensive team of staff and contractors, events calendar and infrastructure, Pennsylvania’s trade operations lacked a clear set of performance metrics to measure effectiveness, efficiency, and return on the state’s investment. Additionally, without such metrics, it was difficult to establish and define the distinct but complementary roles that each individual and contributing organization had to play in order to maximize the potential of the trade promotion program and the client companies that used the programs and services. Ambitious but reachable expectations needed to be set, distributed, and assigned from the organizational level down to the individual. Setting such expectations by providing an objective, quantifiable and measurable performance metrics system was viewed as the starting point of reorienting and rationalizing CTD’s program. Additionally, with such a system in place, CTD could more clearly demonstrate and defend the program’s importance to the wide variety of stakeholders that periodically inquire about the program’s effectiveness and return on investment.

12. Describe the specific activities and operations of the program in chronological order?

March–June 2005
- Program review, partner interviews, goals refinement; training workshops

July–December 2005
- Proposed new operational policies and procedures to Department management
- Began quarterly training workshops for Regional Export Network partners
- Drafted and implemented new performance measurements for FY05-06
Draft XPDiT Database requirements definitions

January–March 2006
- Implemented XPDiT Database, Phase I
- Set Five-Year Plan goals for Export Sales ($525 Million by July 2010)
- Drafted expanded and refined performance goals for FY06-07

June 2006
- Implemented performance goals for FY06-07 based on revised REN budget allocations, historical performance and CTD system-wide objectives

Continuous
- (Spring) Annual refinement of goals based on historical performance, department objectives, global economic realities, e.g. US dollar value trends

13. Why is the program a new and creative approach?
The program is unique in that it incorporates methodologies and valuations that allow a trade program administrator to better manage a larger and more complete spectrum of trade promotion activities, the activities’ contribution to clients’ export successes, and the economic impact on the business community relative to the state investment made to operate such a program.

14. What were the program’s start-up costs?
There were no specific, incremental startup costs associated with revamping the program. Modifying the program through the introduction of new performance metrics required some time to research and define what the performance measure should be, how they should be distributed, tracked. It also required additional time to discuss and educate CTD staff, contractors and partners. Transitioning from CTD’s original client tracking system to the more robust and comprehensive web-based XPDiT system cost approximately $125,000. The system was developed in-house. A similar system could likely be launched at less cost using off-the-shelf software and modifying it for specific needs. In our case, state restrictions on the use of off-the-shelf software precluded us from doing so.

15. What are the program’s operational costs?
At the time of its inception in 2005, CTD’s operational budget was approximately $4 million, though as mentioned in #14 above, no additional costs were incurred to institute the performance metrics program. The program is not costing CTD any additional dollars than it would have cost to maintain the previous program.

16. How is the program funded?
Program funding is provided through an annual appropriation in the state budget for international business development operations, as administered through the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development.

17. Did this program require the passage of legislation, executive order or regulations?
No
18. **What equipment, technology and software are used to operate and administer this program?**

CTD worked with DCED’s Information Technology Office to define the requirements of a web-based, relational database that permitted CTD staff, in-state partners and overseas contractors to measure both on-going operations, as well as their year-to-date progress-toward-goal metrics.

On the operations side, the system had to allow all users to file, track and fulfill (close-out) a high volume of “Work Orders” (WOs are numbered, dated requests from PA firms requesting trade advice/counseling, market research, or on-the-ground assistance in a foreign market). The system also had to provide visibility to the user in the event problems or issues arose in the course of helping clients tap PA’s overseas offices. Some examples of issues or trends that the system needed to measure include:

- Low Work Order volume generated from a specific region of the state
- Low Work Order volume directed to a specific overseas contractor
- Low “exporter conversion rate” (i.e. PA client companies using CTD’s trade program and services but not achieving or reporting export successes)
- High Work Order volume directed to a specific overseas contractor possibly resulting in large backlogs and delayed response times

To allow users to measure their year-to-date performance, the system also needed to provide timely performance reports to each user so problems or issues could be spotted early and addressed.

The result is the XPDiT database launched in phases from 2006 through the present. For the most part, the system has been well-received by 85 in-state and overseas users and has allowed the team to coordinate client work and stay current on work volume. See *Addendum 4 for XPDiT description, technical details and system architecture.*

19. **Did this program originate in your state?**

Several aspects of Pennsylvania’s program originated in the State of Maryland’s trade promotions program in the late 1990s and early 2000, though the system was thoroughly refined and additional quantitative aspects were added.

20. **Are you aware of similar programs in other states?**

In our discussions with many states’ international trade offices through the auspices of the State International Directors’ Organization as administered by the CSG, we are aware that many states track events-related activities and tasks, numbers of clients counseled, and in some case, export sales either attributed to the state program or general export sales trends. We are not aware of another state that tracks the full spectrum of metrics that CTD has instituted, nor are we aware of the quantitative methods that have been applied to measure performance in as flexible a manner as described here.

21. **Has the program been fully implemented?** Yes
22. Evaluate (pro and con) the program’s effectiveness in addressing the defined problems or issues. Provide tangible examples.

The advantages of using such a system, combined with an outreach effort that educates stakeholders of the need and value of this system, have been discussed throughout this application and should be evident to state trade directors.

Ensuring the system is perceived as “fair” to all parties being evaluated has required periodic adjustments and allowances. In one example, one of our in-state partners with oversight of a largely rural region, complained that the export dollar sales goal that he was expected to achieve was too high. He indicated that his region was comprised of many small businesses that did not conduct multi-million dollar deals like larger businesses in more urban or suburban settings. Based on his comments, we instituted the weights, capping and the performance score systems. The effect has been to allow our partners to underachieve in one area, (Export Sales, for example), overachieve in another (Active Clients), and allows the partner to still be regarded as operating at a satisfactory or optimal level. This refinement, instituted after the first year’s operation, has gone a long way to bringing consensus among our partners that the system is rational, relevant, and “fair” in its design and deployment.

On a related matter, procedural changes to the collection, documentation and validation of export successes and the dollar value of those sales were instituted concurrently with the new performance metrics program. CTD set a high standard that all sales had to be reported, in writing, using the Export Sales Confirmation form. States that do not use a similar reporting tool and anticipate converting to such a system can anticipate resistance, particularly if that task is assigned not to line staff but to partnering organizations as is done in PA. We have found that over time, however, the majority of clients are willing to report their facilitated sales as long as our office educates the client of the need and importance of such feedback and the confidentiality with which these sales are treated.

23. How has the program grown and/or changed since its inception?

As discussed in #9, Program Description, CTD amended the program during year one of the metrics program introduction.

24. What limitations or obstacles might other states expect to encounter if they attempt to adopt this program?

Clearly, instituting even a small scale program according to the methods described here will require some measure of state resources and programmatic support, and we are aware that some states, at current funding levels, could not field sufficient staff to undertake even a modest program due to current budget restrictions and varying budget priorities. Where this methodology can be useful, however, are state-sponsored export promotion programs that can benefit from additional operational structure and direction, as well as a clearer set of widely accepted performance goals and activities that contribute to those goals.
Summary

Pennsylvania’s Center for Trade Development has successfully instituted these management techniques thanks to the interest, dedication, and flexibility of its staff, contractors and DCED leadership. The trust instilled in the entire in-state and global team has paid off with a fast-growing and highly accountable trade promotion operation. Each component of the operation—Harrisburg staff, Regional Export Network partners, Authorized Trade Representatives, the Pennsylvania exporter community—has supported and benefitted from this highly structured but flexible approach to helping Pennsylvania businesses expand their reach and capacity in international markets. In addition, collecting interim progress and sales data from our client companies presumes a good and trusting working relationship that prompts our clients to release to us this often sensitive business information.

This performance metrics regimen is one that can be considered by state trade offices seeking additional structure and direction. The program can be scaled up or down depending upon existing resources or the inevitable shifts to resource levels. The regimen does not stand on its own and should be combined with export education, counseling, financing, and events programming conducted by the office or in cooperation with partnering organizations within the state. By virtue of this application, we would be pleased to discuss this approach in further detail with any state trade office contemplating introduction of any aspects of this program.
Sample: Export Sales Confirmation Form

Addendum 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALE DATE</th>
<th>COUNTRY OF DESTINATION</th>
<th>PRODUCT/SERVICE</th>
<th>SALE VALUE</th>
<th>PREFER EXPORT TO THIS MARKET?</th>
<th>REUSE ONLY AT ASKED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-08</td>
<td>China-Beijing</td>
<td>Tire Handler</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-08</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Winch Trucks</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-08</td>
<td>S. Africa</td>
<td>Heavy Dump</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-08</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Up-filled Vats</td>
<td>$860,000</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-08</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Heavy Dump</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-08</td>
<td>Saudi-Arabia</td>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO XXX INITIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPORT ACTIVITIES

Please indicate other export-related activities that your company was involved in during the past year (check all that apply):

☒ Foreign trade events attended, how many: 3. Please specify countries: Canada; Chile; Russia

☒ Market access grants

☒ Meeting with prospective customers, distributors or partners overseas. # meetings: 42. Country: Canada; Russia; Vietnam; Chile

☒ Meeting with prospective foreign buyer or distributor in PA. Approximately how many meetings: 12

☒ De mark certification. ISO certification. Other certification. Specify:________

☒ Establishment of a foreign-based sales office. Country: __________

☒ Use of export finance programs (EXIM, SBA, Commonwealth of PA)

☒ Subscription to US Department of Commerce Services. Please specify: June trade mission to Russia with PA-Gold Key

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

CONTACT NAME: [Redacted]
TITLE: General Manager
COMPANY: [Redacted]
E-MAIL: [Redacted]
PHONE: [Redacted]
SIGNATURE: [Redacted]
DATE: 9/18/2008

*Pennsylvania’s Overseas Offices: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China (Beijing and Shanghai), Czech Republic, France, Germany, India, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Taiwan, United Kingdom and Vietnam

Please return the completed form to TKay Gressley, SAP&DC, at gressley@sapdc.org or 814-449-6508 (fax). All questions should be directed to Tina Taylor, at taylorm@sapdc.org or 814-449-6517 (direct line). Thank you for your cooperation!
Addendum 4

**XPDiT Database Description**

The XPDiT web application is used to track projects that are collected and inputted by the Trade consultants.

**Software used:**
XPDiT is a web application that runs on Microsoft 2.0.Net Framework using Visual Studio 2005/2008. The database is Microsoft SQL 2005, which is housed in DCED. Users log into the secure system with a user name and password on the server that is housed in the Commonwealth Technology Center. The users will have to register themselves using the PA Power Port.

**Hardware Used:**
Application and Database Server:
IBM x Series 346 8840-45U
Intel Xeon Dual Processor 3.6 GHz
Memory: 3 GB

![XPDiT Application Diagram](image-url)