Hi Aileen,

Thank you so much for the meeting today! As I mentioned, I’m sending over the question we’re trying to tackle.  I wanted to include some of the things we covered today, but I realized it got a little long. Below is the bottom line, and then some supporting info and specific questions if you’d like. 

**The challenge:** **MTS data does not match DATA Act data for: gross outlays; FYTD as of Q2, or March 2017; for each agency.**

**The main question:** Should these be off from one another? And if so, what are the reasons or plausible explanations for why this would be the case?

(To be transparent, I care less about whether or not the numbers match up, and more so about the relationship between MTS and DATA Act, and being able to understand/explain when and why they won’t match.)

**Attached:**

(1) my comparison spreadsheet, where I was comparing MTS numbers to data we pulled from the API in June and July, which includes a copy of Table 5 from the MTS, as well as a copy of the pivot tables from the API pulls. I rounded the API numbers to the same place as the MTS ($ M).

(2) the raw March 2017 MTS, freshly downloaded 

**More Specific Questions/Information:**

* **Did I pull the right number from Table 5 in the MTS?**
  + I’m using Gross Outlays, and you pointed out some receipts were in that column that were not considered “applicable receipts”: proprietary receipts from the public and intrabudgetary transactions. The receipts, in fact, were in a “receipts” column, so that’s good. The transfers are in the outlays column and part of the agency’s total number.
* **Are “intrabudgetary transfers” on the MTS what we call interagency transfers? Are interagency transfers counted as outlays?  Could interagency transfers be causing some kind of double counting?**
  + Problem with above theory: USDA’s MTS total gross outlays was $*25 billion* above the DATA Act number, and its intrabudgetary transfer was only $10 million.
* **If MTS is from CARS, GTAS is from CARS, and we validate our data against GTAS, then why don’t we match MTS numbers?**
  + You asked about validations. This was the rule from the File A outlay variable:
    - GrossOutlayAmountByTAS\_CPE= value for GTAS SF 133 line #3020 for the same reporting period.
  + I don’t understand the SF 133. enough to take that info and run with it at this time, but I’d be happy to look into it.
* **When looking to see if specific agencies are contributing to the $654 B discrepancy (!), most agencies are contributing 0-2% of the differences. DoD, HHS, and Treasury each account for roughly 1/3 of the disparity. What’s going on with these three?**
  + **DoD** hasn’t submitted everything yet, so maybe that’s ok.
    - But then I realized DoD’s outlays look *higher* in our data than MTS by $206B, so it doesn’t seem related to them not having submitted data yet.
  + The MTS has **Treasury**’s outlays at $330B and DATA Act at $525B, off by about $195B.
    - Is it possible outlays for debt/interest are included in one system but not the other?
    - Interest on the debt is recognized on an accrual basis—is it possible MTS is thus missing outlays that we’re seeing in our data?
  + **HHS** – they’re off by about $178B, and I have no theory here…
* There are also differences between our own data from the TAS balances and TAS categories endpoints, which roughly line up with Files A and B, respectively. These could be from agencies submitting despite warnings re: File A-B linkages. **Which source do you consider authoritative if Files A and B don’t match?**

A really big thank you again for your time today and any info you can dig up related to this.