

FULL REPORT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2011 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Efficiency	Outcome	Output
------------	---------	--------

PAR Appendix Report FY 2011

STRATEGIC GOAL: Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: Cash resources are available to operate the government

OUTCOME: Revenue collected when due through a fair and uniform application of the law

Financial Management Service

MEASURE: Amount of Delinquent Debt Collected Per \$1 Spent (E)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	36.4	36.5	40	43	43	43	45	48
Actual	39.97	53.55	54.76	53.76	54.54	51.65*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure shows the efficiency of the Debt Collection program. The costs include all debt collection activities and all funding sources.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Collection of data and reporting on the cost of the debt collection program are performed on an annual basis.

Data Verification and Validation: Data from FMS' collection program systems is validated against data contained in FMS' Debt Management Accounting System by program staff and verified by senior management. Program costs are derived from FMS' accounting system and budget reports. The methodology and the origin of the data are consistent from year to year.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FMS exceeded its target through several improvements which include: an increase in agency referrals, expansions of the State Reciprocal and Unemployment Insurance Compensation Programs, a salary offset pilot with the Department of Education, as well as Debt Collection system and process enhancements.

MEASURE: Amount of Delinquent Debt Collected Through All Available Tools (\$ billions) (Ot)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.9	4.65	4.84	5.8	6.1
Actual	3.34	3.76	4.41	5.03	5.45	6.17		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure provides information on the total amount collected, in billions, through debt collection tools operated by Debt Management Services.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The process of collecting and reporting the debt collection data is performed on a monthly basis. The methodology and the origin of the data are consistent from month to month. The collection data is generated by the program systems (TOP and DMSC) and is reported on a monthly basis. The tools include: tax refund offset, administrative offset, private collection agencies, demand letters, and credit bureau reporting. FMS also collects debt through the State debt program and tax levy.

Data Verification and Validation: The data from the program systems is validated against the data contained in the Debt Management Account System (DMAS).

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FMS exceeded its target through several improvements which include: an increase in agency referrals, expansions of the State Reciprocal and Unemployment Insurance Compensation Programs, a salary offset pilot with the Department of Education, as well as Debt Collection system and process enhancements.

MEASURE: Dollar Amount of Collections Processed Through Pay.Gov Government-Wide Internet Collections Portal (\$ billions) (Ot)

[DISCONTINUED FY 2010]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	15	30	40	43	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	29.5	37.94	48.7	68.8				
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Pay.gov is a financial management transaction. It offers a suite of online electronic financial services that FA can use to meet their responsibilities towards the public.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Pay.Gov has been developed to meet the FMS commitment to process collections electronically using Internet technologies. Pay.Gov is a secure government-wide collection portal. The application is web-based allowing customers to access their accounts from any computer with Internet access. The Pay.Gov application is comprised of four services: Collections (ACH and Credit Card), Forms, Billing/Notification, and Reporting.

Data Verification and Validation: Data is verified and validated on a monthly, quarterly, and yearly basis. Reporting is presented from the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, as well as through CA\$H-Link and Fifth Third Bank (credit Card only). These numbers are cross checked to verify accuracy.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued FY 2010.

MEASURE: Percentage Collected Electronically of Total Dollar Amount of Federal Government Receipts (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	83	80	79	80	80	82	90	93
Actual	79	79	80	84	85	96		
Target Met?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Electronic collections data are retrieved from the CA\$H-LINK system, which encompasses eight collection systems.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: This measure considers the percentage of government collections that are collected by electronic mechanisms

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

(Electronic Federal Tax Payment System, Plastic Card, FEDWIRE Deposit System, and Automated Clearinghouse (ACH)) compared to total government collections. The system receives deposit and accounting information from local depositories and provides detailed accounting information to STAR, FMS' central accounting and reporting system.

Data Verification and Validation: The agencies that report collections are responsible for ensuring the deposit reports are correct. Financial institutions and Federal agencies report deposits into the CA\$H-LINK deposit reporting system using an Account Key which identifies the collection mechanism (lockbox, which is non-electronic or ACH, electronic) through which the collection was made. FMS analysts gather deposit information from CA\$H-LINK reports and then report totals and percentages on a monthly Collections Summary Report and on the Total Government Collections Report. The Total Government Collections Report totals all deposits divided into electronic/non-electronic mechanisms and tax and non-tax totals within the mechanisms.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: On December 7, 2010, a Treasury regulation was published which required businesses with an annual tax liability of at least \$10,000 to pay electronically. FMS pre-enrolled 1.4 million taxpayers in the Electronic Federal Tax Payment System in order to facilitate the transition of these taxpayers to paperless payments. By eliminating FTD coupons, and by transitioning lockboxes to the Electronic Check Processing application, Federal Finance has increased the percentage of funds sent via EFT. Actual performance exceeded the FY 2011 target because the regulation had not been implemented until after the FY 2011 projections had been developed. With continued emphasis in moving to an all-electronic Treasury, the percentage of funds collected via EFT will continue to grow.

MEASURE: Percentage of Delinquent Debt Referred to FMS for Collection Compared To Amount Eligible For Referral (Ot)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	93	94	95	97	97	97	98	98
Actual	95	100	99	100	100	100		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The measure tracks the percentage of the dollar volume of debt referred to the total dollar volume that is eligible for referral.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The process of collecting and reporting the debt collection data is performed on a monthly basis. The methodology and the origin of the data are consistent from month to month. The referral data is contained in the program systems (TOP and DMSC). The referral data is loaded from the files received from Federal Program Agencies (AFPAs).

Data Verification and Validation: The agencies are responsible for certifying the debt referrals to Treasury.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FMS has exceeded the target performance measure for FY 2011. In FY 2012, FMS is targeted to receive 98% of the delinquent debt eligible to be referred to FMS for collection. Over the past few years, FMS has exceeded the performance target due to high-performing agency outreach and education efforts and improvements made to debt collection systems.

MEASURE: Percentage of Federal Agency Customers Indicating an Overall Rating of Satisfactory or Better (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	81	81	85	87	88	89	87	87
Actual	80	88	88	91	86	86.8		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		

Definition: The percentage of customers who utilize our collections network who are at least satisfied with the process.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The survey is sent out via e-mail with a link to a specially designed website to complete the survey. Data is captured in the website.

Data Verification and Validation: FMS' Agency Relationship Management Division sends out a survey every year to all the agencies (approximately 100 CFO and non-CFO agencies) asking for their feedback on a number of things such as people, policies, products, etc. These agencies are asked to rate these categories as very satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied and very dissatisfied. The satisfied and very satisfied responses are added to give the satisfaction measure.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The FY 2011 Customer Satisfaction Survey revealed that approximately 87% of FF customers are satisfied w/the organization. The results of this survey are slightly higher than the FY 2011 target. Upon completion of implementation of the CCMM Initiative, the percentage of collections customers indicating an overall rating of satisfactory or better is expected to rise.

MEASURE: Unit Cost to Process a Federal Revenue Collection Transaction (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1.37	1.33	1.3	1.27	1.25	1.7	1.7	1.7
Actual	1.1	1.19	1.195	1.57	1.67	1.45*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		

Definition: The unit cost to process a revenue collection transaction.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The cost data is captured through an activity based costing process. The unit cost is the calculated ratio of total direct and indirect costs over total governmentwide collection transactions.

Data Verification and Validation: At the end of each year actual costs for collections are accumulated and calculated for electronic and non-electronic collections. In addition, the number of transactions is calculated for each collection system. This information is calculated in conjunction with and verified by the program office, and is reviewed by senior level executives.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: One of FMS' goals is to convert paper cash flows to more efficient electronic processing. In FY 2011, FMS deactivated the PATAX system and transitioned taxpayers to EFTPS. It also converted lockbox account to settlement via the Electronic Check Processing. These efforts and others have helped to make the collections process more cost-efficient.

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau

MEASURE: Amount of Revenue Collected Per Program Dollar (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	300	400	400	410	400
Actual			313	427	478	468		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Represents the amount of federal excise taxes collected divided by the amount of resources expended to collect the taxes.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Taxes collected are captured by the Federal Excise Tax (FET) database; expense data are maintained in Oracle Financials.

Data Verification and Validation: Both of these components represent information that is subject to annual audits and routine reconciliation.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2012, to meet its performance target, TTB will continue to include in its audit plan a mix of comprehensive audits, limited scope audits, and examinations of taxpayers in the alcohol, tobacco, and firearms industries. This strategy maximizes TTB's limited audit resources and enables much broader coverage of the TTB tax base. TTB also plans to address revenue risk areas in FY 2012 through enhanced risk modeling and audit programs developed for specific types of TTB permit holders. For example, to assure compliance in the importer community that TTB regulates, TTB is participating in joint federal agency initiatives designed to trace alcohol and tobacco products through the Customs warehouse system to ensure that product moving into domestic commerce is properly tax paid and meets packaging and marking requirements. Finally, in its reconciliation process for tax returns and industry operational reports, TTB will continue to pursue innovation and automation in its revenue collection function to measurably decrease costs and improve performance.

MEASURE: Percent of Voluntary Compliance from Large Taxpayers in Filing Tax Payments Timely and Accurately (In Terms of Revenue) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	92	92	92	94	94
Actual			94	94	94	95		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of total revenue dollars from taxpayers who file over \$50,000 in tax payments annually collected on or before the scheduled due date (without notification of any delinquency from the National Revenue Center).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The NRC maintains all tax return and payment information in the FET database.

Data Verification and Validation: The National Revenue Center (NRC) generates reports to identify late-filed returns and payments in the Federal Excise Tax (FET) database.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, TTB tax enforcement efforts demonstrated a positive influence on industry compliance. Looking forward, TTB will maintain a targeted field enforcement presence, focusing on industry members and activities that present a high risk to federal excise tax revenues. TTB also will continue its outreach and taxpayer education efforts to promote voluntary compliance, including promotion of the Pay.gov electronic filing system for reports and tax returns. Finally, TTB will continue its issuance of timely notices to industry members for compliance violations, facilitated by the Error Tracking Database (ETD). TTB will expand the database to include all permit types required to file operational reports with TTB, and make enhancements to the ETD module that monitors the timeliness of excise tax return filings.

Internal Revenue Service

MEASURE: Automated Collection System (ACS) Accuracy (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	88	91	92	92	92.5	94	94	95
Actual	91	92.9	95.3	94.3	95.9	94.9		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percent of taxpayers who receive the correct answer to their ACS question.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Centralized Quality Review System (CQRS) monitors the calls as they are reviewed. Data is input to the Quality Review Database for product review and reporting.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

- Data Verification and Validation:** 1.CQRS management samples QRDbv2 records and validates that sample plans have been followed.
 2.CQRS management reviews QRDbv2 employee input DCIs for consistency and coding.
 3. CQRS tracks and reviews rebuttals quarterly, and an annual sample of each product line's rebuttals are performed.
 4. A rebuttal web site is used to share technical and coding issues in CQRS.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include focusing on process and performance reviews to maintain the highest accuracy rate possible. It plans to do this by collaborating with and facilitating information sharing between the sites as part of monitoring ACS quality performance and addressing any concerns that are identified.

MEASURE: Automated Underreporter (AUR) Coverage (%) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	3.3	4	3.7
Actual	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.6	3	3.3*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: A percentage representing the total number of W&I and SB/SE contact closures (a closure resulting from a case where SB/SE and W&I made contact) divided by the total return filings for the prior year.

Effective: 10/2006

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: NUMERATOR: The sum of all individual returns closed will be extracted as follows: SB/SE AUR: AUR MISTLE Report; W&I AUR: AUR MISTLE Report

DENOMINATOR: The source for the total individual return filings for the prior calendar year is the Office of Research Projections of return filings as shown in IRS Document 6187 (Table 1A). AUR MISTLE AUR Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE)

Data Verification and Validation: 1.AUR run controls are reviewed to see if the weekend processing has been completed and are accurate. 2. MISTLE reports are reviewed with other AUR reports to see if processing has been completed and are accurate. 3. MISTLE reports are reviewed to see if information is complete and accurate.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include better case selection and continued system enhancements to allow the closure of more cases per FTE.

MEASURE: Automated Underreporter (AUR) Efficiency (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1759	1932	1961	1855	1868	1980	2017	2084
Actual	1832	1956	1982	1905	1924	2007		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The total number of W&I and SB/SE contact closures (a closure resulting from a case where we made contact) divided by the total FTE, including overtime.

Effective: 10/2006

Indicator Type: Measure

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Capture and Source: Each case initiated in AUR results in a closure either in the pre-notice or notice phases. All closing actions are posted on the system through the use of process codes that describe the reason & type of closure. Pre-notice closures (no taxpayer contact) include screen outs (discrepancy accounted for on the return), transfers and referrals. Pre-notice closures are included in the Efficiency Measure numerator. Notice phase closures can be posted at the CP2501, CP2000 or Statutory phases. Tax examiners evaluate taxpayer/practitioner responses to the notice and close cases using process codes that denote the respondent's full or partial agreement or disagreement, no change to the original tax liability, transfer or referral. Time: Examiners complete Form 3081 to record time charged to each program code. The Form 3081 is input onto the WP&C system and a Resource Allocation Report generated.

Source: Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE).

Data Verification and Validation: Closures - 1. AUR run controls are reviewed to see if the weekend processing has been completed and are accurate. 2. MISTLE Reports are reviewed with other AUR reports to see if processing has been completed and are accurate. 3. MISTLE reports are reviewed to see if information is complete and accurate.

Time - 1. Managers review Form 3081 prior to input to verify that time is appropriately charged. 2. WP and C monitored to ensure appropriate time usage.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include better case selection and continued system enhancements to allow the closure of more cases per FTE.

MEASURE: Collection Coverage - Units (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	52	54	53	54.4	50.5	49.1	47.9	45.6
Actual	54	54	55.2	54.2	50.1	50		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		

Definition: The volume of collection work disposed compared to the volume of collection work available.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data comes from the Collection Activity Report (CAR.)

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Changes to programming of Collection Activity Reports are generally made once a year. Those changes are tested and verified by program analysts at headquarters before the first new report is released. Monthly spot checks are also done to verify they match the data sent to the DataMart. 2. Accuracy of Automated Offer in Compromise database is validated by management checks in the operating units.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Even though the target was met, there was a 3.5 percent decrease in net dispositions and 30 percent more collection work returned to inventory, compared to last year. Although the reduction in dispositions has a positive impact on potentially collectible inventory, the notice decrease will negatively impact future collection coverage and efficiency. Future plans, include working with the campuses throughout the year to identify and assign inventory to mitigate the notice deposition shortfall.

MEASURE: Collection Efficiency - Units (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1650	1723	1835	1872	1898	1824	1752	2095
Actual	1677	1828	1926	1845	1822	1952		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Definition: The volume of collection work disposed divided by total collection FTE.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data comes from the Collection Activity Report (CAR) and the Integrated Financial System (IFS).

Data Verification and Validation: 1.Changes to programming of Collection Activity Reports are generally made once a year. Those changes are tested and verified by program analysts at headquarters before the first new report is released. Monthly spot checks are also done to verify they match the data sent to the DataMart.

2. Accuracy of Automated Offer in Compromise database is validated by management checks in the operating units.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include gaining efficiencies by improving case selection and systemic processing.

MEASURE: Conviction Efficiency Rate (Cost Per Conviction) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	339565	314008	317625	317100	331000	350000	360000	360000
Actual	328750	301788	315751	327328	324776	310029		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		

Definition: The cost of Criminal Investigation's (CI's) program divided by the number of convictions. The number of convictions is the total number of cases with the following statuses: guilty plea, nolo contendere, judge guilty or jury guilty. The Criminal Investigation financial plan includes direct and reimbursable costs, including employees' salaries, benefits, and investigative expenses, as well as facility costs (office space, heating, cleaning, computers, security, etc.), and other overhead costs.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The final fiscal year-end expenses as documented in IFS plus corporate costs as determined by the Chief Financial Officer divided by the number of convictions reported for the year. The source: CI Management Information System (CIMIS) and the Integrated Financial System (IFS)

Data Verification and Validation: Criminal Investigation management dictates that the lead agent assigned to the investigation and/or the agent's manager(s) input investigation data directly into CIMIS. Agents and management are to enter status updates into CIMIS within five calendar days of the triggering event. Further, upper management directs first line managers to review individual work group CIMIS reports for accuracy each month to ensure any system input errors or omissions are corrected within 30 days of the initial issuance of the monthly data tables. The CFO, Associate CFO for Internal Financial Management, and Associate CFO Corporate Performance Budgeting ensure the functionality and accuracy of the Integrated Financial System-the Service's core accounting system of records. (Rev. 1-07)

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In order to achieve future targets, the IRS will continue to focus on managerial oversight to ensure the effectiveness of field operations performance.

MEASURE: Conviction Rate (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Actual	92	90.2	92.3	87.2	90.2	92.7		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		

Definition: The percent of adjudicated criminal cases that result in convictions. The conviction rate is defined as the total number of cases with CIMIS status codes of guilty plea, nolo-contendere, judge guilty, or jury guilty divided by these status codes and nolle prosequi, judge dismissed and jury acquitted.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Cases are tracked in CIMIS with frequent updates to the status code.

Data Verification and Validation: Criminal Investigation management dictates that the lead agent assigned to the investigation and/or the agent's manager(s) input investigation data directly into CIMIS. Agents and management directs first line managers to review individual work group CIMIS reports for accuracy each month to ensure any system input errors or omissions are corrected within 30 days of the initial issuance of the monthly data tables. (Rev. 1-07) Standardized reports extract data related to the status codes cited above on a monthly basis. This calculation is performed monthly.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In order to achieve future targets, the IRS will continue to monitor performance and ensure appropriate and consistent contact with DOJ and the U.S. Attorney's Office regarding prosecutorial priorities.

MEASURE: Cost Per Taxpayer Served (\$) (HCTC) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	10	11	13
Actual					9.52	12.36		
Target Met?					Y	N		

Definition: The costs associated with serving the taxpayers including program kit correspondence, registration and program participation.

[IFS Monthly Disbursement - (83% IT Cost + 60% Program Management Costs + Special Projects and Costs + (IRS Non-Labor Costs - Printing))] divided by Taxpayers Served *1.6.

Where Taxpayers Served is the unique count of SSN for primary candidates that are enrolled, and/or interact with the customer contact center including correspondence and program kits, 1.6 is a factor attributed to the average number of taxpayers served per primary enrollee, to reflect affected Qualified Family Members.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: IRS costs and exclusions: IFS disbursement report. Accenture costs and exclusions: Monthly Work Request report. Taxpayers served: Health Care Tax Credit Siebel system provides data extracts to the HCTC reporting database, and further queries and reports are created from there.

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Health Care Tax Credit Program office reviews IFS disbursement, 2. Health Care Tax Credit PMO team review and checks Contractor costs and exclusions, and 3. PMO reporting team verifies the source data against previous months of IFS data and Work Request data.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The primary reason for the shortfall was due to a continued decrease in monthly taxpayers served as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) provisions expired and fewer candidates and participants contacted the program. Higher costs can also be attributed to an increase in costs associated with post-ARRA transition back to a maintenance & operations environment. Staffing adjustments were made in the summer to help curtail cost, but with fewer candidates and a decrease in participates, the target was not achieved. Moving forward, HCTC expects difficulty in maintaining current performance due to unfunded legislative changes that are expected to adversely affect program operations due to our inability to positively address increased program workload and taxpayer demand.

MEASURE: Cost Per Taxpayer Served (\$) (HCTC)(E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Target	Baseline	14.25	14.25	17	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	13.71	14.93	16.94	13.79				
Target Met?	Y	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The costs associated with serving the taxpayers including program kit correspondence, registration and program participation.

$[(IFS \text{ Monthly Disbursement } \zeta (83\% \text{ IT Cost} + 60\% \text{ Program Management Costs} + \text{Special Projects and Costs} + (\text{IRS Non-Labor Costs } \zeta \text{ Printing})))] \text{ divided by Taxpayers Served} * 1.6$

Where Taxpayers Served is the unique count of SSNs for primary candidates that are enrolled, and/or interact with the customer contact center including correspondence and program kits, 1.6 is a factor attributed to the average number of taxpayers served per primary enrollee, to reflect affected Qualified Family Members.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: IRS costs and exclusions: IFS disbursement report

Accenture costs and exclusions: Monthly Work Request report. Taxpayers served: Health Care Tax Credit Siebel system provides data extracts to the HCTC reporting database, and further queries and reports are created from there.

Data Verification and Validation: 1.Health Care Tax Credit Program office reviews IFS disbursement, 2.Health Care Tax Credit PMO team reviews and checks Contractor costs and exclusions

3.PMO reporting team verifies the source data against previous months of IFS data and Work Request data

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Criminal Investigations Completed (Ot)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	3945	4000	4000	3900	3900	3900	3980	4000
Actual	4157	4269	4044	3848	4325	3000		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		

Definition: The total number of subject criminal investigations completed during the fiscal year, including those that resulted in prosecution recommendations to the Department of Justice as well as those discontinued due to a lack of prosecution potential.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Criminal Investigations Management Information System (CIMIS)

Data Verification and Validation: The guidance and direction given by upper management to first line managers is that the first line managers should review their individual work group CIMIS data tables at the beginning of each month. The use of this procedure will assure that system input errors are corrected no later than 30 days after the error is initially reported in the monthly CIMIS data tables. Additionally, national standard monthly reports and statistical information are circulated among the senior staff and headquarter analysts for their review and use. If the published information on the official critical measure appears to be out of line with what is normal or expected, headquarters analysts or senior staff request that the CI research staff verify that the published and circulated information and/or report is accurate. If the published and circulated information is not accurate, then the CI research staff corrects the error and issues revised data for the month.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In order to achieve future targets, the IRS will continue to focus on managerial oversight to ensure the effectiveness of field operations performance.

MEASURE: Customer Accuracy - Customer Accounts (Phones) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Target	92	93.3	93.5	93.5	93.7	95	95	95
Actual	93.2	93.4	93.7	94.9	95.7	96		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of correct answers given by a live assistor on Toll-free account inquiries. The measure indicates how often customers receive the correct answer to their account inquiry and/or had their case resolved correctly based upon all available information and Internal Revenue Manual required actions.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Quality reviewers on the Centralized Quality staff complete a data collection instrument as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the Quality Review Database for product review and reporting.

Data Verification and Validation: Field 715 on the DCI is coded by the CQRS monitor as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the NQRS. The NQRS contains several levels of validation that occur as part of the review process. The input records are validated requiring entries and combinations of entries based upon the relationships inherent in different product lines or based upon an entry in a quality attribute. The national reviews conducted by CQRS site staff on telephone product lines are sampled by local management and management officials at the CQRS site. In addition, every review is available on-line to the site for verification purposes. Sites monitor their review records daily and have a small rebuttal period to contest any review.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Incremental improvement in performance is expected in the future from continued improvement efforts such as the development of new online tools for assistors to research taxpayer questions

MEASURE: Customer Accuracy - Tax Law Phones (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90	91	91	91	91.2	92.7	92.7	92.7
Actual	90.9	91.2	91.2	92.9	92.7	96		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of correct answers given by a live assistor on Toll-free tax law inquiries. The measure indicates how often customers receive the correct answer to their tax law inquiry based upon all available information and Internal Revenue Manual required actions.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Quality reviewers on the Centralized Quality staff complete a data collection instrument as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the Quality Review Database for product review and reporting.

Data Verification and Validation: Field 715 on the DCI is coded by the CORS monitor as calls are reviewed. Data is input to the NQRS. The NQRS contains several levels of validation that occur as part of the review process. The input records are validated requiring entries and combinations of entries based upon the relationships inherent in different product lines or based upon an entry in a quality attribute. The national reviews conducted by CORS site staff on telephone product lines are sampled by local management and management officials at the CORS site. In addition, every review is available on-line to the site for verification purposes. Sites monitor their review records daily and have a small rebuttal period to contest any review.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Incremental improvement in performance is expected in the future from continued improvement efforts such as the development of new online tools for assistors to research taxpayer questions.

MEASURE: Customer Contacts Resolved Per Staff Year (E)

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	7477	7702	8000	10386	9398	12074	12061	12686
Actual	7414	7648	12634	12918	10744	12419		
Target Met?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The number of Customer Contacts resolved in relation to staff years expended. Customer Contacts Resolved are derived from all telephone and paper inquiries received by Accounts Management, in which all required actions have been taken, and the taxpayer has been notified as appropriate. The measure includes all self-service, Internet-based applications, such as the "Where's My Refund?" service available on www.irs.gov.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Contacts resolved volumes are derived from internal telephone management systems and modernization project websites. Staff year data is extracted from the weekly Work Planning & Control report and consolidated and included in the weekly resource usage report.

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Data is compiled from several sources (see individual components below). Each area is responsible for component accuracy: Enterprise Telephone Data (ETD) Snapshot Report, Accounts Management Information Report (AMIR), Internet Refund/Fact of Filing, MIS Reporting Tool, Electronic Tax Administration (ETA) Website, Work Planning & Control (WP&C) Report, Resource Allocation Report (RAR)

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Service will continue to handle customer contacts effectively with the resources available

MEASURE: Customer Service Representative (CSR) Level of Service (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	82	82	82	70	71	71	80	70
Actual	82	82.1	52.8	70	74	70.1		
Target Met?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		

Definition: The number of toll-free callers that either speak to a Customer Service Representative or receive automated informational messages divided by the total number of attempted calls.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Enterprise Telephone Database (ETD)

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Validation of monthly report data by W&I P&A staff. 2. The JOC validates CSR LOS data prior to publication of the weekly official Snapshot report. Independent weekly CSR LOS source data is also gathered and validated by comparing data with the data used to produce the official Snapshot report.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The IRS will continue to properly staff toll-free sites in order to maintain the CSR Level of Service target.

MEASURE: Examination Coverage - Business Assets >\$10 million (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	7.3	8.2	6.6	5.8	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.7
Actual	7.4	7.2	6.1	5.6	5.7	6.2		
Target Met?	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		

Definition: The number of LB&I returns (C and S Corporations with assets over \$10 million and all partnerships) examined and closed by LB&I during the current fiscal year divided by the number of filings for the preceding calendar year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The number of returns examined and closed during the Fiscal Year is from the Audit Information Management System (AIMS) closed case database, accessed via A-CIS (an MS Access application). Filings are from Document 6186, which is issued by the Office of Research, Analysis and Statistics.

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Examination Support & Processing (ESP) group (SBSE) validates data on AIMS (Detroit server) and makes necessary correction. 2. LMSB picks closing codes and downloads data down to (A-CIS) Access database (Atlanta server). Charles Johnson (Plantation, FL) validates data, uploads to A-CIS. 3. (LMSB - Chicago) downloads LMSB version of data and performs data validation before providing data to CPP. 4. The information is Document 6186 is validated by the Office of Research, Analysis and Statistics before it is released.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: New audit selection tools will be developed and used to improve audit selection.

MEASURE: Examination Coverage - Individual (1040) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	0.9	1	1	1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1
Actual	1	1	1	1	1.1	1.1		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The sum of all individual 1040 returns closed by Small Business/Self Employed (SB/SE), Wage & Investment (W&I), Tax Exempt and Government Entities (TEGE) and Large Business & International (LB&I) (Field Exam and Correspondence Exam programs) divided by the total individual return filings for the prior calendar year. In FY 2005, Automated Underreported (AUR) cases were included as part of this measure. In FY 2006, AUR is covered as a separate measure.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data comes from the Audit Information Management System (AIMS) closed case data base, the automated underreporter Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE) reports and Research projections for individual return filings.

Data Verification and Validation: new measure - verification and validations will be supplied

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include leveraging NRP data to improve return selection criteria, streamline automation, emphasis on multi-year non-compliance and utilization of risk analysis/assessment in all processes.

MEASURE: Examination Efficiency - Individual (1040) (E)

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	121	136	133	132	132	134	126	134
Actual	128	137	138	138	140	139		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The sum of all individual 1040 returns closed by SB/SE, W&I, TEGE and LB&I (Field Exam and Correspondence Exam programs) divided by the Total Full Time Equivalents (FTE) expended in relation to those individual returns. In FY 2005, Automated Underreporter (AUR) cases were included as part of this measure.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data comes from the Audit Information Management System (AIMS) closed case data base, the automated underreporter Management Information System for Top Level Executives (MISTLE) reports and Exams time reporting system and the Integrated Financial System.

Data Verification and Validation: Closures and AIMS Closures - 1. Case closing documents are reviewed for accuracy during sample reviews by managers and quality reviewers.

2. AIMS data is validated prior to distribution. 3. Queries used to retrieve data are reviewed for thoroughness and accuracy.

Frivolous Filers (Non-AIMS Closures): 1. Cases are reviewed by managers for accuracy, timeliness and completeness at any point in the process. 2. Headquarters Analyst reconciles WP&C data to Summary Report in order to validate data.

SB/SE AUR: Closures - 1. Managerial review samples (phone calls, open and closed cases). 2. Checks and balances exist in the AUR Control System to validate the input. 3. Sample physical review of cases closed on the AUR Control System by Program Analysis System ("PAS") for accuracy and appropriateness of actions.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future strategies to improve performance include improvements to the work stream through better case identification and classification, including leveraging NRP data to improve Exam's ability to select the best workload for examination.

MEASURE: Examination Quality - Coordinated Industry (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	92	97	96	96	96	96	96	97
Actual	96	96	97	95	95	96		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y		

Definition: Average of the scores of Coordinated Industry Cases reviewed. Case scores are based on the percentage of elements passed within each auditing standard.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Large & Mid-Size Business (LMSB) Quality Measurement System (LQMS) database.

Data Verification and Validation: The Examination Teams make a reasonable effort to keep the CEMIS database accurate and timely with milestone completion information.

The LQMS Industry Review Team Managers regularly review the work being performed by the Reviewers. Each Review Group has two senior Review Team Leaders (GS-14 employees) and they are actively involved in overseeing the reviews being conducted by their team members. The groups have regularly scheduled meetings at which consistent determinations on issues is reviewed by the entire group of Reviewers.

The team of Managers and Analysts that prepare the quarterly reports are involved in reviewing the conclusions for mistakes and inconsistencies.

The Coordinated Industry LQMS Program Managers also performs reviews of the work processes in the Coordinated Industry LQMS Groups. The

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

review of Specialty issues (such as International, Engineering, Economist, etc.) is done by Specialists in those areas.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include focusing on the importance of meeting the quality measures through direct feedback to field teams, partnering with the Industries in quality improvement efforts, quality articles, quarterly reports/memos, and outreach to field teams.

MEASURE: Examination Quality - Industry (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	80	88	88	88	89	89	89	90
Actual	85	87	88	88	87	90		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y		

Definition: Average of the scores of Industry Cases reviewed. Case scores are based on the percentage of elements passed within each auditing standard.

The average of the percentage of critical quality attributes passed on Industry cases (corporations, S-corps (pass through corporations) and partnerships with assets over \$10 million) reviewed.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Large & Mid-Size Business (LMSB) Quality Measurement System (LQMS) database.

Data Verification and Validation: There are controls and validity checks built into the ERCS database that ensure that it captures all closed cases. The LQMS Industry Review Team Managers regularly review the work being performed by the Reviewers. Each Review Group has two senior Review Team Leaders (GS-14 employees) and they are actively involved in overseeing the reviews being conducted by their team members. The groups have regularly scheduled meetings at which consistent determinations on issues is reviewed by the entire group of Reviewers. The team of Managers and Analysts that prepare the quarterly reports are involved in reviewing the conclusions for mistakes and inconsistencies. The Industry LQMS Program Managers also performs reviews of the work processes in the Industry LQMS Groups.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include providing feedback to field teams through the development and circulation of quality articles, reports, memos, and by partnering with the Industries in improvement efforts

MEASURE: Field Collection National Quality Review Score(Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	84.2	86	86	80	81	81	81	79
Actual	84.2	84	79	80.5	80.6	80.3		
Target Met?	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		

Definition: The score awarded to a reviewed collection cases by a Quality Reviewer using the NQRS quality attributes.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Monthly reports supplied from the EQMS database.

Data Verification and Validation: Cases are sent to the review sites to be reviewed. The cases are then reviewed and results are recorded into the CQMS EQ database. A validity check is conducted by EQ review site management. Once the data has been validated the information is transmitted to the EQ website.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In previous years, attribute 709 - Case File Folder was reviewed in roughly 80% of cases and scored consistently at 90% accuracy. In mid-FY 2010, NQRS began conducting "ICS History Only" reviews which resulted in a rating of "N/A" for attribute 709. Through the end of FY 2011, attribute 709 was only rated in 23% of cases reviewed. Additionally, 13.8% of the cases reviewed this year have been older than the normal Collection Field function case closure time of six to eight months. Plans are underway to improve the sampling and reduce the reliance on ICS History Only reviews resulting in a more complete review process for FY 2012 coupled with further revisions to the attributes.

MEASURE: Field Examination National Quality Review Score (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	85.9	87	87	87	86.3	83.7	84.9	85.6
Actual	85.9	85.9	86	85.1	84.9	85.8		
Target Met?	Y	N	N	N	N	Y		

Definition: The score awarded to a reviewed Field Examination case by a Quality Reviewer using the National Quality Review System (NQRS) quality attributes.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Monthly reports supplied from the EQMS database.

Data Verification and Validation: A manual validation for inconsistencies in the data input is completed at the end of each monthly cycle. Potential errors are sent to the EQMS site managers for either verification or correction. Monthly consistency meetings are held with EQMS management, analyst and reviewers to ensure consistent application of the quality ratings.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include Improvement Teams continuing efforts to develop tools and communications to assist examiners with improving the lowest scoring attributes.

MEASURE: Number of Convictions (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	2260	2069	2135	2135	2135	2135	2135	2175
Actual	2019	2155	2144	2105	2184	2350		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		

Definition: The number of criminal convictions. Convictions are the total number of cases with Criminal Investigation Management Information System (CIMIS) status codes of guilty plea, nolo-contendere, judge guilty or jury guilty.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Standardized reports extract data related to the status codes cited above on a monthly basis.

Data Verification and Validation: Cases are tracked in CIMIS with frequent updates to the status code.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In order to achieve future targets, the IRS will continue to focus on managerial oversight of field operations.

MEASURE: Office Examination National Quality Review Score (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	88.2	89	90	90	90.9	90.4	90.9	90.9
Actual	88.2	89.4	90	92.1	91.6	90.4		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The score awarded to a reviewed Office Examination case by a Quality Reviewer using the National Quality Review System (NQRS) quality attributes.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Examination Quality Measurement System

Data Verification and Validation: A manual validation for inconsistencies in the data input is completed at the end of each monthly cycle. Potential errors are sent to the EQMS site managers for either verification or correction. Monthly consistency meetings are held with EQMS management, analyst and reviewers to ensure consistent application of the quality ratings.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Exam is continuing efforts to improve the weakest performing quality attributes with initiatives such as establishing an Exam General Processes Quality Improvement Team to develop actions to address weaknesses found within Attributes 510 (Time Span), developing an income website to provide examiners with income probe resources compiled in a centralized location and delivery of Income Toolkit Training for Income Examinations. Future plans include continuing to identify and resolve quality weaknesses.

MEASURE: Percent Individual Returns Processed Electronically (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	55	57	61.8	64	70.2	74	76	77
Actual	54.1	57.1	57.6	65.9	69.3	76.9		
Target Met?	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y		

Definition: The percentage of electronically filed individual tax returns divided by the total individual returns filed.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Working Planning and Control reports from W&I Submission Processing campuses.

Data Verification and Validation: 1. At each Submission Processing Center, managerial oversight is used to ensure that the balancing instructions for the Balance Forward Listing are followed and that necessary adjustments are made. 2. Management Officials review "II" Report prior to its release to Headquarters personnel. 3. Headquarters Personnel release preliminary data for peer and managerial review prior to releasing data for the measure.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include continuing promoting and marketing the benefits of e-file.

MEASURE: Percent of BSM Projects Within +/- 10% Cost Variance (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	90	90	90	90	90
Actual			92	60	40	71.4		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of BSM projects that are within the +/- 10% threshold for cost. The cost variance is measured from the initial cost estimate versus current cost estimate. The percent of projects that were within +/- 10% cost variance by release/sub-release of a Business Systems Modernization (BSM) funded project's initial approved cost estimate versus current, approved cost estimate. Cost variances less than or equal to +/- 10% are categorized as being within acceptable tolerance thresholds. Cost variances greater than +/- 10% of the variance are categorized as being outside of acceptable thresholds.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is collected from the approved and enacted Expenditure Plan and subsequent modifications resulting from changes to project cost plans as approved via the BSM Governance Procedures and documented by the Resource Management Office.

Data Verification and Validation: The baseline data will be reviewed/ validated by the Program Performance Management (PPM) Team and Manager. To indicate the baseline is valid and approved, the manager will send a notification that the data (Excel spreadsheets) may be placed in the PPM shared library. Before the measure is reported, the PPM Team and Manager will review/ validate the report. The PPM Manager will provide the monthly report to the Deputy Associate CIO for Business Integration for approval. Concurrence will be obtained from the Associate CIO for BSM. To indicate the report is validated and approved, the manager will send a notification to store the report in the PPM shared library and report on Improvement Measure externally.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Six out of seven releases met the cost variance measure. MeF Release 7 Milestone 3 (-24%) came in under expected cost (\$3.75 million) as a result of lower than expected hardware and software costs, as well as lower than expected contract expenditures. In order to meet future targets, the IRS will continue to improve on its modernization efforts by implementing new practices, such as the Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) and the Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL), which help to improve in areas such as development, services, and acquisitions.

MEASURE: Percent of BSM Projects Within +/- 10% Schedule Variance (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	90	90	90	90	90
Actual			92	90	100	100		
Target Met?			Y	Y	N	N		

Definition: The percentage of BSM projects that are within the +/- 10% threshold for schedule. The schedule variance is measured from the initial schedule estimate to the current schedule estimate. The percent of projects that were within +/- 10% schedule variance by release/sub-release of a BSM funded project's initial approved schedule estimate versus current, approved schedule estimate. Schedule variances less than or equal to +/- 10% will be categorized as being within acceptable tolerance thresholds. If schedule variances are greater than +/- 10%, the variance will be categorized as being outside of acceptable thresholds.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is collected at the time of Expenditure Plan creation and subsequent modifications resulting from changes to project schedule plans as approved via the BSM Governance Procedures and documented by the Resource Management Office.

Data Verification and Validation: The baseline data will be reviewed/ validated by the Program Performance Management (PPM) Team and Manager. To indicate the baseline is valid and approved, the manager will send a notification that the data (Excel spreadsheets) may be placed in the PPM shared library. Before the measure is reported, the PPM Team and Manager will review/ validate the report. The PPM Manager will provide the monthly report to the Deputy Associate CIO for Business Integration for approval. Concurrence will be obtained from the Associate CIO for BSM. To indicate the report is validated and approved, the manager will send a notification to store the report in the PPM shared library and report on Improvement Measure externally.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In order to meet future targets, the IRS will continue to improve on its modernization efforts by implementing new practices, such as the Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) and the Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL), which help to improve in areas such as development, services, and acquisitions.

MEASURE: Percent of Business Returns Processed Electronically (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	18.6	19.5	20.8	21.6	24.3	27	28	30
Actual	16.6	19.1	19.4	22.8	25.5	31.8		
Target Met?	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of electronically filed business tax returns divided by the total business returns filed.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Work Planning and Control reports from W&I Submission Processing campuses.

Data Verification and Validation: 1. At each Submission Processing Center, managerial oversight is used to ensure that the balancing instructions for the Balance Forward Listing are followed and that necessary adjustments are made. 2. Management Officials review Program Analysis Reports prior to its release to Headquarters personnel. 3. Headquarters Personnel release preliminary data for peer and managerial review prior to releasing data for the measure.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include continuing promoting and marketing the benefits of e-file and pursuing additional legislative mandates.

MEASURE: Refund Timeliness - Individual (Paper) (%) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	99.2	99.2	98.4	98.4	98.4	97	97.5	98
Actual	99.3	99.1	99.1	99.2	96.1	99.4		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y		

Definition: The percentage of refunds resulting from processing Individual Master File paper returns issued within 40 days or less.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Submission Processing Measures Analysis and Reporting Tool (SMART). Data is extracted from a Generalize Mainframe Framework computer run that processes data input by the processing centers.

Data Verification and Validation: The calculation for Refund Timeliness is a ratio of untimely IMF paper refunds in a sample compared against the total number of IMF paper refunds reviewed in a sample. The result of the ratio is weighted against the entire volume of refund returns a center has processed on a monthly basis. The monthly results are tabulated to determine the performance rating at the corporate and site level.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future plans include continuing to monitor IMF return cycles and inventories through various reports and production meetings.

MEASURE: Sign-up Time (Days) - Customer Engagement (HCTC) (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	97	97	97	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	98.7	93.3	94	91.3				
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The length of time between the first Program Kit mailing and first payment received. The calculation of this measure is the median number of calendar days that elapse per registration from the date the Program Kit is mailed to the date the first payment is received from the participant. This is calculated based on queries and reports from system data.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: 1.Dates captured in system during operations, 2.Data queried by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting team, 3.Measure calculated by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting team. Source: Siebel via Microsoft Systems Reporting.

Data Verification and Validation: 1.Data is reviewed by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting function and compared with previous months, 2.Diagnostic reports will be available for further review

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Sign-up Time (Days) - Customer Engagement (HCTC) (Ot)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	124	137	125
Actual					124	117		
Target Met?					Y	Y		

Definition: The length of time between the first Program Kit mailing and first payment received. The calculation of this measure is the median number of calendar days that elapse per registration from the date the Program Kit is mailed to the date the first payment is received from the participant. This is calculated based on queries and reports from the system data.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: 1. Dates captured in system during operations, 2. Data queried by Health Care Tax Program Evaluation and Reporting team, 3. Measure calculated by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting team. Source: Siebel via Microsoft Systems Reporting.

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Data is reviewed by Health Care Tax Credit Program Evaluation and Reporting function and compared with previous months, 2. Diagnostic reports will be available for further review

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Moving forward, HCTC expects difficulty in maintaining current performance due to unfunded legislative changes that are expected to adversely affect program operations due to our inability to positively address increased program workload and taxpayer demand.

MEASURE: TEGE Determination Case Closures (Ot)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	112400	118200	100600	94000	140465	97151	85471	80700
Actual	108462	109408	100050	96246	105247	91205		
Target Met?	N	N	N	Y	N	N		

Definition: The number of cases closed in the Employee Plans or Exempt Organizations Determination programs, regardless of type of case or type of closing.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Tax Exempt and Government Entities (TE/GE) Determination System (EDS) Table 2A

Data Verification and Validation: 1. Group managers review data entered on closing documents by determination specialists prior to approving the case for closing.

2. Error registers/reports are generated for data not meeting system consistency checks

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: A series of factors continue to contribute to a shortfall in determination closures. In Exempt Organizations (EO), a shift in processing methods continues to result in more time applied than anticipated to the intermediate processing category. In addition, EO has shifted resources to process full development cases, which take longer to process, in order to reduce aging inventory. In Employee Plans, agents have shifted to work more complex Individually Designed Plans and Preapproved Plan receipts.

MEASURE: Taxpayer Self Assistance Rate (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	45.7	48.6	51.5	64.7	61.3	68.7	68.7	71.2
Actual	46.8	49.5	66.8	69.3	64.4	70.1		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of taxpayer assistance requests resolved using self-assisted automated services.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Enterprise Telephone Data (ETD) Snapshot Report, Accounts Management Information Report (AMIR), Internet Refund/Fact of Filing Project Site, MIS Reporting Tool, Electronic Tax Administration (ETA) Website, Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet tracking (Kiosk Visits)

Data Verification and Validation: Automated Calls Answered Web Services Completed Divided by: Assistor Calls Answered Automated Calls Answered Web Services Completed Electronic Interactions Customer Accounts Resolved (Paper) Taxpayer Assistance Centers Contact. This measure summarizes the following self-service activities: telephone automated calls answered, and web services (IRFOF, Internet EIN, Disclosure Authorization, P-TIN) compared to the volume of all interactions, including correspondence and amended returns, electronic interactions such as from electronic interactions such as ETLA, & I-EAR and assistor calls answered.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In order to achieve future targets, the IRS will continue to increase the self-service applications provided to taxpayers through IRS.gov and the release of new smartphone applications such as IRS2GO which lets taxpayers interact with the IRS where they want and when they want it.

MEASURE: Timeliness of Critical Individual Filing Season Tax Products to the Public (%) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	92	85.2	86	92	94	94	95	95
Actual	83	83.5	92.4	96.8	95.3	96.3		
Target Met?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of critical individual filing season tax products (tax forms, schedules, instructions, publications, tax packages, and certain notices required by a large number of filers to prepare a complete and accurate tax return) available to the public in a timely fashion. This measure will assess the percentage of Critical Individual Filing Season (CIFS) tax products available to the public by the fifth workday in January. CIFS tax products are those tax forms, schedules, instructions, publications, tax packages, and certain notices required by a large number of filers to prepare a complete and accurate individual income tax return by April 15th.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Publishing Services Data (PSD) System

Data Verification and Validation: Nightly processes provide analysts and management with reports concerning production status, missing data problems, and past due situations.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The IRS expects to continue to timely deliver tax products to the public.

MEASURE: Timeliness of Critical TE/GE and Business Tax Products to the Public (%) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	85	79.6	86	89	90	91	93	95
Actual	61.2	84	89.5	95.2	97.7	96.4		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of Critical Other Tax Products, paper and electronic, available to the public in a timely fashion. Critical Other Tax Products are business tax products, Tax Exempt and Government Entities and miscellaneous tax products. This measure contains two components: (1) percentage of paper tax products that meet the scheduled start to ship date within five business days of the actual start to ship date and (2) percentage of scheduled electronic tax products that is available on the Internet within five business days of the ok-to-print date. The intent is to have the tax products available to the public 30 days before the form is required to be filed.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Publishing Services Data System (PSD)

Data Verification and Validation: Nightly processes provide analysts and management with reports concerning production status, missing data problems, and past due situations.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The IRS expects to continue to timely deliver tax products to the public.

OUTCOME: Timely and accurate payments at the lowest possible cost

Financial Management Service

MEASURE: Percentage of Paper Check and Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) Payments Made Accurately And On-Time (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.9	99.9
Actual	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Accurately refers to the percentage of check and EFT payments that FMS makes which are not duplicate or double payments. On time means that FMS releases checks to the U.S. Postal Service and EFT payments to the Federal Reserve Bank such that normal delivery by them results in timely receipt by payees.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Accuracy data is captured through FMS' Regional Financial Centers which submit statistics on duplicate payments and data for the performance measure. The payments are balanced with payment certifications submitted to FMS by Federal Program Agencies. On time data on check and EFT volumes are captured monthly in a report from FMS' Production Reporting System.

Data Verification and Validation: Accuracy is ensured through payment processes and accounting systems that are subject to numerous internal controls and audit reviews. RFC managers validate payment controls. Systems and accounting reports are used to independently validate payment accuracy and identify the number of duplicate payments. RFCs balance the input to the PRS with a payment control file. The volume of checks released to the USPS is verified against the volume of checks listed on Postal Form 3600. USPS timeliness is ensured through Form 3600, which contains the time and date of release of checks from RFCs to the USPS. For EFT timeliness verification, the volume of payments released is verified against the volume of payments listed on the transmission report which also states the time and date of transmission from an RFC to the Federal Reserve Bank.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FMS continues to meet the goal of making payments accurately and on time. This has been a long standing operational value in FMS and will continue to be the cornerstone for our entire disbursement operation as we streamline and modernize our payment processes to become more efficient and cost effective.

MEASURE: Percentage of Treasury Payments and Associated Information Made Electronically (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	78	78	79	80	81	83	85	89
Actual	77	78	79	81	82	84.3		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The portion of the total volume of payments that is made electronically by FMS. Electronic payments include transfers through the automated clearinghouse and wire transfer payments through the FEDWIRE system.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The volume of payments is tracked through FMS' Production Reporting System. The amount and number of payments are also maintained under accounting control.

Data Verification and Validation: Accounting controls provide verification that the number of payments, both checks and EFT, is accurately tracked and reported. The number of inquires made against Federal check payments, whether disbursed by FMS or by other agencies, is separately tracked and reported. Additionally, payment files are balanced with payment authorizations that are electronically certified and submitted to FMS by Federal program agencies. The Federal Reserve Banks also validate the payment files.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Due to continued success with the Go Direct campaign and the All Electronic Treasury initiative, this goal was exceeded in FY 11. We anticipate continued increases in the % of electronic payments as we expand these efforts to additional benefit agencies and payment types.

MEASURE: Unit Cost For Federal Government Payments (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	0.35	0.39	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.37	0.34
Actual	0.37	0.39	0.394	0.37	0.36	0.37*		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Unit cost combines both paper and electronic payment mechanisms and includes the aftermath processes (reconciliation and claims) for both types of payment mechanisms.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The cost data is captured through an activity based costing process. The unit cost is the calculated ratio of cost per payment.

Data Verification and Validation: At the end of each fiscal year, actual costs for issuing payments are accumulated and calculated for checks and EFT payments. This information is calculated in conjunction with and verified by the program office and is reviewed by senior executives. Additional accounting controls provide verification that the number of payments is accurately tracked and reported.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FMS exceeded the FY 2011 performance measure set for the Unit Cost for Federal Government Payments by \$.03. This was accomplished due to the following: higher than expected conversions of check to EFT due to the continued success with the Go Direct campaign, the All Electronic Treasury Initiative, the transition of the Austin Regional Finance Center (AFC) from a payment center to a debt collection center. Going forward, FMS expects the unit cost to continue to trend downward due to a continuing increase in EFT payments and subsequent decrease in check payments and from the cost savings from converting the AFC to a Debt Operations Center as of October 1, 2011. Please note, this unit measure is estimated until cost are finalized.

OUTCOME: Government financing at the lowest possible cost over time

Bureau of the Public Debt

MEASURE: Cost Per Debt Financing Operation (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	133683	228409	263306	256336	193962	161726	160251	138918
Actual	148926	235172	220732	170214	162378	160785*		
Target Met?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This performance measure divides debt financing operations costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of auctions and buybacks.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The number of debt financing operations is captured on-line at TreasuryDirect.gov. Costs are captured in BPD's administrative accounting system.

Data Verification and Validation: Analysts determine the number of debt financing operations from TreasuryDirect.gov. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Based upon FY 2011 estimated year-to-date data, Public Debt is expected to meet the cost per debt financing operation target. Future upgrades to the Treasury Automated Auction Processing System software are planned to keep pace with technology changes that will ensure financing operations are conducted timely and with 100 percent accuracy, with regularly scheduled auction volume holding steady. The estimated FY 2011 cost per debt financing result is a forecast of year-end actual numbers including FRB resources.

MEASURE: Cost Per Government Agency Investment Services Transaction (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90.15	72.33	75.55	69.11	45.7	86.18	33.04	34.38
Actual	62.64	68.53	64.98	41.71	82.08	89.89*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		

Definition: This performance measure divides the federal funds investment costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of issues, redemptions, and interest payments for more than 200 trust funds, as well as the Treasury managed funds.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The automated investment accounting system captures and reports transaction counts. Costs are captured in Public Debt's administrative accounting system.

Data Verification and Validation: Accountants review transaction reports for reasonableness and any unusual trends are investigated. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Based upon FY 2011 estimated year-to-date data, the cost per federal funds investment transaction is forecasted to exceed the initial target of \$86.18 due to a decrease in the volume of investment activity as a result of the debt ceiling impasse. Beginning in FY 2012, the calculation of the cost per item volumes changes from federal funds investments to the government agency investments services (GAIS) summary level projection in order to incorporate all GAIS components and is based upon a five-year rolling average volume. This new target for FY 2012 of \$33.04 is a direct result of the GAIS program recognizing the benefit of streamlining and standardizing common business processes. The estimated FY 2011 cost per federal funds investment transaction is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.

MEASURE: Cost Per TreasuryDirect Assisted Transaction (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	7.75	6.16	9.25	9.34	8.57	7.95	6.2	6.4
Actual	4.97	6.65	8.19	8.72	8.23	2.93*		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This performance measure divides TreasuryDirect customer service transaction costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of customer requests completed with assistance by a customer service representative.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: For customer service transactions received by mail and for some requests received by phone or internet, Public Debt (BPD) obtains volumes from an automated tracking system. Simple phone and internet requests are manually counted. Costs are captured in BPD's administrative accounting system.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Verification and Validation: The accuracy of the system-generated volumes is verified twice a year by customer service staff performing manual counts. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Based upon FY 2011 estimated year-to-date data, Public Debt expects to fall below the FY 2011 target of \$7.95 per transaction. The cost per transaction is expected to be below the target because volumes were significantly higher than expected as customers transitioned to TreasuryDirect from the paper payroll savings bond program and Legacy Treasury Direct. As the program continues to evolve in the coming years, Public Debt will align resources to respond to customers' needs. The estimated FY 2011 cost per TreasuryDirect assisted transaction is a forecast of year-end actual numbers including FRB resources.

MEASURE: Cost Per TreasuryDirect Online Transaction (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	2.99	2.96	4.34	4.34	5.69	5.46	3.19	2.77
Actual	3.06	3.24	4.34	5.21	6.12	3.83*		
Target Met?	N	N	Y	N	N	Y		

Definition: This performance measure divides TreasuryDirect online transaction costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of TreasuryDirect online transactions.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Workload figures are captured from information stored in TreasuryDirect. Costs are captured in Public Debt's administrative accounting system.

Data Verification and Validation: Workload figures are electronically verified by the Treasury Direct system. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Based upon FY 2011 estimated year-to-date data, Public Debt expects to fall below the FY 2011 target of \$5.46 per transaction. The cost per transaction is expected to be below the target because volumes were significantly higher than expected as customers transitioned to TreasuryDirect from the paper payroll savings bond program and Legacy Treasury Direct. As the program continues to evolve in the coming years, Public Debt will align resources to respond to customers' needs. The estimated FY 2011 cost per TreasuryDirect online transactions is a forecast of year-end actual numbers including FRB resources.

MEASURE: Number of Government Agency Investment Services Control Processes Consolidated (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target		Baseline	2	0	5	0	2	Disc
Actual		3	2	0	5	0		
Target Met?		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N/A

Definition: Government Agency Investment Services (GAIS), one of the Bureau of Public Debt's primary Lines of Business, is responsible for the accounting of the Federal Investments, Special Purpose Securities, and Loans Receivable programs. In July 2005, Public Debt management announced a strategic direction to reduce the number of systems used to support GAIS. Through systems reduction, Public Debt will streamline the diversity of technology involved in supporting this business line. Additionally, this effort will allow Public Debt to consolidate and standardize the internal controls over processes common to all GAIS programs. The control environment consists of 18 processes that will be transformed into 6 standardized processes. The processes are funds management, investment accounting, standard reporting, customer interface, account maintenance, and enhanced reporting.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for tracking the status of the project using a project plan detailing all stages of the System Development Life Cycle. This plan includes milestones that help to measure significant accomplishments. This information is routinely shared with management of the program areas as part of an established and well-documented IT governance and change management process.

Data Verification and Validation: The Project Manager (PM) for the systems consolidation project is responsible for keeping management informed of the project plan and implementation dates of the system consolidation effort. The PM coordinates with program areas on all system related efforts to ensure the control environment is reduced with each system consolidation effort. With each milestone achieved in the systems consolidation project, there is a corresponding standardization and reduction of controls in the GAIS program. For example, in FY 2007 the loans receivable program consolidated funds management, investment accounting, and standard reporting. This reduced the total processes from 18 to 15 with the ultimate goal of 6 standardized processes by FY 2012.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Fiscal year 2011 has been a year of assessment in which no processes were reduced. Only 8 Government Agency Investment Services control processes remain. By the end of FY 2012, 2 additional processes will be consolidated and the control environment, which originally consisted of 18 processes, will finally be consolidated to 6 processes. Through systems reduction, Public Debt is streamlining the diversity of technology involved in supporting this business line as well as consolidating and standardizing internal controls.

MEASURE: Percent of Auction Results Released in Two Minutes +/- 30 Seconds (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	95	95	95	95	95	100	100	100
Actual	100	99.1	100	100	100	100		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measures the elapsed time from the auction close to the public release of the auction results. The annual percentage of auctions meeting the release time target of 2 minutes plus or minus 30 seconds is calculated for the fiscal year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: BPD's automated auction processing systems

Data Verification and Validation: For each auction, analysts verify and validate the system time stamps that record the auction close and auction posting times.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Future upgrades to the Treasury Automated Auction Processing System software are planned to keep pace with technology changes that will ensure financing operations are conducted timely and with 100 percent accuracy, with regularly scheduled auction volume holding steady.

MEASURE: Percent of Primary Dealers that submit live bids from their disaster recovery site on two separate auction dates (%) (Ot)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	70	90	Disc
Actual					78	100		
Target Met?					Y	Y		N/A

Definition: This performance measure tracks progress in meeting the Bureau of the Public Debt's long-term goal of having 90 percent of Primary Dealers submit live bids from their disaster recovery sites on two separate auction dates during FY 2012.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: At the beginning of each fiscal year, Public Debt will begin counting anew the number of times a Primary Dealer submits live bids from its disaster recovery site to determine whether the goal is reached by the end of the fiscal year. Participation in an auction from a disaster recovery site is counted either electronically via tokens or by auction staff.

Data Verification and Validation: Site participation by a primary dealer can be validated electronically and anecdotally by staff. Procedures require participants to call the Federal Reserve Bank of New York before and after each operation at the disaster recovery site.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Public Debt will continue to encourage primary dealers to prepare for emergency situations by conducting dealer visits and discussing the dealers' plans to continue submitting live bids from their disaster recovery (DR) sites. Public Debt will have two new primary dealers sign the Strategic Plan for Auction Contingencies. Also, Public Debt will participate in the annual industry-wide contingency test where Treasury and the participating auction submitters will fail over to their DR sites and enter bids in a mock auction. Finally, Treasury and Public Debt staff will visit the primary dealers' DR sites to verify that those sites are ready to be activated and functional for submission of auction bids in a contingency situation.

MEASURE: Percent of Respondents Selecting the Highest Rating of Customer Satisfaction with Government Agency Investment Services (%)

(Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	56	57	58
Actual					55	60		
Target Met?					Y	Y		

Definition: Government Agency Investment Services (GAIS) is one of the Bureaus of the Public Debt's (BPD) five primary Lines of Business. GAIS is responsible for the accounting of the Federal Investments, the Special Purpose Securities, and the Federal Borrowings programs. To determine the level of customer satisfaction with the functionality of GAIS, BPD will conduct a customer satisfaction survey on GAIS. The first survey results will establish a baseline customer satisfaction percentage. Survey questions will focus on both program and system satisfaction. BPD will conduct future surveys to measure the percentage improvement from the baseline. The measurement supports an objective to provide quality customer service, transaction processing, and accurate and timely payments to investors.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: BPD will develop, coordinate, and administer the customer satisfaction surveys. BPD will distribute the surveys to both internal and external users. Survey questions will focus on both program and system satisfaction. Survey results will reveal areas of customer needs and wants concerning IT enhancements and program direction. This information will be routinely shared with management of the program areas as part of an established and well-documented IT governance and change management process.

Data Verification and Validation: Once the surveys are completed and returned, the results will be manually verified and validated. The project and system satisfaction ratings will then be examined and analyzed for trends with the results being communicated to management.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: During FY 2011, survey results showed 60 percent of respondents rating their overall satisfaction with government agency investment services (GAIS) as "excellent." This percentage exceeded our satisfaction goal for the year. Using the survey responses, Public Debt plans to target areas for improvement, thereby progressively increasing the percentage of customers rating GAIS as "excellent" for FY 2012.

MEASURE: Percentage of Retail Customer Service Transactions Completed within 5 Business Days (%) (Ot)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	86	87	87	88
Actual				86	92.7	73.1		
Target Met?				Y	Y	N		

Definition: By FY 2014, significantly improve the number of Retail customer service transactions completed within 5 business days. The length of time to complete a customer service transaction is measured from the date each transaction is received to the date it is completed.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: For customer service transactions received by mail and for some requests received by phone or e-mail, Public Debt uses an automated tracking system that measures the length of time it takes to complete the transactions. Simple phone and internet requests are manually tracked.

Data Verification and Validation: The accuracy of system-generated data is cross-checked at least twice a year by customer service staff performing manual counts.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Public Debt did not meet its FY 2011 goal of processing 87 percent of time-sensitive retail customer service transactions within five business days. Performance was on target through March 2011, when Public Debt's announcement to curtail services in Legacy Treasury Direct initiated an influx of customer requests to transfer holdings from Legacy Treasury Direct to Treasury Direct. Processing these manually intensive transfer transactions caused Public Debt to miss its target. Public Debt's goal is to complete 87 percent of time-sensitive retail customer service transactions within five business days in FY 2012, as it was in FY 2011. Transactions include answering phone and email inquiries, processing payments or changes to payment instructions, and handling TreasuryDirect requests. Public Debt expects to meet its annual target by continually streamlining work processes and increasing the volume of electronic business transactions.

OUTCOME: Effective cash management

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Variance between estimated and actual receipts (annual forecast)(%)(Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5
Actual	3.9	2.1	4.6	5.5	5.8	4.4		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		

Definition: Percentage error measures the accuracy of the Benchmark receipt forecasts produced monthly by the Office of Fiscal Projections (OFP). It measures the relative amount of error or bias in receipt forecasts.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: OFP within the Office of the Fiscal Assistant Secretary creates estimates of Federal receipts by major categories (e.g., withheld income/FICA taxes, individual/SECA taxes, corporate taxes, customs deposits, estate and gift taxes and excise taxes) as well as by collection mechanisms (e.g., electronic and paper coupons) as a part of an extensive cash flow forecast used to inform Treasury's debt management decisions. OFP is also responsible for forecasting the daily tax receipts in order to manage the federal government's cash flow. Data on daily and monthly estimated and actual federal tax receipts are compiled by the office and used to report on the United States' daily, monthly, and annual cash position.

Data Verification and Validation: The percentage error is computed by subtracting the forecast value of tax receipts from the actual (At - Ft), and dividing this error of forecast by the actual value, and then multiplying it by 100. $PE_t = ((At - Ft)/At) * 100$ At is actual value of receipts at time t, and Ft is forecasted value of receipts at time t. The average percentage error is more general measure that will be used to compare the relative error in the forecasts. This measure adds up all the percentage errors at each point and divides them by the number of time point $APE = (|?t=1TPEt|)/T$

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

where PEt is the percentage error of forecasts in (1) and T is the total number of time point. The absolute value of the average percentage error will be used to measure the magnitude of error or bias in the receipts forecasts.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FY 2012 promises to be an exceptionally difficult year to forecast. The uncertain direction of the economy, a variety of potential legislative initiatives, and reduced notification for refund payments all contribute to making FY 2012 a challenging year.

OUTCOME: Accurate, timely, useful, transparent and accessible financial information

Bureau of the Public Debt

MEASURE: Cost Per Summary Debt Accounting Transaction (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	11.59	10.98	9.91	10.01	11.81	15.5	27.07	17.16
Actual	10.96	9.29	9.11	8.66	11.28	15.35*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This performance measure divides summary debt accounting transaction costs, determined by an established cost allocation methodology, by the number of summary debt accounting transactions.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Public Debt's investment accounting systems capture and report transaction counts. Costs are captured in Public Debt's administrative accounting system.

Data Verification and Validation: Accountants review transactional activity reports for reasonableness and any unusual trends are investigated. Senior management regularly reviews the cost allocation methodology and the allocations are updated at least annually.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Based upon FY 2011 estimated year-to-date data, the cost per summary debt accounting transaction is forecasted to be below the FY 2011 target of \$15.50. Beginning in FY 2012, the calculation of the cost per item is based upon a five-year rolling average volume to limit the impact of transaction volatility in summary debt accounting (SDA). The new consolidated SDA cost per transaction for FY 2012 is \$27.07. The FY 2012 projected cost per summary debt accounting transaction is increasing over FY 2011 as a direct result of the development costs to redefine and modernize the SDA environment. The estimated FY 2011 cost per summary debt accounting transaction is a forecast of year-end actual numbers.

MEASURE: Percent of Summary Debt Accounting business processes restructured or eliminated (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	6	6	26
Actual					6	9.5		
Target Met?					Y	Y		

Definition: Measures the progress in migrating Summary Debt Accounting to a shared service solution.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for tracking the status of the project using a project plan detailing all stages of the System Development Life Cycle. This plan includes milestones that help to measure significant accomplishments. This information is routinely shared with management of the program areas as part of an established and well-documented IT governance and change management

FULL REPORT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2011 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

process.

Data Verification and Validation: The Project Manager (PM) responsible for migrating Summary Debt Accounting (SDA) to a shared service solution will identify the total number of business processes for the SDA program. The PM will then develop a schedule and report to management on the percentage of SDA business processes that have been restructured or eliminated. The project will be considered complete when 44% of SDA business processes have been restructured or eliminated.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In an effort to modernize the debt accounting environment, Public Debt is engaging in a thorough reengineering of business processes to best support summary debt accounting needs. The percent of summary debt accounting business processes restructured or eliminated during FY 2011 was 9.5 percent with the goal for the fiscal year being 6 percent. The goal for fiscal year 2012 is also 6 percent. The Bureau expects the project to provide requirements for moving to a shared service solution, to ensure consistent processes across the board, to drive improvements in the subsidiary reporting systems, and to ultimately create greater efficiency within the debt accounting programs at the summary and subsidiary levels.

Financial Management Service

MEASURE: Percentage of Government-Wide Accounting Reports Issued Accurately (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: All Governmentwide financial data that FMS publishes relating to U.S. Treasury cash-based accounting reports (i.e., the Daily Treasury Statement, the Monthly Treasury Statement, and the Annual Combined Report) will be 100% accurate.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: A monthly tracking system reports on the various published statements and monitors errata as it pertains to this data.

Data Verification and Validation: There are no errata in any of the published governmentwide financial information.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Daily Treasury Statement (DTS) data is validated and reconciled daily with the reporting sources such as; Regional Financial Centers, Federal Program Agencies and various electronic deposit and payment applications to ensure the accuracy of the Federal Reserve balances on the statement. The Cash Forecasting Division has deadlines and procedures in place that reporting sources are required to adhere to in order to ensure accuracy, completeness and timeliness of the DTS as well as releasing the statement to the public on time every business day. For the Monthly Treasury Statement (MTS) each quarter we perform various checks and validations to ensure accuracy to the extent possible. In the event a material reporting error is discovered after finalizing the report, but before we publish, we will manually change the report to reflect the accurate information.

MEASURE: Percentage of Government-Wide Accounting Reports Issued Timely (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: All Governmentwide financial data that FMS publishes relating to U.S. Treasury cash-based accounting reports (i.e., the Daily Treasury Statement, the Monthly Treasury Statement, and the Annual Combined Report) will be on time 100% of the time.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: A monthly reporting system is used to track the release dates to the public of all of the various governmentwide statements.

Data Verification and Validation: Procedures are in place to validate that the statements are released on time to the public 100% of the time.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Daily Treasury Statement (DTS) data is validated and reconciled daily with the reporting sources such as; Regional Financial Centers, Federal Program Agencies and various electronic deposit and payment applications to ensure the accuracy of the Federal Reserve balances on the statement. The Cash Forecasting Division has deadlines and procedures in place that reporting sources are required to adhere to in order to ensure accuracy, completeness and timeliness of the DTS as well as releasing the statement to the public on time every business day. For the Monthly Treasury Statement (MTS) each month, quarter and at year-end we plan the daily tasks required to release the reports on time. Because deadlines are very short, the work to resolve reporting issues timely requires the coordination of several areas of expertise i.e., functional business, systems IT, and Federal Reserve Banks.

MEASURE: Unit Cost to Manage \$1 Million Dollars of Cash Flow (E)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	10.69	11.72	12.38	11.77	10.15	8.9	9.27
Actual	8.5	10.36	8.958	7.08	7.36	6.93*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This Unit Cost Measure assesses Government Wide Accounting's (GWA's) Cost to Manage Government Operations. The Government Operations consists of total GWA costs which consist of all Directorates, Systems, Administrative Overhead, and major initiatives performed within GWA. On a monthly basis the Cost-per-Million of Cash Flow managed by GWA is calculated.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Total GWA Cost data is retrieved from the year ending Cost Accounting Report. The Operating Cash, which is rounded in millions, is determined from the final DTS of each month for the fiscal year. The ratio of total costs to GWA per month over Deposits and Withdrawals (Excluding Transfers) gives us the cost to manage \$1 Million dollars of cash flow. This ratio is calculated for GWA alone to determine controllable costs, and using Information Resources / TWAI and Management Overhead to determine the uncontrollable costs attributed to GWA.

Data Verification and Validation: At the beginning of each month, the actual operating cash of the United States in the form of Deposits and Withdrawals is obtained from the Last Daily Treasury Statement (DTS) of the previous month. GWA total costs are broken down and retrieved from the Cost Accounting Report that is prepared at the end of the fiscal year. This information is verified and excludes Financial Services. Additional data is retrieved from this source and included in the report and is reviewed by senior executives.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The difference from the \$6.93 estimate and the target of \$10.15 is attributed to the significant increase in cash flows over the past 2 years versus the 10 year linear trend on which the estimate is based.

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Release Federal Government-Wide Financial Statements on Time (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Actual	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This report is the audited consolidated financial report of the Federal Government required by the Government Management Reform Act.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are collected from the audited financial results of all federal agencies and is audited by GAO.

Data Verification and Validation: Report is released to the public with a release date that can be independently verified. The due date is established by OMB policy. The statutory deadline is March 31st.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: We are on target to meet the target, but it is not official until December 19th which is the scheduled date. Normally, for FY 2011 we would report having met the FY 2010 statement date.

OUTCOME: Commerce enabled through safe, secure U.S. notes and coins

United States Mint

MEASURE: Numismatic Sales Units								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	7	7
Actual						7.3		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: The numismatic sales units indicates the number of coin products sold to the public from numismatic operations. It quantifies the demand for the Nation's official numismatic products. Increases in units sold allow the Mint to potentially reduce the sales prices, as fixed costs will spread among more units. More units sold will also demonstrate that the Mint is meeting demand for products.

Indicator Type:

Data Capture and Source:

Data Verification and Validation:

Data Accuracy:

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Mint plans to meet future targets by providing high quality products, enhancing customer service, improving communications and investing in promotional campaigns to increase the general public's and coin-collectors' awareness of Mint products.

STRATEGIC GOAL: U.S. and World Economies Perform at Full Economic Potential

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: Improved economic opportunity, mobility and security with robust, real, sustainable economic growth at home and abroad

OUTCOME: Strong U.S. economic competitiveness

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau

MEASURE: Average Number of Days to Process an Original Permit Application at the National Revenue Center (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	72	72	72	75	75
Actual			64	64	65	74		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	N		

Definition: The average number of days to process an original permit application (including those rejected) at the National Revenue Center (NRC). An application is stamped when received and recorded when processed.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The NRC generates statistical reports, searches, and queries from the IRIS system.

Data Verification and Validation: The NRC maintains data in the Integrated Revenue Information System (IRIS) database that reflects the receipt date of the application and the permit issue or close date. The IRIS system contains built-in data integrity controls to validate the information.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, TTB released the first phase of a new Permits Online system which allows industry members to submit permit applications electronically. Initial processing times for original permit applications suffered greatly in the second and third quarters of FY 2011 as employees were trained and became familiar with the new system. This transitional period was further impeded by reductions to staff resources. During the fourth quarter of FY 2011, processing times for the permit types included in Permits Online showed improvement as the industry user adoption rate grew and employees gained experience using the system. As the phased rollout of Permits Online continues during FY 2012 and user adoption rates increase, TTB expects to sustain processing times despite anticipated increases to the permit application filings.

MEASURE: National Revenue Center (NRC) Customer Satisfaction Survey Results (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	85	85	85	85	85
Actual			90	89	89	90		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The NRC conducts a customer survey to determine satisfaction levels among industry members applying for a permit or filing a claim with TTB. The questions used in this survey are standardized for each commodity.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data is captured from clients through a survey mechanism. Results are posted to a detailed Excel spreadsheet. There are periodic reports generated for management.

Data Verification and Validation: Supervisor reviews report of summary data developed by National Revenue Center (NRC) staff.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: With the continued phased rollout of Permits Online scheduled during FY 2012, TTB anticipates reduced processing times for original permit applications and permit amendments, which will have a positive impact on the customer satisfaction survey results among TTB customers who file for a TTB permit through the National Revenue Center. As the user adoption rate for Permits Online grows, the customer satisfaction scores will continue to improve over time as applicants experience faster response times and the ease of using the system, assuming that permit processing staffing levels remain in a steady state. TTB has also created a task force to review internal processes for efficiencies. As an initial act, the task force will analyze and improve the forms and instructions for those filing a bond with TTB. Many TTB permittees must secure a bond to protect against revenue loss in the production and transport of taxable goods.

MEASURE: Percent of Electronically Filed Certificate of Label Approval Applications (E)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	27	47	52	53	78	81	83	87
Actual	38	51	62	74	79	88		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Calculated by dividing the number of e-filed applications by the total Certificate of Label Approval applications (COLA) submissions (paper and electronic). The quarterly results are cumulative.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data is captured through the COLAs Online database system. There are periodic statistical reports, searches, and queries that are generated.

Data Verification and Validation: Supervisor reviews report generated from the COLAs Online database.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, TTB achieved a notable increase in its electronic filing rate for alcohol beverage label applications. Manufacturers and importers of alcohol beverages must have a TTB-approved label for their product prior to its introduction into U.S. commerce. In its efforts to reduce the time industry must wait for a label approval, and thus to facilitate fair and robust trade, TTB will continue to promote its electronic filing options through webinars and targeted industry interfacing, focusing efforts on the largest paper filers. In FY 2012, TTB also will revamp the COLAs Online e-newsletter and use its web site to educate industry members regarding the benefits of electronic filing, the most important of which include shorter response times and the ability to monitor the status of applications online. The integration of COLAs Online with the new Formulas Online system, which allows industry members to electronically apply for product formulation approval, will further incentivize use of the COLAs Online system.

MEASURE: Percentage of Importers Identified by TTB as Illegally Operating without a Federal Permit (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	20	19	19	14	14
Actual			22	15	15	14		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure estimates the rate of occurrences in which an individual or business imports tobacco illegally (i.e., without a Federal permit) in the United States by dividing the number of illicit importers, as determined by a comparison of data in U.S. Customs' International Trade Database System (ITDS) and TTB's Integrated Revenue Information System (IRIS), by the total number of importers operating, as captured in ITDS. TTB revised the methodology for this measure in September 2008, finding that the use of data from ITDS on active importers in a given reporting period better reflects the level of illicit activity in the marketplace.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data is captured through the ITDS and compared with that of the NRC permit database. There are periodic statistical reports, searches, and queries that are generated.

Data Verification and Validation: Supervisor reviews report developed based on the comparison of data from ITDS and IRIS, the TTB permit

database.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: TTB will remain vigilant in monitoring imports of tobacco products by non-permitted importers. Special emphasis is placed each year on enforcing S. 1147 (PACT Act), a law designed to prevent tobacco smuggling and to ensure the collection of all taxes levied on tobacco products. Under the PACT Act, shipments of tobacco products via U.S. Postal Service (USPS) are prohibited. TTB continues to coordinate with the USPS and other ground carriers to provide enforcement assistance. Furthermore, TTB is monitoring the importation of processed tobacco to ensure the fidelity of the importers handling this commodity. As an untaxed commodity, processed tobacco poses a particular revenue risk if it is diverted for the illicit manufacture of taxable tobacco products (e.g., cigarettes). In FY 2012, TTB will continue to monitor the importation of processed tobacco and contact all importers who have failed to apply for a TTB permit.

Community Development Financial Institutions Fund

MEASURE: ALL - Affordable Housing Units Created								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	16419	16018
Actual						19083		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Number of affordable housing units created by CDFI Fund programs. This includes real estate construction and rehabilitation financed in part by CDFI Program financial assistance awardees, New Markets Tax Credit allocatees and CMF awardees.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees. The Financial Strategies and Research Unit administers the Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports which contain business lending data for each CDFI Financial Assistance awardee and NMTC allocatee. CMF reporting systems will be established in 2011.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect affordable housing unit data through the annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was baselined in FY2011. Future performance for this measure is calibrated to reflect available resources and any changes in trends.

MEASURE: ALL - Award Cycle Time								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	7.5	7.5
Actual						7.4		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months). Cycle time is calculated as a weighted average across all CDFI Fund programs, weighted by the number of awards per program in each round.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted.

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award

announcements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Despite delays in appropriations during FY2011 which compressed the review period for application-award cycle process, actual performance met the target. This measure is projected to remain steady in future years which reflects administrative performance estimates based on an internal review of the potential for improvements in internal controls and procedures. The CDFI Fund will review the results of implementing administrative improvements and assess whether the targets can be revised in the future.

MEASURE: ALL - Businesses Financed								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	5104	5104
Actual						5729		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Number of loans provided to businesses financed by CDFI Fund programs. This includes the number of business and microenterprise loans made by awardees receiving CDFI Program financial assistance grants, and the number of businesses supported by NMTC allocatees.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees. The Financial Strategies and Research Unit administers the Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports which contain business lending data for each CDFI Financial Assistance awardee and NMTC allocatee.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect data on business lending for the CDFI Program through Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was baselined in FY2011. Future performance for this measure is calibrated to reflect available resources and any changes in trends.

MEASURE: ALL - Disbursement Cycle Time								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	2.5	2.5
Actual						2.1		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Cycle time from the date of award announcement to the date of disbursement (in months). Cycle time is calculated as a weighted average across all CDFI Fund programs, weighted by the number of awards per program in each round. The CDFI Fund is expected to have disbursed 85% of the funds within the target period. The 15% buffer is necessary because disbursement depends on having awardees/allocatees sign and return the agreements in a timely fashion.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted.

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Despite delays in appropriations during FY2011 which lengthened the process, the performance target was met. Future targets are projected to remain steady and reflect administrative performance estimates based on an internal review of potential for improvements in internal controls and procedures. The CDFI Fund will review the results of implementing administrative improvements and assess whether the targets can be revised in the future.

MEASURE: ALL - Jobs Created/Maintained								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	43335	43335
Actual						55274		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Jobs maintained are jobs at the business at the time the loan or investment is made. Jobs created are new jobs created after the loan or investment is made. Total jobs are derived from a) all business loans originated in the CDFI Program portfolio; b) all NMTC allocatees' business and tenant jobs at qualified low-income community businesses (QALICBs); and c) all reported job creation/maintenance for other CDFI Fund programs. Total jobs are computed as full-time equivalents (FTEs) based on at least a 35-hour workweek. In calculating the number of full-time projected equivalents, part-time employees should be combined to full-time equivalents. For example, two part-time employees that each work 17.5 hours/week should be combined to count as one full-time equivalent. Jobs created serve as an important indicator of the economic vitality of underserved areas.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees. Many organizations track the number of jobs projected to be created. A smaller number collect annual information on actual number of jobs created. Some do not collect the data and respond "don't know." The Financial Strategies and Research Unit administers the Transaction Level Reports which contain FTE data for each CDFI Financial Assistance awardee and NMTC allocatee.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect FTE through the annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data is provided by awardees but based on the source listed for their estimates; the data are compared to benchmarks derived from federal statistical agencies (e.g. Bureau of Labor Statistics) for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Performance for this measure was particularly strong due to the effects of awards and allocations under ARRA. Future performance for this measure is recalibrated on an annual basis to reflect available resources and any changes in trends.

MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Financial Assistance Application Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	5130	6920	6920	6920	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	8710	7180	7200	3283				
Target Met?	N	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The cost per application for Financial Assistance (FA) applications.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Fund will analyze the cost of materials as well as staff time and contractor's time to determine the total fixed and variable cost per application.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will conduct an analysis of the total cost of processing a single FA application. The analysis will include both fixed and variable costs for the project.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Number of Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) Applications Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1280	1455	1455	1455	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	1630	1950	3070	2366				
Target Met?	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The fixed and variable cost per application for Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) applications.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Fund will analyze the cost of materials as well as staff time and contractor's time to determine the total cost per application.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will conduct an analysis of the total cost of processing a single BEA application. The analysis will include both fixed and variable costs for the project.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Number of Native American CDFI Assistance Applications Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	10050	9090	9090	9090	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	8130	13510	10990	3162				
Target Met?	Y	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The Fund will determine the total cost associated with Native American CDFI Assistance (NACA) applications based on fixed and variable costs.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Fund will capture this information through budget documentation.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will determine the total cost of a single NACA application based on material costs as well as the amount staff and contractor time per application.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Administrative Costs Per Number of New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) Applications Processed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	5390	4875	4875	4875	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc

Actual	4360	5320	7400	3254				
Target Met?	Y	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The cost per application for New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) applications.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Fund will analyze the cost of materials as well as staff time and contractor's time to determine the total fixed and variable cost per application.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will conduct an analysis of the total cost of processing a single NMTC application. The analysis will include both fixed and variable costs for the project.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Annual Percentage Increase In The Total Assets of Native CDFIs (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	182	19	19	23	26	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: Measure the percent change in total assets that Native CDFIs report from one year to the next. The Fund will calculate: $[(\text{Total Assets in Current Year} - \text{Total Assets in Previous Year}) / (\text{Total Assets in Previous Year})]$

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The Native CDFIs financial data is captured through the annual Institution Level Report.

Data Verification and Validation: Native CDFIs report their total assets to the Fund in their Institution Level Report. The Fund verifies the total assets reported against the organization's submitted balance sheet. Organizations are contacted regarding any discrepancies in the data reported. The Fund compares the total assets of CDFIs from year-to-year.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: Because this measure has been demoted to indicator status beginning in FY2011, no target has been set. To be consistent with the CDFI Program assets indicator, the methodology was changed in FY2011 to reflect the percentage of Native CDFIs reporting an increase in assets over the prior year instead of an overall change in assets. These results cannot be compared to prior years.

MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - BEA [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					4.75			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - CDFI [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					8			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - NMTC [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					6.75			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Application Cycle Time - Native Initiatives [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					6.75			

Target Met? Y N/A N/A N/A

Definition: Cycle time from the date when applications are received to the date of award announcement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Application intake dates and award announcement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on dates of receipt of applications and date of award announcements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: BEA-Increase in Community Development Activities Over Prior Year For All BEA Program Applicants (\$ million) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	81	100	180	202	210	244.2	0	0
Actual	318	227	232	292	290	268.3		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measures the Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) applicants' increase in qualified community development activities over prior year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each BEA Program applicant is required to submit an application containing a Report of Transactions. The BEA Program Unit administers the BEA application. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

Data Verification and Validation: The data is self-reported by applicants during the application process.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Particularly strong bank interest in the program led to the target being exceeded for FY2011. No target has been set for future years because the administration has not requested an appropriation for this program.

MEASURE: CDFI - Amount of Loans/Investments Originated (Annual)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	1188	1156
Actual						1228		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Total dollar amount of loans/investments originated by reporting CDFI Financial Assistance awardees during the program year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees in the Community Investment Impact System (CIIS).

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect data on loans and investments originated by awardees through the Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was baselined in FY2011. Future performance for this measure is calibrated to reflect available resources and any changes in trends.

MEASURE: CDFI - Number of Loans/Investments Originated (Annual)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	16000	16000
Actual						16313		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Number of loans/investments originated by reporting CDFI Financial Assistance awardees during the program year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees in the Community Investment Impact System (CIIS).

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect data on loans and investments originated by awardees through the Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was baselined in FY2011. Future performance for this measure is calibrated to reflect available resources and any changes in trends.

MEASURE: Commercial Real-Estate Properties Financed by BEA Program Applicants That Provide Access to Essential Community Products And Services In Underserved Communities (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target		Baseline	285	285	285	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual		301	287	500	283			
Target Met?		Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Number of commercial real-estate projects financed by BEA applicants.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each BEA Program applicant is required to submit an application containing a Report of Transactions. The BEA Program Unit administers the BEA application. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

Data Verification and Validation: The data is self-reported by applicants during the application process.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Community Development Entities' Annual Investments In Low-Income Communities (\$ billions) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Target	1.6	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	4	4
Actual	2	2.5	3.3	3.6	3.1	4.7		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Amount of investments in Low Income Communities that Community Development Entities have made with capital raised through their New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) allocations. The Fund will report NMTC Qualified Low-Income Community Investments (QLICs) that are supported by NMTC Qualified Equity Investments (QEIs).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Fund will capture the data in the CDEs' annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports.

Data Verification and Validation: CDEs will attract private sector equity in the form of QEIs. CDEs will have 12 months to invest these QEIs in QLICs. The CDEs will self-report QLICs in their annual Transaction Level Report. The Fund uses these reports for research, reporting, and compliance. The Fund is confident that CDEs will accurately report, as the consequence of misinformation may be recapture of the New Markets Tax Credits.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Performance for this measure was particularly strong due to the effects of the ARRA allocation round. Future performance for this measure is recalibrated to reflect available resources and changes in trends.

MEASURE: Community Development Entities' Cumulative Investments in Low-Income Communities (\$ billion) (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	2	4	6	11.4	10	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	3.1	5.6	8.9	12.5	15.8			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Amount of cumulative investments in Low Income Communities that Community Development Entities have made with capital raised through their New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC) allocations in billions. The Fund will report NMTC Qualified Low-Income Community Investments (QLICs) that are supported by NMTC Qualified Equity Investments (QEIs).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Fund will capture the data in the CDEs' annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports.

Data Verification and Validation: CDEs will attract private sector equity in the form of QEIs. CDEs will have 12 months to invest these QEIs in QLICs. The CDEs will self-report QLICs in their annual Transaction Level Report. The Fund uses these reports for research, reporting, and compliance. The Fund is confident that CDEs will accurately report, as the consequence of misinformation may be recapture of the New Markets Tax Credits.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - BEA

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					2			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - CDFI								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					2			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - NMTC [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					2			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from the date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Disbursement Cycle Time - Native Initiatives [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					2			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Cycle time from date of award announcement to date of disbursement (in months)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Award announcement and award disbursement dates posted

Data Verification and Validation: Verification is derived from administrative data on the date of award announcement and dates of award disbursement.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Dollars of Private and Non-CDFI Fund Investments That CDFIs are Able To Leverage Because of Their CDFI Fund Financial Assistance. (\$ million) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	1400	778	621	1298	1989	1500		

Definition: This measure represents the dollars of private and non-CDFI Fund investments that CDFIs are able to leverage because of their CDFI Fund Financial Assistance (FA) award. For CDFIs, leverage is defined as the one-to-one non-federal match (as required by the FA program), plus funds the CDFI is able to leverage with CDFI Fund FA grant and equity dollars, plus dollars that the awardees' borrowers leverage for projects. (Project leverage example - Of the total financing needed for a housing development is \$5 million and the awardee lends \$1 million, while other investors lend the remaining \$4 million, then the \$4 million is the project leverage).

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: FA award disbursements are made once CDFIs provide documentation showing that they have received or been committed matching funds. Disbursements of FA are tracked by the Financial Manager and are used as the proxy for matching funds raised. The CDFI Program annual Institution Level Report captures the leverage ratio for FA grants and equity dollars, as well as project level leverage.

Data Verification and Validation: CDFI awardees' one-to-one match is equal to the amount disbursed to awardees. The FA grant and equity dollar leverage ratio is taken from the awardees' financial statements. (In most cases, the financial statements have been audited.) Project level leverage is reported by the awardee and is not verifiable by the Fund.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: Because this measure has been demoted to indicator status beginning in FY2011, no target has been set.

MEASURE: FEC - Number of Prospective Homebuyers Served

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	2200	2124
Actual						1135		

Target Met?

Y

Definition: Each Financial Education and Counseling (FEC) awardee is charged with serving Prospective Homebuyers, clients identified by their annual income and family size compared to area medians. The number of Prospective Homebuyers demonstrates the size and scope of FEC activity.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each FEC awardee is required to submit an annual report indicating the number of Prospective Homebuyers served. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

Data Verification and Validation: The data is self-reported by awardees.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The target is based on projections made by applicants in response to GAO-11-737R: Financial Education and Counseling Pilot Program, July 27, 2011.

MEASURE: Increase in the Percentage Of Eligible Areas Served by a CDFI (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	5	8	15	15	21	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	13.5	19.5	17.8	25.1	27.5			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: From 2000 census data, there are 24,795 geographic tracts in the U.S. that are designated as eligible to be served by CDFIs. The CDFI Fund captures portfolio data at the specific project address level from organizations receiving awards. By having this information, it can be determined how many eligible tracts CDFIs are serving in an annual reporting year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee collects and tracks their portfolio data in its own management information system(s). It is then uploaded into the CDFI Fund's Community Investment Impact System (CIIS). This information is self-reported by the awardees.

Data Verification and Validation: The CDFI Fund will collect portfolio data thru the annual transaction level reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the CDFI Fund. Awardees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in 2011 because it has been substantially revised and replaced by an alternative measure: CDFI-Pct. of eligible areas served by CDFI Awardees.

MEASURE: NACA - Amount of Loans/Investments Originated (Annual)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	14.5	14.5
Actual						14.7		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Total dollar amount of loans/investments originated by reporting NACA Financial Assistance awardees during the program year.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees in the Community Investment Impact System (CIIS).

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect data on loans and investments originated by awardees through the Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was baselined in FY2011. Future performance for this measure is calibrated to reflect available resources and changes in trends.

MEASURE: NACA - Number of Loans/Investments Originated (Annual)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	1000	1000
Actual						1004		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Number of loans/investments originated by reporting NACA Financial Assistance awardees during the program year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks information in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees in the Community Investment Impact System (CIIS).

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect data on loans and investments originated by awardees through the Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was baselined in FY2011. Future performance for this measure is calibrated to reflect available resources and changes in trends.

MEASURE: NMTC-Percentage of Loans and Investments that Went Into Severely Distressed Communities (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	66	66	66	66	66	68.2	70	70
Actual	71	76	73	81	73.4	72.4		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Portfolio data being reported by allocatees' at the project level is used to determine the percentage of loans going into a distressed community. A distressed community is composed of any of the following criteria:

1)Poverty > 30%

2)Median Income < 60%

3)Unemployment Rate 1.5x National Average

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each allocatee collects and tracks their portfolio data in its own management information system(s). It is then uploaded into the CDFI Fund's Community Investment Impact System (CIIS). This information is self-reported by the awardees.

Data Verification and Validation: The CDFI Fund will collect portfolio data thru annual transaction level reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the CDFI Fund. Awardees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Performance for this measure has been consistently high, reflecting a competitive application process. As a result, future targets have been increased.

MEASURE: Number of Full-Time Equivalent Jobs Created Or Maintained In Underserved Communities By Businesses Financed by CDFI Program Awardees (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	29158	34009	28676	30000	85000	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	22329	35022	29539	70260	80796			
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Jobs maintained are jobs at the business at the time the loan or investment is made. Jobs created are new jobs created after the loan or investment is made. Total jobs are derived from all business loans outstanding in the CDFI portfolio. Jobs created and maintained serve as an important indicator of the economic vitality of underserved areas. Underserved communities are those that qualify as CDFI Program Target Markets (which include a specific geography called an Investment Area or a specific community of people with demonstrated lack of access to credit, equity, or financial services called a Low-Income Targeted Population or an Other Targeted Population).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee and allocatee collects and tracks job data in its own management information system(s). The information is self-reported by awardees and allocatees. Many organizations track the number of jobs projected to be created. A smaller number collect annual information on actual number of jobs created. Some do not collect the data and respond "don't know." Each CDFI Financial Assistance awardee and NMTC Allocatee is required to complete a Transaction Level Report. CDFI awardees report FTE data in the Institution Level Report or Transaction Level Report, while NMTC Allocatees report FTE data in the Transaction Level Report only.

Data Verification and Validation: The Fund will collect FTE through the annual Institution Level and Transaction Level Reports. Data provided is compared to the awardees' and allocatees' actual financial statements for accuracy and "reasonableness" as defined by the Fund. Awardees and allocatees are contacted regarding any discrepancies.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Number of Small Businesses Located In Underserved Communities Financed by BEA Program Applicants (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target		Baseline	329	288	252	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual		375	906	640	1005			

Target Met? Y Y Y Y N/A N/A N/A

Definition: Number of loans provided to small businesses financed by BEA applicants.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each BEA Program applicant is required to submit an application containing a Report of Transactions. The BEA Program Unit administers the BEA application. All reports are submitted electronically and the data is stored in the Fund's databases.

Data Verification and Validation: The data is self-reported by applicants during the application process.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Percent of CDFIs that Increased Their Total Assets (Cumulative) (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	70	70	70	70	65	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	84	82	87	88	84			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Measure the # of CDFIs that reported an increase in total assets in the current year compared to the original year that was first reported to the CDFI Fund.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: CDFIs financial data is captured through the annual Institutional Level Report.

Data Verification and Validation: CDFIs report their total assets to the CDFI Fund in their Institutional Level Report. The CDFI Fund verifies the total assets reported against the organization's submitted balance sheet. Organizations are contacted regarding any discrepancies in the data reported.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Percent of CDFIs that Increased Their Total Assets Over the Previous Year (Annual) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	82	74	80	69	52	65		

Definition: Measure the # of CDFIs that reported an increase in total assets over the previous year.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The CDFIs financial data is captured through the annual Institution Level Report.

Data Verification and Validation: CDFIs report their total assets to the CDFI Fund in their Institutional Level Report. The CDFI Fund verifies the total assets reported against the organization's submitted balance sheet. Organizations are contacted regarding any discrepancies in the data reported. The CDFI Fund compares the total assets of CDFIs from year-to-year.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: Because this measure has been demoted to indicator status beginning in FY2011, no target has been set.

MEASURE: Percentage of Eligible Areas Served by CDFI Awardees (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1	1	3	3	5	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	1.6	4.2	3.4	14.8	16.6			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: This measure illustrates the extent to which CDFIs are serving geographically defined, distressed target markets by comparing locations of transactions made by CDFI awardees to the locations of eligible Census tracts. Eligible census tracts are any census tract or group of contiguous census tracts or counties that meet at least one of following: a) at least 20% of population living in poverty; b) for Metro Areas where median family income <=80% of metro areas MFI or national metro area MFI, whichever is greater; c) for outside Metro Areas where median family income <= 80% of statewide non-metropolitan area MFI or national non-metro area MFI whichever is greater; d) where the unemployment rate at least 1.5 times the national average. Eligible non-metro counties may also include census tracts with population loss of 10% or more over 10 years, or 5% or more over 5 years.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each awardee collects and tracks their portfolio data in its own management information system(s). It is then uploaded into the CDFI Fund's Community Investment Impact System (CIIS). This information is self-reported by the awardees.

Data Verification and Validation: The CDFI Fund will collect annual transaction level reports and compare them to eligible investment areas to determine the overall percentage of eligible tracts that have been served.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

OUTCOME: Free trade and investment

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Number of New Trade and Investment Negotiations Underway or Completed (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	6	2	2	6	6
Actual			14	15	6	15		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The number of international trade or investment agreements underway or completed during the period and the number of those that reflect commitments to high standards, including new commitments by a foreign government to open its financial services markets to U.S.

providers. It includes bilateral agreements such as Free Trade Agreements, Bilateral Investment treaties and multilateral undertaking (e.g., WTO) from which the U.S. benefits.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: International Affairs staff and U.S. Trade Representative's office reporting.

Data Verification and Validation: Based upon a count by International Affairs staff responsible for such negotiations and verifiable by reference to U.S. Trade Representative.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations made progress this year and will intensify in the coming fiscal year. Congress enacted implementing legislation for pending free trade agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama this year, and the Administration is committed to ensuring that these agreements are fully implemented by our trading partners. Global economic conditions will affect efforts to complete both bilateral and multilateral negotiations that are underway. Progress towards Department goals could be slowed if weaker economic conditions continue. The Department will make every effort to work with other agencies to complete additional negotiations for 2012.

MEASURE: Number of Specific New Trade Actions Involving Treasury Interagency Participation in Order to Enact, Implement, and Enforce U.S. Trade Law and International Agreements (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	30	40	40	50	50
Actual			68	98	83	87		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Specific trade actions involving Treasury interagency participation under legislation, decision whether to initiate trade disputes, review of country eligibility for preference programs, and review of specific trade petitions and recommendations (under preference programs, Section 301, CITA, Section 337, etc.)

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: International Affairs staff and U.S. Trade Representative's (USTR) office, USTIC, and the Federal Register.

Data Verification and Validation: Based upon a count by International Affairs staff responsible for such negotiations and verifiable by reference to USTR, Federal Register notices, USTIC notices, and other official websites.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Challenging economic conditions again ensured that the number of new trade actions for 2011 exceeded initial expectations. If the global economy improves, the chances for similar economic conditions in 2012 are less likely; therefore the target for 2012 remains 50.

OUTCOME: Prevented or mitigated financial and economic crises

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Average days to close a FOIA case

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	64	64	50	35
Actual				67	95	98		
Target Met?				Y	N	N		

Definition: This measure tracks the average number of days it takes to close a FOIA case after it is received by OFS.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The OFS analysts log all incoming FOIA requests upon receipt and update the status of each case in the FOIA database.

Data Verification and Validation: OFS analysts ensure that OFS program office staff respond promptly and accurately to all FOIA cases and update the status of each case in the FOIA database.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, OFS was able to reduce its case backlog of FY 2009 and FY 2010 FOIA cases that were unresolved by 80%. In addition, OFS received significantly less new FOIA cases in FY 2011 than in previous fiscal years. Consequently, the average days for OFS to close a FOIA case was more reflective of the average days to close older cases. It is important to note that for cases received in FY 2011 OFS was well below the target set for average days to close. OFS expects the elimination of backlogged cases in FY 2011 will allow a further reduction in the number of days it takes to close a FOIA case in FY 2012.

MEASURE: Changes that Result from Project Engagement (Impact) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
Actual			3.1	3.1	3	3.2*		
Target Met?			Y	Y	N	Y		

Definition: The extent to which a Technical Assistance project objective contributes to the achievement of the goal(s) described in the Terms of Reference and addresses the country problem describe

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Generated by the Financial Technical Assistant Advisor who manage the project in the countries were technical assistant project exist.

Data Verification and Validation: The data is verified by the five contracting office representatives, the Associate Director of OTA and approved by the director of OTA.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The target goal for FY 2011 was exceeded. Performance has been consistent within .1 of targeted goals since the baseline was set in 2008, and OTA anticipates that this pattern will be continued in the future. The nature of the OTA program is such that country projects that reach performance goals and objectives are concluded by mutual agreement between Treasury and the counterpart country. New projects are begun where challenges are great, needs are clear, and there is a will to reform on the part of the counterpart country. The effect of this program dynamic keeps the target goal always challenging but reachable if performance remains high across all teams and projects.

MEASURE: Clean audit opinion on TARP financial statements								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	1	1	1	1
Actual				Met	Met	Met		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure identifies whether OFS receives a clean audit opinion from the GAO on its TARP financial statements.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The OFS Office of the Chief Financial Officer generates the TARP financial statements and will receive and communicate the audit opinion from GAO.

Data Verification and Validation: TARP financial statements are subject to an audit conducted by GAO.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OFS successfully met its target for FY 20101 by receiving a clean audit opinion from GAO. OFS will continue to strive for accuracy and transparency in its financial statements so that OFS can continue to receive clean audit opinions.

MEASURE: Percentage of SIGTARP and GAO oversight recommendations responded to on time								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	100	100	100	100
Actual				100	93	88		
Target Met?				Y	N	N		

Definition: This measure tracks the percentage of SIGTARP and GAO oversight recommendations that were responded to within the required timeframes.

SIGTARP: 30 days.

GAO: 60 days.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Upon completion of an audit, SIGTARP and GAO have the opportunity to issue recommendations to which OFS provides responses detailing actions, if any, taken by Treasury to remedy the SIGTARP and GAO recommendations.

OFS staff inputs GAO recommendations and OFS responses into Treasury's Joint Management Enterprise System (JAMES). SIGTARP inputs SIGTARP recommendations into JAMES and OFS inputs the associated responses.

Data Verification and Validation: The data in the periodic reports are compared to data entered into JAMES. The number of recommendations and their associated statuses are tallied and analyzed by OFS analysts.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In reference to the shortfall accounted for above, Treasury's response to the recommendations included in SIGTARP's January 2011 Quarterly Report was delayed due to negotiations between Treasury and SIGTARP regarding the scope of those recommendations.

MEASURE: Percentage of congressional correspondence responses drafted within 48 hours								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	90	90	98	98
Actual				87	97	98		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure tracks the percentage of congressional correspondence letters sent to OFS that have a response letter completed (drafted, cleared and signed) within 10 business days of receipt.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Correspondence is logged in Main Treasury's TACT system. OFS staff maintains a subsidiary tracking report in Excel

to monitor and calculate the response time.

Data Verification and Validation: The OFS team lead confirms all correspondence response times by reviewing TACT-generated and COO response emails to verify dates and lapsed time.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OFS met and exceeded its performance target for FY 2011 for the percentage of Congressional correspondence responses completed (drafted, cleared and signed) within 10 business days. OFS continues to streamline its correspondence response process and will continue to improve its response time.

*Congressional correspondence refers to letters forwarded by members of Congress on behalf of their constituents and does not include Policy letters addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury.

MEASURE: Percentage of customers satisfied with FinancialStability.gov								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	70	65	67	69
Actual				65	63	66		
Target Met?				Y	N	Y		

Definition: This measure tracks the percentage of customers that are sufficiently satisfied with the information provided on our website as well as the ease of navigating the site itself.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The survey presents randomly to 60% of the visitors who have viewed at least 2 pages of the web site. Respondents are asked to evaluate a series of questions around the website's content, functionality, look & feel navigation, transparency, and performance. The results are combined into a single customer satisfaction score.

Data Verification and Validation: Foresee employs random sampling and seeks a response rate in excess of 8% to ensure data validity.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OFS will continue to use the user survey analysis provided by Foresee Results, Inc. to identify opportunities for implementing new layouts and functionality to improve the experience of visitors to the FinancialStability.gov website.

MEASURE: Percentage of statutorily-mandated reports submitted on time								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	100	100	100	100
Actual				100	100	100		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Timely submission of statutorily and other housing transaction required reports to the Congress:

ζ §105 Report: by the 10th of each month

ζ Transaction Report: 2 business days following a TARP transaction (investment).

ζ Transaction Report: 2 business days following a TARP transaction (housing).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: OFS posts all statutorily-mandated and other housing transaction reports submitted to the Congress on

FinancialStability.gov.

Data Verification and Validation: The submission date for each report is posted alongside each report link on FinancialStability.gov.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OFS will continue to publish and submit all reports to the Congress by statutorily-mandated and other related deadlines.

MEASURE: Scope and Intensity of Engagement Traction (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Actual			3.6	3.7	3.5	3.7*		
Target Met?			Y	Y	N	Y		

Definition: The degree to which a Technical Assistance project brings about changes in behavior among the counterparts and other country participants.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Generated by the Financial Technical Assistant Advisor who manage the project in the countries were technical assistant project exist.

Data Verification and Validation: The data is verified and validated by the five contracting office representatives, the Associate Director of OTA and approved by the Director of OTA.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The target goal for FY 2011 was exceeded. Performance has been consistent within .1 of targeted goals since the baseline was set in 2008, and OTA anticipates that this pattern will be continued in the future. The nature of the OTA program is such that country projects that reach performance goals and objectives are concluded by mutual agreement between Treasury and the counterpart country. New projects are begun where challenges are great, needs are clear, and there is a will to reform on the part of the counterpart country. The effect of this program dynamic keeps the target goal always challenging but reachable if performance remains high across all teams and projects.

Office of Comptroller of the Currency

MEASURE: Percent of National Banks With Composite CAMELS Rating 1 or 2 (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	95	96	92	82	70	75	Disc	Disc

Definition: This measure reflects the overall condition of the national banking system at fiscal year-end. Bank regulatory agencies use the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, CAMELS, to provide a general framework for assimilating and evaluating all significant financial, operational and compliance factors inherent in a bank. Evaluations are made on: Capital adequacy, Asset quality, Management, Earnings, Liquidity, and Sensitivity to Market Risk. The rating scale is 1 through 5 where 1 is the highest rating granted.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The Supervisory Information office identifies the current composite ratings from Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) at fiscal year-end. The number of national banks at fiscal year-end is obtained from the Federal Reserve Board's National Information Center database. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks with current composite CAMELS ratings of 1 or 2 to the total number of national banks at fiscal year-end.

Data Verification and Validation: Either quarterly or semi-annually, an independent reviewer compares a sample of Reports of Examination to the Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) data to ensure the accuracy of the recorded composite ratings. Any discrepancies between the supporting documentation and the systems data are reported to the respective Assistant Deputy Comptroller or Deputy

Comptroller for corrective action.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: Performance has improved as the economy recovers. OCC will continue to closely monitor bank performance and initiate formal and informal agreements as necessary to enhance its level of supervision.

This measure is being discontinued in FY 2012, due to realignment of OTS with OCC under the Dodd-Frank Act. Starting in FY 2012, OCC will incorporate regulation of both the national banking system and federal savings associations into its performance measures.

MEASURE: Percentage of Licensing Applications and Notices Completed within Established Timeframes (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	95	95	95	95	95	95	Disc	Disc
Actual	94	96	95	95	96	97		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A

Definition: This measure reflects the extent to which OCC meets its established timeframes for reaching decisions on licensing applications and notices. The OCC's timely and effective approval of corporate applications and notices contributes to the nation's economy by enabling national banks to engage in corporate transactions and introduce new financial products and services.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Chief Counsel's office uses the Corporate Activity Information System (CAIS) to identify applications completed during the fiscal year. For each filing, the actual decision date is compared to the target action date to determine whether the application was completed within established standards. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of licensing applications processed within the required timeframes to the total number of licensing applications processed during the fiscal year. The processing time is the number of calendar days from the date of OCC receipt to the date of OCC's decision. The established processing timeframe depends on the application type and if the application qualifies for expedited processing.

Data Verification and Validation: The Licensing Department tracks processing of all applications and notices through the Corporate Activity Information System (CAIS). The analyst who is assigned the application will verify the accuracy of the CAIS data as the application is processed. The senior analyst or manager who approves the final decision also verifies the accuracy of the CAIS data.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OCC will continue to work with its banks to maintain the percentage of licensing applications and notices completed within established time frames.

This measure is being discontinued in FY 2012, due to realignment of OTS with OCC under the Dodd-Frank Act. Starting in FY 2012, OCC will incorporate regulation of both the national banking system and federal savings associations into its performance measures.

MEASURE: Percentage of National Banks that are Categorized as Well Capitalized (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	99	99	99	86	90	93	Disc	Disc

Definition: This measure reflects whether the national banking system is well capitalized at fiscal year-end. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act established a system of prompt corrective action (PCA) that classifies insured depository institutions into five categories (well capitalized; adequately capitalized; undercapitalized, significantly undercapitalized; and critically undercapitalized) based on their relative capital levels. The purpose of PCA is to resolve the problems of insured depository institutions at the least possible long-term cost to the deposit insurance fund.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: National banks file quarterly Reports of Condition and Income with the Federal Finance Institution Examination Council through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's data processing center. The Supervisory Information office reviews the Reports of Condition

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

and Income (i.e., call reports) for each quarter to identify national banks that meet all of the criteria for a well capitalized institution. The number of national banks at fiscal year-end is obtained from the Federal Reserve Board's National Information Center database. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks that meet all of the established criteria for being well capitalized to the total number of national banks at fiscal year-end.

Data Verification and Validation: The banks' boards of directors attest to the accuracy of the reported data. The reliability of these quarterly reports is evaluated by OCC examiners during bank examinations.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: Target was not met primarily due to the long term effects of the economic downturn on the banking industry; however there has been recent improvement. More banks have been issued enforcement actions and this precludes them from being labeled as well capitalized. OTs will continue to closely monitor the capital levels of all its institutions and ensure that appropriate corrective action is instituted on a timely basis.

This measure is being discontinued in FY 2012, due to realignment of OTS with OCC under the Dodd-Frank Act. Starting in FY 2012, OCC will incorporate regulation of both the national banking system and federal savings associations into its performance measures.

MEASURE: Percentage of National Banks with Consumer Compliance Rating of 1 or 2 (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	94	97	97	97	95	97	Disc	Disc

Definition: This measure reflects the national banking system's compliance with consumer laws and regulations. Bank regulatory agencies use the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, Interagency Consumer Compliance Rating, to provide a general framework for assimilating and evaluating significant consumer compliance factors inherent in a bank. Each bank is assigned a consumer compliance rating based on an evaluation of its present compliance with consumer protection and civil rights statutes and regulations, and the adequacy of its operating systems designed to ensure continuing compliance. Ratings are on a scale of 1 through 5 in increasing order of supervisory concern.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The Supervisory Information office identifies the number of banks with current consumer compliance ratings of 1 or 2 and the total number of national banks from Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) subject to consumer compliance examinations at fiscal year-end. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks with current consumer compliance ratings of 1 or 2 to the total number of national banks subject to consumer compliance examinations at fiscal year-end.

Data Verification and Validation: Consumer compliance ratings are assigned at the completion of each consumer compliance examination. These ratings are entered into OCC's management information systems, Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS), by the banks' Examiner-in-Charge and reviewed and approved by the Supervisory Offices' Assistant Deputy Comptroller (Mid-Size/Community banks) or Deputy Comptroller (Large banks).

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: The OCC will continue to monitor its compliance program to ensure it maintains its effectiveness.

This measure is being discontinued in FY 2012, due to realignment of OTS with OCC under the Dodd-Frank Act. Starting in FY 2012, OCC will incorporate regulation of both the national banking system and federal savings associations into its performance measures.

MEASURE: Rehabilitated National Banks as a Percentage of Problem National Banks One Year Ago (CAMEL 3,4, or 5) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	46	52	47	29	23	22	Disc	Disc

Definition: This measure reflects the successful rehabilitation of problem national banks during the past twelve months. Problem banks can ultimately reach a point where rehabilitation is no longer feasible. The OCC's early identification of and intervention with problem banks can lead to successful remediation of problem banks.

Indicator Type: Indicator

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Capture and Source: The Supervisory Information office in OCC's headquarters office uses Examiner View (EV) and the Supervisory Information System (SIS) to identify and compare the composite CAMELS ratings for problem banks from twelve months prior to the current period composite CAMELS ratings for the same banks. The percentage is determined by comparing the number of national banks that have upgraded composite CAMELS ratings of 1 or 2 from composite CAMELS ratings of 3, 4 or 5 to the total number of national banks that had composite CAMELS ratings of 3, 4 or 5 twelve months ago.

Data Verification and Validation: Either quarterly or semi-annually, an independent reviewer compares a sample of Reports of Examination to the Examiner View (EV) and Supervisory Information System (SIS) data to ensure the accuracy of the recorded composite ratings. Any discrepancies between the supporting documentation and the systems data are reported to the respective Assistant Deputy Comptroller or Deputy Comptroller for corrective action.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: This measure was not met largely because the impact of economic conditions on banks requires longer term rehabilitation efforts. OCC will continue to closely monitor the performance of all its problem national banks and, increase formal and informal agreements as necessary to enhance the level of supervision.

This measure is being discontinued in FY 2012, due to realignment of OTS with OCC under the Dodd-Frank Act. Starting in FY 2012, OCC will incorporate regulation of both the national banking system and federal savings associations into its performance measures.

MEASURE: Total OCC Costs Relative to Every \$100,000 in Bank Assets Regulated (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	9.55	9.55	9.22	9.22	9.22	Disc	Disc
Actual	8.84	8.89	8.39	8.81	9.28*	8.76*		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A

Definition: This measure reflects the efficiency of OCC operations while meeting the increasing supervisory demands of a growing and more complex national banking system.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: OCC costs are those reported as total program costs on the annual audited Statement of Net Cost. Banks assets are those reported quarterly by national banks on their Reports of Condition and Income.

Data Verification and Validation: OCC's financial statements and controls over the data are audited by an independent accountant each year. National banks file quarterly Reports on Condition and Income with the FFIEC through the FDIC's data processing center. The banks' boards of directors attest to the accuracy of the reported data. The reliability of these quarterly reports is evaluated by OCC examiners during bank examinations.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: Estimated based on 6/30/2011 assets. Year-end assets not available at this time.

This measure is being discontinued in FY 2012, due to realignment of OTS with OCC under the Dodd-Frank Act. Starting in FY 2012, OCC will incorporate regulation of both the national banking system and federal savings associations into its performance measures.

Office of Thrift Supervision

MEASURE: Percent of Safety and Soundness Exams Started as Scheduled (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90	90	90	90	90	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	94	95	94	94	97			

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Target Met? Y Y Y Y Y N/A N/A N/A

Definition: OTS examines savings associations every 12-18 months for safety and soundness, compliance and consumer protection laws. OTS performs safety and soundness examinations of its regulated savings associations consistent with the requirements in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (FDICIA) as amended by the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. When safety and soundness or compliance issues are identified during its risk-focused examinations, OTS acts promptly to ensure association management and directors institute corrective actions to address supervisory concerns. OTS staff often meets with the savings association's board of directors after delivery of the Report of Examination to discuss findings and recommendations.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: When a savings association is examined, OTS staff enters into the Examination Data System the examination type, examination beginning and completion dates, report of examination mail date, and CAMELS or equivalent ratings. The percentage success rate for this measure is calculated by dividing the number of examinations that were started by the number of examinations that were scheduled to be started during the review period.

Data Verification and Validation: The Managing Director, Supervision and her staff along with the regional personnel continuously monitors the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of Exam start dates are available online through the Examination Data System.

OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including CAMELS ratings, and reports of examination with start date for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued because OTS was abolished with the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act as of July 21, 2011, and their responsibilities transferred to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and other federal entities outside of Treasury.

MEASURE: Percent of Thrifts that are Well Capitalized (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	95	95	95	95	95	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	99.9	99	98.4	97	95			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Capital absorbs losses, promotes public confidence and provides protection to depositors and the FDIC insurance funds. It provides a financial cushion that can allow a savings association to continue operating during periods of loss or other adverse conditions. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act established a system of prompt corrective action (PCA) that classifies insured depository institutions into five categories (well-capitalized; adequately capitalized; undercapitalized, significantly undercapitalized; and critically undercapitalized) based on their relative capital levels. The purpose of PCA is to resolve the problems of insured depository institutions at the least possible long-term cost to the deposit insurance fund.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Prompt Corrective Action (PCA) ratings are stored in the Examination Data System and can also be found in the Thrift Overview Report and off-site financial monitoring reports. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of OTS-regulated savings associations that are well capitalized by the total number of OTS-regulated institutions.

PCA ratings are stored in the Examination Data System. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of OTS-regulated savings associations that are well capitalized by the total number of OTS-regulated received a compliance examination rating of 1 or 2 on their most recent examination by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that have been assigned a compliance examination rating.

Data Verification and Validation: The Managing Director, Supervision and her staff along with the regional personnel continuously monitors the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of compliance ratings are available online through the Examination Data System and are provided to each association at the conclusion of an exam. The composite rating is used semi-annually in the assessment process.

OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including compliance ratings, and reports of examination for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued because OTS was abolished with the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act as of July 21, 2011, and their responsibilities transferred to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and other federal entities outside of Treasury.

MEASURE: Percent of Thrifts with Composite CAMELS Ratings of 1 or 2 (%) (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90	90	90	90	80	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	93	93	90	84	77			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: On December 9, 1996, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) adopted the CAMELS rating system as the internal rating system to be used by the Federal and State regulators for assessing the safety and soundness of financial institutions on a uniform basis. The CAMELS rating system puts increased emphasis on the quality of risk management practices. "CAMELS" stands for Capital adequacy, Asset quality, Management, Earnings, Liquidity and Sensitivity to market risk. OTS assigns composite CAMELS rating to savings associations at each examination. OTS adjusts the level of supervisory resources devoted to an association based on the composite rating. The CAMELS rating is based upon a scale of 1 through 5 in increasing order of supervisory concern.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Composite CAMELS ratings are stored in and retrieved from the online Examination Data System. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of savings associations having composite CAMELS rating of 1 or 2 by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that have been assigned a composite CAMELS rating.

Data Verification and Validation: The Managing Director, Supervision, and her staff along with regional personnel continuously monitor the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of CAMELS ratings are available online through the Examination Data System and are provided to each association at the conclusion of an exam. The composite rating is used semi-annually in the assessment process. Quarterly press releases provide a summary of the thrift industry's CAMELS ratings to the public.

OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including CAMELS ratings, and reports of examination for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued because OTS was abolished with the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act as of July 21, 2011, and their responsibilities transferred to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and other federal entities outside of Treasury.

MEASURE: Percent of Thrifts with a Compliance Examination Ratings of 1 or 2 (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90	90	90	90	90	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	93	97	95.8	95	92			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: A uniform, interagency compliance rating system was first approved by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) in 1980. The FFIEC rating system was designed to reflect, in a comprehensive and uniform fashion, the nature and extent of an association's compliance with consumer protection statutes, regulations and requirements. The Compliance Rating System is based upon a scale of 1 through

5 in increasing order of supervisory concern.

OTS began to combine safety and soundness and compliance examinations in 2002 to attain exam efficiencies and to improve risk assessment. Using comprehensive exam procedures, compliance with consumer protection laws is reviewed at more frequent intervals, which has improved the quality of the examination process.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Compliance examination ratings are stored in the Examination Data System. OTS calculates this measure by dividing the number of OTS-regulated savings associations that received a compliance examination rating of 1 or 2 on their most recent examination by the total number of OTS-regulated savings associations that have been assigned a compliance examination rating.

Data Verification and Validation: The Managing Director, Supervision and her staff along with the regional personnel continuously monitors the status of the exam ratings. Summary and detail reporting of compliance ratings are available online through the Examination Data System and are provided to each association at the conclusion of an exam. The composite rating is used semi-annually in the assessment process.

OTS uses a web-based EDS/ROE system (Examination Data System/Report of Examination). The EDS/ROE system collects and stores examination data, including compliance ratings, and reports of examination for all entities examined and supervised by OTS. EDS captures basic data from an institution's examination and maintains it on a central database in Washington.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued because OTS was abolished with the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act as of July 21, 2011, and their responsibilities transferred to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and other federal entities outside of Treasury.

MEASURE: Total OTS Costs Relative to Every \$100,000 in Savings Association Assets Regulated (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	14.33	15.08	23.04	22	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	13.46	13.9	15.1	19.88	24.01			
Target Met?	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Beginning in FY 2006, OTS included a performance measure that reflects the efficiency of its operations while meeting the increasing supervisory demands of a growing and more complex thrift industry. This measure supports OTS's ongoing efforts to efficiently use agency resources. The efficiency measure is impacted by the relative size of the savings associations regulated. As of June 30, 2006, 63% of all savings associations have total assets of less than \$250 million and are generally community-based organizations that provide retail financial services in their local markets. In addition, the measure does not include over \$7 trillion in assets of holding company enterprises regulated by OTS.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The OTS expenses published in OTS's annual audited financial statement are used in this calculation. If the performance measure calculation is provided before the audited financial statement is available, the estimated expenses are derived from OTS's Budget Variance System. The OTS regulated assets are published in the OTS quarterly press release of thrift industry financial highlights and are derived from the institutions' quarterly Thrift Financial Reports. The measure is calculated by dividing total fiscal year expenses by total thrift assets.

Data Verification and Validation: OTS expenses are verified during the annual CFO audit and reflect those published in the OTS annual audited financial statements. The industry's assets are reported by OTS's regulated institutions in the quarterly Thrift Financial Report, edited and verified by OTS staff, and then published in the OTS quarterly press release and available to the public on the OTS Internet site. OTS allows amendments from the industry for six months after the filing date.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued because OTS was abolished with the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act as of July 21, 2011, and their responsibilities transferred to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and other federal entities outside of Treasury.

OUTCOME: Decreased gap in global standard of living

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Improve International Monetary Fund (IMF) Effectiveness and Quality through Periodic Review of IMF Program (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90	90	90	90	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	100	100	93	23				
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: This measure tracks efforts by International Affairs (IA) staff to monitor quality of IMF country programs and ensure the application of appropriately high standards. IA staff endeavors to review each country program and provide a synopsis, analysis, and recommendation for action at least one week before each program is voted on by the IMF Board. The measure tracks the percentage of times the staff review is completed in a timely manner (at least one week before Board action) to allow for alterations in language if deemed necessary. Note: IA has modified this measure beginning in FY10 such that the staff review must be completed prior to the IMF Board date rather than one week in advance (see below).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: International Affairs staff tracks and accounts for actions undertaken during the reporting period.

Data Verification and Validation: Publicly available accounts of meetings (press, etc.), communiqués issued following multilateral or bilateral meetings.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Semi-Annual

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Monitor Quality and Enhance Effectiveness of International Monetary Fund (IMF) Lending Through Review of IMF Country Programs (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	97	100	100
Actual					97	100		
Target Met?					Y	Y		

Definition: This measure tracks efforts by International Affairs (IA) staff to monitor quality of IMF country programs and ensure the application of appropriately high standards. IA staff endeavors to review each country program and provide a synopsis, analysis, and recommendation for action at least one day before the IMF Board voting date. The measure tracks the percentage of times the staff review is completed in a timely manner (at least one day before Board action) to allow for alterations in language or policy position if deemed necessary.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: International Affairs staff tracks and accounts for actions undertaken during the reporting period.

Data Verification and Validation: Publicly available accounts of meetings (press, etc.), communiqués issued following multilateral or bilateral meetings.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Semi-Annual

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Office of International Monetary Policy (IMF office) will closely monitor the IMF Executive Board calendar and will assign IMF office staff as appropriate to undertake reviews of new IMF program requests. Progress toward meeting target will be verified during regular IMF office staff meetings.

MEASURE: Percentage of Grant and Loan Proposals Containing Satisfactory Frameworks for Results Measurement (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	88	92	94	94	92.5	94		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The percentage of grant and loan project proposals that contain a satisfactory framework for measuring project results (such as outcome indicators, quantifiable and time-bound targets, etc.) This information is measured on an annual basis.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: MDB monthly operational report, special requests to MDBs for loan and grant approvals, MDB annual reports and U.S. voting positions

Data Verification and Validation: Data provided by the MDB is compared with Treasury MDB Office vote history database and internal supporting memoranda.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Semi-Annual

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Department will continue to closely monitor the quality of MDB results measurement efforts. In various forms, the Department is seeking to increase the emphasis on impact evaluation in the MDBs, taking results measurement beyond the calculation of project inputs and outputs.

OUTCOME: Commerce enabled through safe, secure U.S. notes and coins

Bureau of Engraving and Printing

MEASURE: Best places to work in Federal Government ranking								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual						174	154	134

Definition: Purpose: To provide a measure of the success of BEP management's efforts to improve employee morale and engagement

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: Office of Personnel Management

Data Verification and Validation:

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: The Bureau continues to sponsor activities and encourage employee's engagement by contributing ideas and participation in events which are aimed at improving the work environment for all employees. During FY 2011, this has resulted in a significant improvement in its ranking among agencies on this measure. The Bureau is continuing these efforts and is confident that this positive direction will continue.

MEASURE: Lost time accident rate per 100 employees								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	1.7	1.7

Actual	1.26
Target Met?	Y

Definition: Purpose: To improve employee safety and minimize unnecessary safety-related costs.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data is collected from collecting lost time hours from NFC payroll reports as well as information from Human Resources; rate per 100 employees.

Data Verification and Validation: Subject matter experts from the Office of Environmental Health and Safety will collect and verify information.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The lost time case rate decreased by more than 25% during the last fiscal year. The Bureau is committed to improving the safety of its employees and has undertaken analysis to determine root causes of injury and to identify best practices, allocating resources where they will have the greatest impact to prevent injury prevention.

MEASURE: Reduction to BEP's three major regulated waste streams (air emissions, wastewater, and solid waste).								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	30	30
Actual						32.7		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: To incentivize further improvements in BEP environmental management.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data is collected using 3 different internal waste stream systems and reported as one rate per 1,000 notes.

Data Verification and Validation: Reduction in waste streams identified in BEP Sustainability Report.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Bureau continues to be certified under ISO 14001 for its environmental efforts in reducing pollutants; it is committed to environmental stewardship and responsibility in maintaining a healthy and productive environment. We will continue to seek ways to reduce the waste from the 3 major sources of pollutants (air emissions, industrial waste water, and regulated solid waste).

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: Trust and confidence in U.S. currency worldwide

OUTCOME: Commerce enabled through safe, secure U.S. notes and coins

Bureau of Engraving and Printing

MEASURE: Currency Production (billion notes) (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	8.2	9.1	7.7	6.2	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	8.2	9.1	7.7	6.2				
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Definition: A measure of BEP's ability to meet customer order delivery schedule. The customer considers this measure satisfied when complete shipments of finished currency are received in the Federal Reserve vault where it is held prior to final distribution to Federal Reserve district banks.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Product delivery data is collected and verified through various through various BEP's product accountability systems.

Data Verification and Validation: Product delivery data is reconciled to invoices generated by BEP, and confirmed by the customer.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Currency Shipment Discrepancies Per Million Notes (%) (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: A qualitative indicator reflecting BEP's ability to provide effective product security and accountability. This measure refers to product overages or underage of as little as a single currency note in shipments of finished notes to the Federal Reserve Banks.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The customer captures this data and report to BEP on a monthly basis.

Data Verification and Validation: BEP reports product discrepancy data based on monthly information provided by the customer.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Improper and/or Erroneous Payments or Purchases (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1000	500	500	500	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	2126	0	0	0				
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: An indicator reflecting the ability of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to make payment for goods and services for only authorized expenses and in a timely manner.

Indicator Type: Measure

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Capture and Source: BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS)

Data Verification and Validation: BEP Annual Financial Audit, The CFO Performance and Accountability Report

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Maintain ISO Certification (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1	1	1	1	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	Met	Met	Met	Met	N/A			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The effectiveness of the manufacturing program is also demonstrated by the attainment of ISO 9001 certification. ISO is an internationally recognized quality assurance program aimed at promoting the adoption of a management system that establishes a process that governs the transformation of inputs into outputs to meet customer requirements. Components of the Bureau's ISO certified system include elements of the accountability activity in that the identification and traceability of product tracking procedures are tested for consistency and reliability.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: ISO compliance is verified by periodic audits of the Bureau's quality management system by an independent ISO designated firm. Periodically the International Organization for Standardization updates the quality standards, thereby, requiring organizations already ISO certified to upgrade their quality management systems in order to maintain certification.

Data Verification and Validation: Certification is achieved based on a successful compliance audit by an independent firm under the auspices of the International Organization for Standardization.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Manufacturing Costs For Currency (Dollar Costs Per Thousand Notes Produced) (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	28.5	32.5	33	37	37	48	48	48
Actual	27.49	28.71	29.47	32.77	44.85	34.6		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		

Definition: An indicator of currency manufacturing efficiency and effectiveness of program management. This standard is developed annually based on the past year's performance, contracted price factors, and anticipated productivity improvements. Actual performance comparison against the standard depends on BEP's ability to meet annual spoilage, efficiency, and capacity utilization goals established for this product line.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Cost data is collected through BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system.

Data Verification and Validation: BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system is audited annually as part of the financial statement audit.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The FY 2011 cost of manufacturing was lower than anticipated due to the suspension of production on the new \$100 Note, pending the outcome of collaboration with major stakeholders. It is anticipated that, as the production of these notes resumes,

the overall cost of manufacturing will increase.

MEASURE: Other Financial Losses [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	15500	0	0	0	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: The face value of product theft that has been reported, investigated as unrecoverable, and verified, during the production, delivery and destruction process.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS)

Data Verification and Validation: BEP Annual Financial Audit, the CFO Performance and Accountability Report

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Percent of currency notes delivered returned due to defects								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	0	0
Actual						0		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: Purpose: To incentivize continuous product quality improvement and reduce defect-driven returns of currency notes by the Federal Reserve back to BEP.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: When BEP's Office of Security receives defective notes back from the Federal Reserve Banks, the notes are recorded and turned over to Office of Quality to investigate cause, determine date of issuance and possible remedy.

Data Verification and Validation: BEP's Office of Security collects and tracks the number of notes by denomination returned from the Federal Reserve Banks.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: An infinitesimal number of notes are returned due to defects. In FY 2011 this amounted to 1007 notes returned, in 2011 the percentage was based on production of 5.8 billion notes produced. BEP anticipates similar data in the future.

MEASURE: Security Costs Per 1,000 Notes Delivered (\$) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	6.25	6	5.65	5.65	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	6	5.92	5.63	5.76				
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: An indicator reflecting the cost of providing effective and efficient product security and accountability. This standard is developed

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

annually based on the past year's cost performance and anticipated cost increases. The formula used to calculate this measure is the total cost of security divided by the number of notes produced divided by 1000.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Cost data is collected through BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system. This standard is developed annually based on the past year's cost performance and anticipated cost increases.

Data Verification and Validation: BEP's accrual-based cost accounting system is audited annually as part of the financial statement audit.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Total Financial Losses (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	66319	8304	0	16000	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: The aggregate amount of annual financial losses that have been reported, investigated, and verified as unrecoverable, as a result of the following: improper and/or erroneous payments or purchases (including late payment penalties); total regulatory fines and claims paid; and other financial losses.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS)

Data Verification and Validation: BEP Annual Financial Audit, the CFO Performance and Accountability Report

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Total Regulatory Fines and Claims Paid (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	48693	8304	0	16000	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: The annual amount of all regulatory fines and tort claims paid by the BEP.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: BEP Management Information System (BEPMIS)

Data Verification and Validation: BEP Annual Financial Audit, the CFO Performance and Accountability Report

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: The measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

United States Mint

MEASURE: Absolute Value of Production Percent Deviation from Net-Pay (%) (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual				6.5				
Target Met?				Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The absolute value of the percentage deviation of cumulative FY total circulating coin production from cumulative FY total net-pay less any inventory adjustment planned and agreed upon by the Federal Reserve Banks or needed to fulfill the United States Mint contingency stock requirements. Monthly production targets are set to smooth production over the FY and ensure cumulative production is sufficient to satisfy Federal Reserve demand.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: United States Mint analysts receive Federal Reserve net-pay and inventory data reports by denomination. Coin production data is maintained in Oracle manufacturing system.

Data Verification and Validation: Results and data are captured and verified by United States Mint and Federal Reserve Bank analysts.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Circulating On-Time Delivery [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual					99.8			
Target Met?					Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: On-time delivery to the Federal Reserve Banks (FRB) is the percentage of total scheduled orders shipped on time to the FRB. The United States Mint is responsible for providing the Nation's coinage in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of commerce. To accomplish this mission, the United States mint must supply coinage in the quantities and timelines specified by the FRB. The FRB is then responsible for distributing coinage to the commercial banking sector.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Each month, the Federal Reserve Bank (FRB) provides United States Mint analysts a report detailing the next month's requirements for coinage. Based on this report, United States Mint analysts establishes a shipment schedule that is captured in the Oracle manufacturing system. Changes to the schedule are only made when the FRB provides formal documentation of a requested adjustment to scheduled orders. Coin shipment data is maintained in the Oracle manufacturing system.

Data Verification and Validation: Results and data are captured and verified by United States Mint analysts.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Customer Satisfaction Index (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Target	Baseline	88	88	88	88
Actual	88.3	86.1	97.1		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y		

Definition: The United States Mint conducts a quarterly Customer Satisfaction Measure (CSM) Tracking Survey among a random sample of active customers. The CSM Survey is intended to capture customer satisfaction with the United States Mint's performance as a coin supplier and the quality of specific products. The CSI is as a single quantitative score of CSM Survey results.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: A professional survey consultant administers quarterly CSM survey to a random sample of active customers.

Data Verification and Validation: Results and data are captured and verified by the professional survey consultant.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Mint plans to meet future targets by implementing a modern order management system and e-commerce web site with improved functionality, efficiency and customer service capabilities. The Mint will also review and revise how it communicates with customers by studying current industry best practices.

MEASURE: Employee Confidence in Protection (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	82	81	81	81	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: Percentage of United States Mint employees reporting a favorable response to their confidence in the Protection Department to safeguard United States Mint assets and assets in the custody of the United States Mint.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: Contractor administered Employee Pulse Check survey which assesses the attitudes of United States Mint employees concerning their work environment.

Data Verification and Validation: Results and data are captured and verified by a professional survey consultant.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Numismatic Customer Base (Units)(Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	0.976	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual				1.06	0.799			
Target Met?				Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Total number of unique purchasers over a fiscal year, where a unique purchaser consists of an account number and address/name without a prior purchase in the fiscal year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Customer account data for each Numismatic product purchase is maintained on CW Direct, a real time system. Daily

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

automatic queries of CW Direct populate a data warehouse. Contracted analysts identify the number of unique purchasers from this data warehouse based on United States Mint defined criteria.

Data Verification and Validation: Results and data are captured and verified by a professional data analyst consultant.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011.

MEASURE: Numismatic Net Margin (%) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual				9.4				
Target Met?				Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The return to Numismatic (non-bullion) operations, calculated as program net income divided by total program sales revenue.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system.

Data Verification and Validation: External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Numismatic program net income and total revenue are included in the financial statements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Protection Cost Per Square Foot (\$) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	32	32.99	32.5	31.75	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	32.49	31.75	31.76	31.57				
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Protection cost per square foot is the Protection Department's operating costs divided by the area of usable space in square feet that the United States Mint Police protects. Usable space is defined as 90% of total square footage. The year-to-date result is then annualized on a straight-line basis.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Protection costs are automatically pulled from the United States Mint's accounting system on a quarterly basis. The square footage is relatively stable and is monitored by the Protection Department and United States Mint management.

Data Verification and Validation: United States Mint analysts review the data for reasonableness and accuracy on a quarterly basis.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Safety Incident Recordable Rate								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	3.34	3.34	3.34
Actual					2.29	2.74		
Target Met?					Y			

Definition: Safety incident recordable rate measures the occurrence of work-related incidents involving death, lost time and restricted work, loss of consciousness, and medical treatment. This definition follows Part 1904 of Title 29, Code of Federal Register (29 CFR 1904).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is captured in the Safety and Health Information Management System (SHIMS). SHIMS is used to record, track, and manage safety incidents and workers' compensation claims.

Data Verification and Validation: Results and data are captured and verified by United States Mint analysts.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Mint has developed several policies and programs to make the workplace environment safer. Executives meet monthly to discuss injury and illness rates, any incidents and corrective actions. The Mint plans to meet future targets by maintaining these effective policies and programs and examining potential new initiatives to reduce risk and prevent future incident.

MEASURE: Seignior age per Dollar Issued (\$) (E)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	0.53	0.41	0.41	0.43
Actual				0.55	0.49	0.45		
Target Met?				Y	N	Y		

Definition: Seigniorage per total face value of circulated coinage shipped to Federal Reserve Banks.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system.

Data Verification and Validation: External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Seigniorage and the total value of circulating coinage shipped to the Federal Reserve Banks are included in the financial statements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Mint plans to meet future targets by level-loading production, reducing overtime usage, improving manufacturing workforce flexibility and reducing overhead expenses.

STRATEGIC GOAL: Prevented Terrorism and Promoted the Nation's Security through Strengthened International Financial Systems

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: Pre-empted and neutralized threats to the international financial system and enhanced U.S. national security

OUTCOME: Removed or reduced threats to national security from terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, drug trafficking and other criminal activity on the part of rogue regimes, individuals, and their support networks

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Impact of TFI programs and activities								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	7.4	7.6	7.6	7.6
Actual				7.81	7.4	7.6		
Target Met?				N	N			

Definition: This measure is used to assess TFI's impact as an organization through its sanctions, law enforcement, intelligence, regulatory and diplomatic programs to reduce threats to U.S. national security. The Office of Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes is responsible for the impact of policymaking, outreach and diplomacy. The Office of Foreign Assets Control is responsible for the impact of economic sanctions. The Office of Intelligence and Analysis is responsible for the impact of information and analysis used by Department decision makers. The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network is responsible for the impact of activities that create safer and more transparent financial systems.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: "An annual survey is conducted by OIA. Performance measure actuals are captured in PRS to determine the rating for FinCEN's performance measures. OFAC and TFFC provide documentation of activities, and use a self assessment rating, all information is kept by OSPPM as the outside validator.

Data Verification and Validation: The Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management validates

all final information. TFFC and OFAC provide a self-assessed rating and supporting documentation. OIA uses an internal (within the Department) customer satisfaction survey to achieve its performance rating. The survey and raw data are provided, and validated at the SECRET level to ensure reliability of the data. The Department reviews/validations, and gives suggestions and recommendations to each office, with a chance to provide additional information.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: - TFI met and exceeded target of effectively employing tools and authorities to further USG policy objectives and mitigating national security threats.

- TFI nearly met target of supporting the formulation of Treasury policy and the execution of departmental authorities through all-source analysis of the global financial network. TFI will work to strengthen training and development programs to ensure that we meet the target for FY2012.

- TFI met target of providing Treasury Department decision makers with timely, accurate, and relevant intelligence support on the full range of economic, political, and security issues.

- TFI met and exceeded target of combating financing of terrorism and money laundering; TFI also met target of administering regulations effectively and efficiently.

Treasury Forfeiture Fund

MEASURE: Percent of Forfeited Cash Proceeds Resulting from High-Impact Cases (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	75	75	75	75	75	80	80	80
Actual	72.93	84.18	86.91	87.65	93.11	91.44		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: A "high impact case" is a case resulting in a cash forfeiture deposit equal to or greater than \$100,000. The performance percentage is calculated by dividing the amount of forfeited cash proceeds from high impact cases, by the total amount of forfeited cash proceeds from all cases.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Treasury Forfeiture Fund is able to capture this data on a monthly basis and the source of the data is the Detailed Collection Report (DCR). The Forfeiture Fund receives the DCR from the Customs and Border Patrol's National Finance Center.

Data Verification and Validation: The source of the data that supports our performance calculation comes from the general ledger of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund which data is audited annually pursuant to our financial statement audit. Therefore, the annual financial statement audit process serves to "verify and validate" the data used to support our performance measure on an annual basis.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: With an emphasis on high impact forfeitures by Treasury Forfeiture Fund management, our member law enforcement bureaus work hard to meet the now-higher target of 80 percent set for FY 2011 and beyond. Bureaus have consistently met the performance target set for high-impact forfeited currency by focusing on strategic cases and investigations that result in high impact forfeitures. Major case emphasis will do the greatest damage to criminal organizations while accomplishing the ultimate objective which is to disrupt and dismantle criminal activity. We anticipate a continued excellent level of performance for FY 2012.

OUTCOME: Safer and more transparent U.S. and international financial systems

Financial Crimes Enforcement Network

MEASURE: Average Time to Process Enforcement Matters (in years) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	1	1	1	1	1	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	1	1.1	0.7	1	0.8			
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The average time to process an enforcement matter is determined from the date a case is referred from the Office of Compliance to the

date the charging (or action) letter is issued.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data for this measure is captured through an internal database that stores enforcement matters. The database records the date cases are received, the analyst assigned, the statute of limitations date, and the date each case was closed.

Data Verification and Validation: The enforcement matters are entered into the automated log and evaluated to determine whether there is enforcement potential through a civil monetary penalty or otherwise. FinCEN has established time management guidelines to reduce the average processing time for civil penalty cases.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

MEASURE: Cost Per BSA form E-Filed (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	0.19	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	0.22	0.14	0.13	0.16	0.1			
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: This measure tracks the government reoccurring operations and maintenance costs associated with E-Filing against the number of Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) forms E-Filed. As more financial institutions E-File, it is anticipated that the cost per BSA form E-Filed will decrease.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: E-Filing cost records and BSA Direct E-Filing Records.

Data Verification and Validation: Results can be verified against E-Filing operations and maintenance cost records and BSA Direct E-Filing records.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

MEASURE: Median transmittal time from receipt of terrorism related hotline tips								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	30	25	16	15	5	4	4	4
Actual	19	7	3	3	2	2		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure tracks FinCEN's ability to facilitate the transmission of potential terrorism-related activity in an expeditious manner. The purpose of the Financial Institution Hotline Tip is to facilitate the transmission of potential terrorism-related activity to law enforcement more rapidly than through the normal manual or electronic filing of a Suspicious Activity Report.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Date of receipt of Hotline Tip and the date of referral in an analytical product, as recorded in the FinCEN Database. Manual records, spreadsheets and/or Access databases will be maintained to record the dates for all Hotline Tips referred.

Data Verification and Validation: Verification of receipt and report dates and medians can be accomplished using the FinCEN Database, paper and/or other electronic records developed to record dates.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, FinCEN surpassed its target of 4 days with a median time of 2 days. To meet future targets, FinCEN will continue to process Hotline Tips in an expeditious manner.

MEASURE: Number of Largest BSA Report Filers Using E-Filing (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	342	302	374	454	534	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	383	297	386	486	542			
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: FinCEN has identified the 650 largest filers of BSA reports and has established the goal of assisting and encouraging members of this group who are not already using the BSA Direct E-filing system to begin E-filing reports. E-filing by this group is seen as a means of achieving FinCEN's long-term goal.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: A list compiled and maintained in the Office of BSA Data Services.

Data Verification and Validation: Magnitude of report filing and method of filing can be checked against records at the IRS Detroit Computing Center and automated records from the BSA Direct E-Filing system.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

MEASURE: Number of Users Directly Accessing BSA Data (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual	4683	8402	9649	10072	11527	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: FinCen will continue to track the performance as an indicator. This indicator tracks the number of users directly accessing BSA data using the web based query system. This is a meaningful indicator as direct access accelerates the secure flow of financial information so that the information is made more readily available to prevent, detect and prosecute financial crime.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The list can be checked through the Profile function at the Detroit Computing Center

Data Verification and Validation: The results are verified by reviewing, the system generated list of users.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan. FinCEN will continue to track this performance as an indicator.

MEASURE: Percentage of BSA bank examinations indicating a systemic anti-money laundering program failure [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual		5.2	2.5	2.1	1.6	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: FinCEN will continue to track this performance as an indicator. This indicator tracks the percentage of bank examinations conducted by federal banking regulators that reveal the existence of systemic compliance failure (i.e., demonstrated by cited violations) of the anti-money laundering program rule. It provides an intermediate assessment of the effectiveness of the efforts of the Regulatory Policy and Programs Division in providing policy guidance and taking formal and informal compliance and enforcement actions to increase financial industry compliance with the BSA. Due to the differing examination cycles, this is the most meaningful indicator for BSA compliance of the banking industry. Federal banking regulators generally examine on a regular cycle, and other industries do not have the same level of consistency of examination cycles. Exams may be selected based more on sampling or risk-based targeting (i.e. this means that resources are allocated to the highest risk, but means there is not the same ability to extrapolate the data as it could be skewed as targeted entities were at higher risk for violations). Therefore, the basis to extrapolate quarterly violation data to the population as a whole is lacking in other industries.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The Federal Banking Agencies aggregated information provided pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding executed in 2004 with FinCEN.

Data Verification and Validation: This information can be validated from the quarterly aggregate reports provided to FinCEN by each agency pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding of 2004. Under the terms of the MOU, the FBAs have 45 days from the end of a quarter to submit their data to FinCEN. Since quarterly results must be calculated within 30 days of the end of a quarter, we must use data from the prior quarter. Due to this lag in data, the year-end figure is based on the three FY 2009 quarters available at the fiscal year-end.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan. FinCEN will continue to track this performance as an indicator.

MEASURE: Percentage of BSA filings submitted electronically

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	60	58	63	67	71	83	85	90
Actual	48	59	71	82	83	87		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure examines FinCEN's progress toward more electronic filing of BSA data. This supports the initiative to create a paperless Treasury. BSA E-Filing improves the quality of the BSA data received and also expedites the processing time and in turn helps ensure that the information is more readily available for law enforcement purposes.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Reports are generated from the Detroit Computing Center.

Data Verification and Validation: Results are checked against reports from the Detroit Computing Center

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, FinCEN surpassed its target of 83 percent with 87 percent of BSA filings E-Filed. To meet the target in FY 2012, FinCEN will continue its outreach efforts to those institutions still submitting paper BSA reports.

MEASURE: Percentage of Complex Analytic Work Completed by FinCEN Analysts (Ot) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	0	38	38	39	39	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual		33	27	44	50			
Target Met?		N	N	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Definition: Comparison of total number of work products generated versus those products that required complex analysis, graphical display of data relationships, analytical findings, comments and recommendations. "Complex" as used in this measure refers to the application of analytic resources to assist law enforcement clients in perfecting investigations that they consider significant due to geographic scope, large data sets, use of multiple or little understood money laundering methodologies or involving financial relationships, products or systems not adequately understood by investigators.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The FinCEN database currently tracks assignments and includes a complexity ranking on each assignment. Management reports can be generated outlining the number of such projects and the number of reports prepared and distributed on an annual basis.

Data Verification and Validation: Production levels can be verified by a review of the paper or electronic file copies of analytical reports generated.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

MEASURE: Percentage of Customers Satisfied with the BSA E-Filing (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	90	90	90	90	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	92	94	93	94	96			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: This measure assesses the customer satisfaction with BSA E-Filing. Feedback will be used to improve the system and customize it for user populations. The measure is meaningful because it tracks the satisfaction with technology used to facilitate analysis of BSA information.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Active status user survey

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and the results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

MEASURE: Percentage of Domestic Law Enforcement and Foreign Financial Intelligence Units Finding FinCEN's Analytical Reports Highly Valuable [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	78	79	80	81	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	77	82	83	81	80			
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The percentage of customers (domestic law enforcement and foreign financial intelligence units) finding FinCEN's analytical reports highly valuable. This is a composite measure compiled from survey results. The survey looks at the impact of FinCEN's analysis products, such as whether the product was used to open a new investigation, whether it generated new leads, or whether it provided information previously unknown.

Indicator Type: Measure

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Capture and Source: The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail and/or telephone surveys of FinCEN's customers in the investigative/intelligence community, financial community and in house customers.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, this measure was discontinued and replaced by the following two performance measures "Percentage of domestic law enforcement finding FinCEN's analytic reports contribute to the detection and deterrence of financial crime" and "Percentage of foreign FIUs finding FinCEN's analytic reports provide valuable information towards the detection and deterrence of financial crime". Breaking the measure out will enable FinCEN to better assess its performance and focus on the distinct needs of its domestic law enforcement and foreign FIU customers.

MEASURE: Percentage of customers finding the BSA data provides valuable information towards the detection and deterrence of financial crime								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	86	86	90
Actual					87	89		
Target Met?					Y			

Definition: This measure examines the survey responses of domestic law enforcement users directly querying the BSA data in support of financial crime investigations. It also includes responses from regulators querying the system for their BSA compliance examinations. FinCEN has over 12,000 external users who rely on BSA data to identify financial crime. The survey looks at the value of BSA data, such as whether the data provided unknown information, supplemented or expanded known information, verified information, helped identify new leads, opened a new investigation or examination, supported an existing investigation or examination, or provided information for an investigative or examination report. This is a meaningful measure as valuable and useful BSA data contribute to the detection and deterrence of financial crime and improve BSA consistency and compliance.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are captured via a survey. The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for the customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail surveys of FinCEN's customers in law enforcement and regulatory agencies accessing BSA information.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: FinCEN met its FY 2012 target of 86 percent with 89 percent of customers finding the BSA data provides valuable information towards the detection and deterrence of financial crime. FinCEN attributes this performance to its efforts to ensure BSA information collected has a high degree of useful for criminal, tax, or regulatory purposes, and its training and access programs which are designed to ensure understanding of the value of the data and maximize its utilization. The modernized technical environment aims to further enhance the performance of this measure by maximizing data integrity and providing more robust and flexible query tools.

MEASURE: Percentage of customers satisfied with the query system to access BSA data								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	81	74	74	77	80
Actual			81	74	74	75		
Target Met?			Y	N	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure monitors FinCEN's progress toward serving the number of law enforcement and regulatory agency user's directly querying BSA information. The technology allows authorized persons to more readily access BSA information and better enable them to conduct investigations more efficiently and effectively.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are captured via a survey.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, FinCEN met its 74 percent target with a rating of 75 percent of its customers satisfied with directly accessing the BSA. FinCEN will continue to provide timely and effective support to users of the query system to help ensure customer satisfaction.

MEASURE: Percentage of domestic law enforcement finding FinCEN's analytic reports contribute to the detection and deterrence of financial crime

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	80	80	80
Actual					80	86		
Target Met?					Y	Y		

Definition: This measure examines the survey responses of domestic law enforcement customers who have received FinCEN's analysis in support of financial crime investigations. Analytic products should assist customers in the detection and deterrence of financial crimes. Survey results help to facilitate refinement of analytic products and ensure that the products are relevant to law enforcement customers. The survey looks at the impact of FinCEN's analytic products, such as whether the product was used to open a new investigation, whether it generated new leads, or whether it provided information previously unknown. This measure is meaningful because valuable analysis contributes to the detection and deterrence of financial crime.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are captured via a survey. The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail surveys of FinCEN's customers in the domestic law enforcement community.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2010, FinCEN baselined this performance measure with 80 percent rating the analytic products as valuable. In FY 2011, 86 percent of the domestic law enforcement respondents rated the analytic products as valuable. FinCEN attributes this performance to its focus on increased communication with law enforcement partners; case support where FinCEN could add value to investigative efforts, and products and services developed to meet the needs of its customers. Once FinCEN has three years of trend data, future targets will be adjusted accordingly.

MEASURE: Percentage of federal and state regulatory agencies with information sharing agreements [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Actual			41	43	46	Disc	Disc	Disc

Definition: This indicator tracks the percentage of the examining universe that FinCEN supports and oversees. The examining universe is the number of federal and state regulators with constituents subject to BSA rules. Support and oversight is established through information sharing agreements with federal and state regulators that provide for two-way sharing of information related to BSA examination and compliance. This indicator tracks FinCEN's progress toward expanding information sharing agreements thus improving consistent BSA examination compliance.

Indicator Type: Indicator

Data Capture and Source: The Office of Compliance maintained list of Memoranda of Understanding agreements with targeted regulators and the list of the examining universe.

Data Verification and Validation: The list can be checked against signed Memoranda of Understanding agreements in the files to verify the results.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Explanation of Outcome/Future Plans: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan. FinCEN will continue to track this performance as an indicator.

MEASURE: Percentage of financial regulators finding information exchanged with FinCEN under MOUs valuable to improve BSA consistency and compliance

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target			Baseline	66	68	86	88	88
Actual			64	82	86	92		
Target Met?			Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure examines the survey responses of state and federal financial regulatory agencies with information sharing agreements. The MOUs require the financial regulators to share examination results and provide a variety of statistical data on their examination results. The survey examines whether the Information Sharing Agreement has improved or enhanced the level of cooperation between the financial regulatory agencies and FinCEN in the area of BSA examination and compliance; whether FinCEN's programs and assistance have enhanced consistency in the application of the BSA, and whether FinCEN and the organization's combined efforts have improved the level of compliance observed. This measure is used to assess improvements in BSA consistency and compliance.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are captured via survey.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 FinCEN surpassed its target of 86 percent rating the information exchange valuable with 92 percent. FinCEN attributes a portion of this success to enhancements made to the products prepared for the state regulators. To achieve future targets, FinCEN will continue to facilitate routine discussions with the MOU holders.

MEASURE: Percentage of foreign FIUs finding FinCEN's analytic reports provide valuable information towards the detection and deterrence of financial crime

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target					Baseline	90	90	90
Actual					90	92		
Target Met?					Y			

Definition: This measure examines the survey responses of foreign Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU) customers who have received FinCEN analysis in support of financial crime investigations. Analytic products should assist customers in the detection and deterrence of financial crimes. Survey results help to facilitate refinement of analytic products and ensure that the products are relevant to foreign FIU customers. The survey looks at the impact of FinCEN's analytic products, such as whether the product was used to verify existing information, whether it generated new leads, or whether it provided information previously unknown. This measure is meaningful because valuable analysis contributes to the detection and deterrence of financial crime.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are captured via a survey. The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail surveys of FinCEN's customers in the foreign FIU community.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2010, FinCEN set a baseline for this measure of 90 percent. In FY 2011, 92 percent of foreign FIUs rated the analytic products as valuable. FinCEN attributes the FIUs' high satisfaction with its analytical reports to the quality, quantity and timeliness of information provided. FinCEN's response time to FIU requests decreased from 41 days in FY 2009 to 32 days in FY 2011, approaching the Egmont Group goal of 30 days. FinCEN's bilateral and multilateral international liaison work enhances the sharing of information while building stronger relationships with foreign FIUs. Once FinCEN has three years of trend data, future targets will be adjusted accordingly.

MEASURE: Percentage of private industry or financial institution customers finding FinCEN's SAR Activity Review products highly valuable.
[DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	72	74	76	75	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	70	71	75	73	82			
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: This indicator tracks the survey responses of private industry or financial institution customers that find FinCEN's Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) activity review products valuable toward improving their anti-money laundering programs. These products are the primary communication vehicle to improve financial institutions' BSA reporting, provide case examples on the usefulness of the BSA data, provide BSA reporting trends by state, and communicate new money laundering vulnerabilities. The surveys look at whether regulated industries find the products useful to improving their BSA/anti-money laundering programs; provide feedback on the use of SARs filed by industry, and whether the products provide useful guidance on filing requirements. The indicator is meaningful as it provides an understanding of the benefit that the financial industry is receiving from the SAR activity review.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Data are captured via a survey. The vendor survey team developed questionnaires for customers, with FinCEN input. They conducted e-mail and/or telephone surveys of FinCEN's customers in the investigative/intelligence community, financial community and in house customers.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

MEASURE: Percentage of regulatory helpline customers understanding BSA guidance

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	Baseline	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	94	91	94	94	92	92		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure examines the survey responses of financial institution customers who contact the Resource Center Helpline for guidance on BSA regulations. The Resource Center Helpline serves as a resource for financial institutions with questions on BSA regulatory and compliance matters. The survey examines whether the information/response/guidance received was understandable. Providing understandable guidance is a desired result and is critical for financial institutions to establish programs that comply with the BSA.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Resource Center customer records and survey data.

Data Verification and Validation: Raw data are received from the survey vendor and results are calculated and verified.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The FY 2011 goal was to maintain a 90 percent satisfaction level for customers rating the guidance as “understandable,” and FinCEN surpassed its goal with 92 percent. FinCEN attained this success by responding timely (within 24 hours of the inquiry) and providing a high level of service. In order to achieve future targets, FinCEN will continue to make guidance available on the Internet, accept and analyze customer feedback, and conduct surveys to measure customer satisfaction.

MEASURE: The Percent of Countries/Jurisdictions Connected to the Egmont Secure Web within One Year of Egmont Membership (Oe)								
[DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	98	98	98	98	98	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	97	98	98	99	99			
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The percent of Egmont Financial Intelligence Unit members connected to the Egmont Secure Web. The goal is to maintain a 98% percent user rate. As new members are admitted to Egmont, we will work to connect them to the Egmont Secure Web.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Egmont Member data base and Egmont Secure Web User database.

Data Verification and Validation: Compare the list of Egmont Secure Web Users to the list of Egmont members.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011 this measure was discontinued to focus on a more stream-lined suite of FinCEN measures that link to the strategic plan.

STRATEGIC GOAL: Management and Organizational Excellence

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: Enabled and effective Treasury Department

OUTCOME: A citizen-centered, results-oriented and strategically aligned organization

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Complete Investigations of EEO Complaints within 180 days (%) (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	50	50	50	50	65	65	60	65
Actual	20	51.6	56	65	86	95		
Target Met?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The average time it takes to complete investigations of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Annual Federal EEO Statistical Report of Discrimination Complaints and the Department's Complaint Tracking System are the primary sources of data.

Data Verification and Validation: Data is reviewed quarterly to ensure accuracy.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Office of Civil Rights and Diversity have been successful in meeting all established goals in FY 2011. We accredit this to Treasury Service Level Standards developed to monitor specific formal complaint processes, including investigations, to ensure TCC staff is efficiently processing cases. Service Level Standards are submitted quarterly to the Office of Civil Rights and Diversity for review. This practice will continue in FY 2012 and 2013. We will be raising our established goals for FY 2013 for timely investigations to 65%.

MEASURE: Percent of Complainants Informally Contacting EEO (for the Purposes of Seeking Counseling or Filing a Complaint) Who Participate in the ADR Process (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	25	30	30	30	35	35	60	60
Actual	25	29	45	35	51	49		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) contact means an instance where an EEO Counselor or an ADR Intake Officer performs the counseling duties described in Chapter 2 of MD 110 (Government-wide managing directive on EEO). This is the same information which is reported in Part I, Section D of 462 Report (Government-wide EEO report). Participation means both parties agree to enter the ADR process.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Treasury's automated Complaint Tracking System.

Data Verification and Validation: Data is periodically reviewed to ensure accuracy.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Office of Civil Rights and Diversity have been successful in meeting all established goals in FY 2011. Our bureaus actively promote the benefits of utilizing ADR to resolve disputes and promote the use of conflict resolution through training and special programs (Treasury Dispute Prevention Week and Treasury Shared Neutrals Program). Treasury has an ADR Policy, which requires management participation when ADR has been elected. We will be increasing our goal for ADR participation for FY 2012-2013 (45%).

Treasury Franchise Fund

MEASURE: Cust. Satisfaction Index - Financial Mgmt Admin Support Services (%) (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	71	74	80	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	75	0	97	89	81	92.7		
Target Met?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Shared service customers satisfaction level with service offerings, service level competence and responsiveness and overall value.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Results are submitted by the management of each franchise business and are obtained from internal or external customer satisfaction reviews.

Data Verification and Validation: Customer satisfaction processes and results for the Franchise businesses are reviewed by the Fund's management to ensure objectivity.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Annually

FULL REPORT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2011 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The Treasury Franchise Fund will continue to conduct a customer satisfaction survey to assess performance within all service lines. In order to continue to meet our customer satisfaction survey target, The Fund will strive to continue achieving excellence in meeting service level objectives along with continually assessing the customer pricing process for improvement opportunities.

MEASURE: Operating Expenses as a Percentage of Total Expenses								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	Disc	Disc
Actual						7.67		
Target Met?						Y	N/A	N/A

Definition: Operating expenses are defined as administrative expenses not directly associated with providing our services. The measure will represent the percentage of this type of expense compared to all expenses incurred.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system. Measure is calculated as Operating Expenses divided by Total Expenses.

Data Verification and Validation: External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Operating Expenses are part of the financial statements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: The actual FY11 Operating Expense Percentage for TFF was below the target of 8%. In FY12, TFF will discontinue reporting against the Operating Expense metric and establish two new metrics: Indirect Cost % - Administrative Services and Indirect Cost % - Information Technology Services. The indirect cost metric will represent the indirect costs as a percentage of total costs and better represent The Fund's relative operating costs. This will provide The Fund with a measure that will encourage efficiency in administrative operations and help assure that services are provided at the lowest possible cost. The Fund will continue to pursue customer growth and evaluate indirect cost expenditures to maintain actual performance at or below the established target. The targets should be 25% and 20% for Administrative Services and Information Technology Services, respectively.

MEASURE: Operating expenses as a percentage of revenue--Financial Management Administrative Support (%) (E) [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	12	12	12	12	12	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	17	15.1	3.6	4.72	6			
Target Met?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: The Franchise Fund will either maintain or decrease their operating (administrative) expenses as a percentage of revenue year to year.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data is captured in Oracle Financials system and reported through Oracle's Discoverer Reporting system. Measure is calculated as Operating Expenses divided by Total Revenue.

Data Verification and Validation: External auditors perform routine audits of financial statements. Operating Expenses are part of the financial statements.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2011 and replaced by another measure.

OUTCOME: Exceptional accountability and transparency

FULL REPORT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2011 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Departmental Offices - S & E

MEASURE: Number of Material Weaknesses (Significant Management Problems Identified by GAO, the IGs and/or the Bureaus) Closed (Oe) [DISCONTINUED FY 2010]								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	2	1	3	0	Disc	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual	1	0	2	0				
Target Met?	N	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: Treasury seeks to reduce and eventually eliminate the material weaknesses that currently exist within Treasury, while simultaneously taking actions which will serve to prevent new material weaknesses. Material weaknesses are significant problems with an organization's internal controls, systems' reliability, controls on waste, fraud or abuse, mission performance, and compliance with laws and regulations.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Identified by the Government Accountability Office, Treasury's Inspectors General, and/or Treasury bureaus.

Data Verification and Validation: Certification statement issued by head of bureau. Independent review to validate material weaknesses has been corrected.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

MEASURE: Percentage of timely completed Planned Corrective Actions (PCAs)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	85	85	85	85	87.5	87.5	90	90
Actual	76	71.7	82.5	85.6	88.4	92		
Target Met?	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: Percentage of total PCAs timely completed to total PCAs due for the quarter. Includes PCAs addressing recommendations from GAO, OIG, TIGTA, and SIGTARP.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data are captured in the JAMES database of updates provided by PCA owners.

Data Verification and Validation: Data will be verified and validated by evaluation performed by DCFO staff and checked with bureaus.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In FY 2011, we exceeded the target of 90% timely completion of PCAs. Our overall timely completion rate was 92%. In order to maintain 90% timeliness throughout FY 2012 and beyond, DCFO will continue to monitor bureau/office progress on timely completion of PCAs and intervene if any indication of slippage occurs. In addition, we will hold regular meetings with our audit follow-up coordinators to provide information on various aspects of the audit follow-up program and the JAMES. Finally, we will provide senior level management with results of bureau/office PCA activity on a regular basis.

Inspector General for Tax Administration

MEASURE: Percentage of Audit Products Delivered when Promised to Stakeholders (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target		Baseline	60	65	65	65	65	70
Actual		68	65	81	76	68		
Target Met?		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This measure tracks the percentage of TIGTA's audit products that are delivered on or before the contract date that TIGTA has committed to. It is critical that TIGTA's work be done in time to support Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and Congressional decision making. The likelihood that our products will be used is enhanced if they are delivered on time.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Information regarding contract dates and actual delivery dates for audits is maintained on the Team Central Management Information System (TCMIS). TIGTA's Management Information System (MIS) coordinators in the Office of Audit's Operating/Business Units monitor overall data accuracy and maintain secure controls over key milestone and contract data entries.

Data Verification and Validation: Summary data used for purposes of reporting on this measure are extracted from the Office of Audit's Team Central Management Information System (TCMIS) and analyzed and summarized by personnel in TIGTA-OA's Office of Management and Policy. A qualified staff member independent of the process validates the statistics.

TCMIS data are reviewed and validated monthly by MIS coordinators, Audit Managers and Directors.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: For FY 2012, TIGTA OA will continue to monitor the execution of its audit programs to identify additional ways to deliver timely audit products to stakeholders. TIGTA plans a slight increase in this measure during FY 2012.

MEASURE: Percentage of Recommendations Made that Have Been Implemented (Oe)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target		Baseline	80	83	83	83	83	85
Actual		90	85	91	95	93		
Target Met?		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The Office of Audit (OA) makes recommendations designed to improve administration of the Federal tax system. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) must implement these recommendations in order for TIGTA's work to produce financial or non-financial benefits. This measure assesses TIGTA's effect on improving the IRS's accountability, operations, and services. Because the IRS may need more than one year to fully implement some of our recommendations, TIGTA identifies the percentage of recommendations made four years ago that have since been implemented by the IRS. This timeframe is used because four years is the point at which TIGTA-OA believes that if a recommendation has not been implemented, it is not likely to be. For example, the FY 2011 actual percentage is the percentage of recommendations made in FY 2007 that the IRS has implemented.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The IRS records recommendations in the Department's Joint Audit Management Enterprise System (JAMES) as they are issued. Summary data regarding the status of the IRS's corrective actions taken in response to TIGTA's recommendations are provided to the Office of Audit via JAMES reports. TIGTA-OA's Office of Management and Policy monitors' implementation of recommendations as the IRS submits updated information to the JAMES.

Data Verification and Validation: Through a formal process, each audit team identifies the number of recommendations included in each report and the IRS enters the findings and corresponding recommendations into the Department of the Treasury's Joint Audit Management Enterprise System (JAMES). The database is updated frequently. TIGTA-OA's Office of Management and Policy receives summary data and monitors the data regularly to make sure the recommendations reported as implemented have been accurately recorded, as well as to accumulate data in regard to progress in meeting this measure. A qualified staff member independent of the process validates the progress related statistics.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: For FY 2012, TIGTA OA will continue to monitor the percentage of recommendations implemented.

Because the IRS is responsible for implementing the recommendations and not TIGTA, the achievement of this goal depends on IRS management. Therefore, only an incremental increase in the goal has been established for FY 2012.

MEASURE: Percentage of Results from Investigative Activities (Oe)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	70	73	76	78	79	79	79	83
Actual	79	81	78	83	86	82		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The Office of Investigations (OI) accomplishes its strategic mission objectives with performance measures, defined as the percentage of results from investigative activities which most accurately align with the mission of the organization, and which provide the greatest impact on the protection of the integrity of Federal tax administration. TIGTA's investigations are based on a performance model that focuses on OI's three primary areas of investigative responsibility: employee integrity; employee and infrastructure security; and external attempts to corrupt Federal tax administration. OI's strategic plan is designed to adapt to the IRS's constantly evolving operations and to mitigate intensified risks associated with responses to threats and attacks directed against IRS employees and infrastructure, and to protect the integrity of IRS operations by detection and deterrence of waste, fraud, abuse, or misconduct.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The total number of investigative cases closed along with the total number of completed Criminal, Civil and Administrative Actions is extracted from the Performance and Results Information System (PARIS). PARIS is a management information system that, among other things, provides TIGTA the ability to manage and account for the thousands of complaints received, investigations initiated, and leads developed from local and national investigative initiatives. It consists of three major elements: the Complaints Screen, the Investigations Screen, and the Leads Screen. PARIS data is housed in an SQL database monitored by information technology staff in Atlanta, Georgia. With the exception of OI staff that perform routine duties, access to data is limited to the OI Performance Team to process performance and production reports, ensure PARIS input accuracy, and identify statistical trends.

Data Verification and Validation: Reports of Investigation and PARIS are reviewed for consistency by Special Agents in Charge prior to closing the investigation. Additionally, independent reviews are conducted periodically of each field office where a sample of closed investigations are quality reviewed by the Operations Division Inspection Team to ensure accuracy of the PARIS data. Periodic tests of PARIS data are also conducted to ensure accuracy.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: For FY 2012 TIGTA OI will continue to monitor its current performance measures and has set the results ratio to 79 percent.

Office of Inspector General

MEASURE: Number of Completed Audit Products (Ot)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	56	56	56	60	62	62	70	70
Actual	57	64	64	68	68	126		

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

Target Met? Y Y Y Y Y Y

Definition: Audits, attestation engagements, and evaluations: (1)promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Treasury programs and operations; (2)prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in those programs and operations; (3)keep the Secretary and the Congress fully informed; and (4)help the Federal government to be accountable to the public.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: OIG audits, attestation engagements, and evaluations result in sequentially numbered written products.

Data Verification and Validation: Official audit files support the performance data.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OIG exceeded the target for this measure in fiscal year 2011, but expects to return to a more normal level of performance in the future, and complete 70 audit products in fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

MEASURE: Percent of Statutory Audits Completed by the Required Date (E)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	50	100		
Target Met?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		

Definition: Legislation mandating certain audit work generally prescribes, or authorizes OMB to prescribe, the required completion date for recurring audits and evaluations, such as those for annual audited financial statements. For other types of mandated audit work, such as a Material Loss Review (MLR) of a failed financial institution, the legislation generally prescribes a timeframe to issue a report (6 months for an MLR, as an example) from the date of an event that triggers the audit.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The date OIG issues an audit, attestation engagement, or evaluation report is printed on the cover. The required dates may vary each year and are specified in different legislation.

Data Verification and Validation: Official audit files and the dates on the reports themselves support the performance data.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OIG met this target in fiscal years 2011, and expects to complete 100 percent of statutory audits by the required date in both fiscal years 2012 and 2013 barring any anomalies that would impact performance, such as an increase in financial institution failures that would require material loss reviews.

MEASURE: Percentage (%) of All Cases Closed During Fiscal Year that were Referred for Criminal/Civil Prosecution or Treasury Administrative Action [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	70	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual				100	93			
Target Met?				Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: In order to protect the integrity and efficiency of Treasury programs it is important that findings of criminal or civil misconduct be referred to the Justice Department, state and/or local governments for prosecution and litigation in a timely manner. Criminal and civil convictions have a greater impact and carry a greater deterrent effect when they are prosecuted expeditiously. Some investigations will identify violations of the Ethical Standards of conduct, Federal Acquisition Regulations, or other administrative standards, which do not rise to the level of criminal or civil prosecution. In these cases it is important that OIG findings are reported to the bureau or office in a timely manner to allow them to take administrative action against the individuals engaging in misconduct.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: This data will be retrieved from the Investigations case management system.

Data Verification and Validation: All case files will be reviewed to ensure that the case data is correct and supported by documentation.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: After senior leadership review, the OIG determined that this performance measure does not accurately reflect investigative performance, and was replaced with a single measure. Starting in FY 2011, OIG began using the measure Percentage (%) of investigations that were referred for criminal/civil or Treasury administrative action, with an initial goal of 80%.

MEASURE: Percentage (%) of All Cases that were Accepted by Prosecutors, Referred for Agency Action, or Closed During the Fiscal Year and were Completed within 18 Months of Case Initiation [DISCONTINUED FY 2011]

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	70	Disc	Disc	Disc
Actual				92	66			
Target Met?				Y	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Definition: In order to protect the integrity and efficiency of Treasury programs it is important that findings of criminal or civil misconduct be referred to the Justice Department, state and/or local governments for prosecution and litigation in a timely manner. Criminal and civil convictions have a greater impact and carry a greater deterrent effect when they are prosecuted expeditiously. Some investigations will identify violations of the Ethical Standards of conduct, Federal Acquisition Regulations, or other administrative standards, which do not rise to the level of criminal or civil prosecution. In these cases it is important that OIG findings are reported to the bureau or office in a timely manner to allow them to take administrative action against the individuals engaging in misconduct.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: This data will be retrieved from the Investigations case management system.

Data Verification and Validation: All case files will be reviewed to ensure that the case data is correct and supported by documentation.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: After senior leadership review, the OIG determined that this performance measure does not accurately reflect investigative performance, and was replaced with a single measure. Starting in FY 2011, OIG began using the measure Percentage (%) of investigations that were referred for criminal/civil or Treasury administrative action, with an initial goal of 80%.

MEASURE: Percentage (%) of Investigations that were referred for Criminal, Civil or Treasury administrative action

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target						Baseline	80	80
Actual						85		
Target Met?						Y		

Definition: In order to protect the integrity and efficiency of Treasury programs, it is important that findings of criminal or civil misconduct be

referred to the Justice Department, state and/or local governments for prosecution and litigation in a timely matter. Criminal and civil convictions have a greater impact and carry a greater deterrent effect when they are prosecuted expeditiously. Some investigations will identify violations of the Ethical Standards of conduct, Federal Acquisition Regulations, or other administrative standards, which do not rise to the level of criminal or civil prosecution. In these cases it is important that OIG findings are reported to the bureau or office in a timely manner to allow them to take administrative action against the individuals engaging in misconduct.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: This data will be retrieved from the OIG's investigative case management system (IMIS)

Data Verification and Validation: All files will be reviewed to ensure that the case data is correct and is supported by documentation.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: OIG exceeded the target in fiscal years 2011, and anticipates maintaining this level of performance in fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

Special IG for TARP

MEASURE: Congressional Requests for Testimony Completed (Ot)(Units)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	4	4	4	4
Actual				9	7	5		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: The number of testimonies that SIGTARP provides to Congress.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: Capture - SIGTARP lists all of their testimonies to date on <http://www.sig tarp.gov/reports.shtml>.

Source - Undetermined.

Data Verification and Validation: SIGTARP's staff monitors and records the number of testimonies completed. This data is published on SIGTARP's website and is validated through Congressional records.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: It is anticipated that Congress will continue to have interest in SIGTARP's work and will request testimonies.

MEASURE: Number of Completed Audit Products (Ot)(Units)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	12	12	12	10
Actual				3	9	13		
Target Met?				Y	N	Y		

Definition: Completed audit products includes audit reports that promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP).

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: SIGTARP audit reports are sequentially numbered and posted on <http://www.sig tarp.gov/reports.shtml>.

Data Verification and Validation: Official audit files support the performance data.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: It is anticipated that Congress will continue to have a high level of interest in SIGTARP's work as it relates to the efficiency and effectiveness of the TARP program and the identification of fraud, waste or abuse of federal funds.

MEASURE: Percent of Recommendations Implemented (Oe)(%)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	70	70	70	70
Actual				100	43	50		
Target Met?				Y	N	N		

Definition: SIGTARP makes recommendations to promote the efficiency and effectiveness of TARP management. The Office of Financial Stability (OFS) must implement these recommendations in order for SIGTARP's work to produce financial or non-financial benefits. This measure tracks EESA's implementation of SIGTARP recommendations.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: SIGTARP inputs their recommendations into the Joint Management Enterprise System (JAMES). The Office of Financial Stability inputs the findings and corresponding recommendations into JAMES, and SIGTARP uses the information in JAMES to track whether or not their recommendations have been implemented. The data for this measure is stored in JAMES.

Data Verification and Validation: Audit Division staff reviews JAMES data on recommendation status and confirms the status with the audit team. The Audit Division staff monitors the data regularly to make sure the recommendations reported as implemented have been accurately recorded, as well as to accumulate data in regard to progress in meeting this measure. A qualified staff member independent of the process validates the progress related statistics.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In fiscal year 2011 the OFS implementation rate of recommendations was lower than anticipated by SIGTARP. OFS is working on implementing the recommendations and planned corrective actions that will extend into FY 2012. SIGTARP will continue to monitor implementation of these recommendations, make other recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of TARP, and anticipates the OFS will continue to implement a majority of these recommendations.

MEASURE: Percentage of Hotline Complaints Referred for Investigation or to OFS within 14 days of Receipt (E)(%)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	60	65	70	70
Actual				77	74	76		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This metric tracks the time taken to resolve citizen complaints to SIGTARP's Investigations Division's hotline.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The data originates from calls, emails, faxes and letters received from citizens and are processed in SIGTARP's Investigations Division's Case Management System.

Data Verification and Validation: Undetermined

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: With procedures in place, SIGTARP anticipates an increased volume of calls in the future and improved mechanisms to screen allegations for different indicators of fraud may impact processing time.

MEASURE: Percentage of Investigations Accepted by Prosecutors (Oe)(%)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	50	55	55	60
Actual				95	100	94		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This metric measures the percentage of SIGTARP criminal or civil investigations that a federal, state, or local prosecutor has formally accepted to prosecute.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The case agent assigned to the case updates the status of investigations as necessary. The data originates from the assigned case agent and is stored on the Case Management System.

Data Verification and Validation: Currently the information is validated by Investigations Squads supervisors and manually tabulated. ID is in the process of adding this field to the case management system so that it could be calculated automatically.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: According to the Attorney General Guidelines for Statutory Offices of Inspector Generals, Inspector Generals should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that allegations, if proven, should be prosecuted. There are a number of conflicting factors that play an important role in the acceptance rate, such as prosecutorial thresholds & resources, sensitivity of the case etc. Due to the current economy, there is still significant interest among prosecutors in Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) related cases, which plays an important factor in this rate.

MEASURE: Percentage of Preliminary Investigations Converted to Full Investigations (Oe)(%)

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	35	40	45	50
Actual				50	80	88		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This metric measures the percentage of preliminary investigations that are converted to full investigations during the reporting period. A preliminary investigation is a limited investigation during which the investigator gathers fundamental information to determine the need to continue, pursue other remedies, or close the case. A full investigation is where the case agent accumulates all additional evidence needed to successfully complete the investigation.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: When an investigator or supervisor assesses the information contained in an allegation of wrongdoing, a number of factors are considered prior to determining what type of case should be opened. For example, if the allegation includes significant supporting

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT | FISCAL YEAR 2011

documentation or witness testimony showing illegal activity, then a case, or "full" investigation, would be opened immediately. However, if the allegation has only brief details, a "preliminary" investigation can be opened to provide a mechanism to develop further information regarding the allegation. The data originates with the case agent and the official case file. The data used to track this metric comes from the SIGTARP investigations Division (ID) Case Management System.

Data Verification and Validation: This measure is calculated in the case management system; the system tracks the dates remaining of cases that have not yet been converted as well as historic case conversion data. A report is run to show cases converted.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: SIGTARP has a backlog of allegations warranting further investigation that is expected to drop during FY 2012 as a number of preliminary cases are dependent on the availability of investigators.

MEASURE: Percentage of cases that are joint agency/task force investigations (Oe)(%)								
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Target				Baseline	30	35	40	45
Actual				60	50	40		
Target Met?				Y	Y	Y		

Definition: This is the overall percentage of cases during the reporting cycle that are joint with other law enforcement agencies.

Indicator Type: Measure

Data Capture and Source: The Data originates from the assigned Case Agent and is stored on the SIGTARP ID Case Management System.

Data Verification and Validation: This data is entered by the case agent and verified by the case supervisor. At the headquarters level SIGTARP Investigations staff validates the data with other Law Enforcement headquarters contacts as well as through weekly reports by the Investigative Squad's assigned Investigations Counsel.

Data Accuracy: Reasonable

Data Frequency: Quarterly

Future Plans/Explanation for Shortfall: In fiscal year 2011, 40 percent of SIGTARP's were joint agency/ task force investigations cases where SIGTARP partnered with other law enforcement agencies. This was due primarily to the high profile of many of these cases when they were initiated. SIGTARP will continue to work in concert with its law enforcement partners to meet its fiscal year 2012 goal, but as its identity as a premier "white collar" law enforcement agency develops, SIGTARP may work more of its cases independently.

*Estimate