

Agency Procurement Data Quality Report

Agency Name: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Fiscal Year of Reported Data: 2011

Agency Data

Total Procurement Obligations for the fiscal year (FY) reported: \$200,465,142.10

Number of Actions Entered into Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS): 2,950

Part I - Data Quality Certification Statement

I certify that:

- a) 88.4 percent of reportable contract actions awarded during FY 11 for our agency have been entered into FPDS within appropriate time frames and in accordance with applicable guidelines¹;
- b) The results reported in Exhibit 2 were derived using the agency's data quality assurance procedures and appropriate sampling techniques;
- c) Agency policies, procedures, and internal controls include regular reviews of qualitative data, such as performance and integrity data, to assess the quality² of the information provided;
- d) Agency policies, procedures, and internal controls include regular reviews of contractor provided data, such as public information on transparency requirements, to assess compliance with reporting requirements and the completeness of the data.

Explanation of Data Missing from Certification

While the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) cannot provide certification that 100 percent of the data in Federal Procurement Data System–Next Generation (FPDS-NG) is accurate, the NRC improved data accuracy by 6 percent from FY 10 to FY 11. The primary causes of the inaccuracies are:

- Different interpretations by the end users with regard to the information required by some of the data elements;
- The inability to accurately capture data at the task order level in FPDS-NG when issuing an order under another agency's contract (Government Wide Acquisition Contracts, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement, etc);

¹ Agencies unable to certify entry of 100 percent of their reportable contract actions must discuss the reasons for this and their plans to remedy this situation under the Explanation of Data Missing from Certification section.

² Quality is defined by OMB Memorandum of February 8, 2010, *Open Government Directive – Framework for the Quality of Federal Spending Information*, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/financial_pdf/Open_Government_Directive_02082010.pdf.

- Resources necessary to research and repair old data issues would be too great, leading to erroneous reporting on new modifications or task orders under older contracts in FPDS-NG.

In order to continue with data quality improvement, NRC has implemented the following:

- NRC has hired a contractor to assist with correcting the errors in FPDS-NG in concert with the Contract Specialists.
- Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for FPDS-NG were developed in FY 10, and those SOPs are being updated as a result of the FY 11 data validation exercise. These updates will add additional detail to focus on the data elements which still have poor accuracy rates.
- Training sessions are scheduled during the 2nd and 3rd quarters of FY 12 to provide detailed training on different areas of the updated SOPs.
- Data quality was added as an element in the performance standards for Contract Specialists in FY 12.
- A peer review process for NRC procurement actions has been implemented, requiring that each award or modification document be reviewed by someone other than the issuing Contracting Officer prior to issuance. This review includes validation of FPDS-NG data to ensure accuracy.
- In FY 12, FPDS-NG data reviews will be completed on a quarterly basis rather than an annual one to identify issues and data trends earlier in the process so that they can be easily corrected.

Part II - Assuring Data Input Accuracy

Controls over Data Input

1. Provide the percent of the agency's FPDS contract action reports entered through the following means:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| a. Contract Writing System(s) (automated) | <u>100%</u> |
| b. Web Portal (On-line login) | <u> </u> % |
| c. Other (please provide description) | <u> </u> % |
| Total | <u>100%</u> |

Please describe any "Other" method(s) used:

Data Quality Assurance Procedures – Updates to Agency Data Quality Plans

Minimal changes have been made to NRC's Data Quality Plan. NRC has improved the data quality assurance process primarily related to USASpending.gov data since the initial agency data quality plan was completed in April 2010. While the process to compile the data remains the same, the review and monitoring pieces have been supplemented to provide more rigor to the process. In addition to the steps outlined in Part I above, the Division of Contracts has issued guidance and provided training on the reporting and use of past performance data.

Reports are run on a quarterly basis to monitor compliance with the guidance and to ensure that the NRC continues improving reporting of past performance information.

The NRC was able to improve the accuracy of almost every data element from FY 10 to FY 11. In large part this is due to the issuance of SOPs on use of the system and multiple training sessions on areas of inaccuracy. The SOPs will continue to be updated, and additional training sessions are scheduled to continue improvement in reporting data to FPDS-NG.

Required Signature

Kathryn O. Greene

SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE NAME (Printed)

Marion D. Stewart-Clark

SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE SIGNATURE

1/25/12

DATE

Exhibit 2

Agency Name: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission **Fiscal Year of FPDs Data:** 2011 **Accuracy Rate of Sample:** 83.3%

Percent of Total Procurement Spend Covered by Sample: 53.0%

Accuracy Computation for Key Data Elements

Systemic Causes of Invalid Data

| Data Element Name | (Column A) No. of CARs Reviewed ⁶ | (Column B) No. of Correct CARs | (Column B/ Column A as %) Accuracy Rate | (Check all that apply) | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|------|-------|
| | | | | User | FPDS | Other |
| 2A Date Signed | 1007 | 920 | 91.36% | X | | |
| 2C Completion Date | 990 | 787 | 79.49% | X | | |
| 2D Est. Ultimate Completion Date | 990 | 823 | 83.13% | X | | |
| 2E Last Date to Order | 125 | 101 | 80.80% | X | | |
| 3A Base and All Option Value | 1007 | 853 | 84.71% | X | | |
| 3B Base and Exercised Option Value | 990 | 813 | 82.12% | X | | |
| 3C Action Obligation | 990 | 930 | 93.94% | X | | |
| 4C Funding Agency ID | 1007 | 995 | 98.81% | X | | |
| 6A Type of Contract | 485 | 445 | 91.75% | X | | |
| 6F Performance Based Service Acquisition | 485 | 399 | 82.27% | X | | |
| 6M Description of Requirement | 1007 | 937 | 93.05% | X | | |
| 8A Product/Service Code | 485 | 467 | 96.29% | X | | X |
| 8G Principal NAICS code | 314 | 220 | 70.06% | X | | X |
| 9A DUNS No | 315 | 305 | 96.83% | | X | |
| 9H Place of Manufacture | 467 | 441 | 94.43% | X | | |
| 9K Place of Performance ZIP Code (+4) | 467 | 344 | 73.66% | X | | |

⁶Total number of contract action reports reviewed for which this data element was required.

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|---------|---|--|---|
| 10A Extent Completed | 315 | 268 | 85.08% | X | | |
| 10C Reason Not Completed | 167 | 126 | 75.45% | X | | |
| 10D Number of Offers Received | 454 | 392 | 86.34% | X | | |
| 10N Type of Set Aside | 315 | 309 | 98.10% | X | | |
| 10R Fair Opportunity/Limited Sources | 213 | 194 | 91.08% | X | | |
| 11A CO's Determination of Business Size Selection | 314 | 279 | 88.85% | X | | X |
| 11B Subcontract Plan | 314 | 314 | 100.00% | X | | X |
| 12A IDV Type | 37 | 32 | 86.49% | X | | |
| 12B Award Type | 467 | 439 | 94.00% | X | | |
| Total Records Sampled | 1544 | 1365 | 88.39% | | | |