Federal Government Procurement Data Quality Summary Fiscal Year 2016 For

Agency Data in the Federal Procurement Data System

- A. The quality of procurement data is critical to managing Federal spending, reducing contract duplication, and saving taxpayer dollars. Federal agencies have been conducting an annual verification and validation of agency procurement data captured in the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) since 2009. These data are the authoritative source of Federal procurement data, used in agency planning, Federal and international reporting, and for transparency.
- B. The agency Senior Procurement Executive annually certifies to the completeness, timeliness, and accuracy of agency procurement data in FPDS. Completeness and timeliness are measured by the percent of agency contract actions reported by the required deadline. Accuracy is measured by reviewing a sample of the data in FPDS against contract files for prescribed¹ data elements. Since 2011, the annual certifications have also included an assurance that agencies have the policies, procedures, and internal controls to address qualitative and contractor provided procurement data. This regulatory and policy requirement for verifying the accuracy and completeness of data meets the requirements for agencies certifying procurement data for the DATA Act.
- C. Exhibit 1 is the Federal-wide summary for completeness and accuracy covering fiscal years 2011-2016. Key summary information:
 - a. Completeness/timeliness the six year weighted average for completeness is 97.6%.
 - i. This means that by the required deadline, agencies had captured 97.6% of contract actions over this time period.
 - ii. The remaining 2.4% of actions that had not yet been recorded by the deadline were primarily related to technical issues and user challenges. Agencies provided milestones for completing all missing actions.
 - b. Accuracy the six-year average for agency accuracy samples is 96.9%
 - This means that for the prescribed data elements, a random sampling of records found that the data recorded in FPDS matched the data in the contract action record 96.9% of the time.
 - ii. The primary cause of error was user based with some related to technical issues.
- D. Agencies reported that they have policies and procedures to address the quality of procurement data contained in multiple systems as well as contractor provided data. Regulatory and contractual requirements for vendors to report or provide certain data before entering the Federal procurement arena coupled with agency internal controls over post-award reporting provides the assurance over such data that is used to meet DATA Act certifications.
- E. Training was identified as the most common challenge to procurement data quality.
- F. Agencies reported providing workforce development tools such as training, checklists, and guidebooks in an effort to improve data quality.

¹ As prescribed by OMB OFPP guidance found at https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/omb/procurement index pro data/

Summary of CFO Act Agencies FPDS Data Sampling FYs11-16

Ī		ary or or			11 00 00	_		-
		FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	Average
	Total Spend	\$535B	\$514B	\$459B	\$443B	\$432B	\$470B	07.00/
	Completeness Sample Accuracy	98%	96%	98.5%	98.63	95.6%	99.2%	97.6%
		94.4%	95.3%	97.2%	98.4%	97.9%	97.4%	96.9%
Element #	FPDS Data Element Name	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	Average
2A	Date Signed	90.3%	90.7%	96.4%	97.6%	96.2%	96.5%	94.6%
2C	Completion Date	89.8%	91.7%	92.9%	94.3%	92.8%	93.1%	92.4%
2D	Estimated Ultimate Completion Date	90.2%	91.4%	92.1%	93.7%	91.5%	91.8%	91.8%
2E	Last Date to Order	91.3%	95.3%	96.3%	97.8%	94.5%	93.7%	94.8%
3A	Base and All Options Value	94.2%	94.0%	97.1%	97.9%	96.5%	97.2%	96.2%
3В	Base and Exercised Options Value	94.6%	94.2%	97.7%	98.7%	98%	96.9%	96.7%
3C	Action Obligation	96.9%	97.2%	98.2%	99.1%	98.3%	97.5%	97.9%
4C	Funding Agency ID	98.8%	98.5%	99%	98%	98.2%	98.7%	98.5%
6A	Type of Contract	97.1%	96.9%	99.3%	99.3%	99.6%	99.8%	98.7%
6F	Performance Based Service Acquisition	95%	96.5%	99%	98%	98.8%	99%	97.7%
6M	Description of Requirement	92.6%	92.7%	93.8%	94.7%	95.1%	96.2%	94.2%
8A	Product/Service Code	95.7%	94.6%	97.7%	98.5%	98.5%	99.1%	97.3%
8G	Principal NAICS Code	91.8%	93.1%	98.1%	98.8%	98.7%	99.1%	96.6%
9A	DUNS No	96.8%	97.5%	98.3%	98.8%	98.6%	99.2%	98.2%
9H	Place of Manufacture	95.6%	96.6%	97.2%	98.4%	98.8%	99.3%	97.6%
9K	Place of Performance ZIP Code (+4)	92.2%	94%	95%	94.7%	94.7%	93%	93.9%
10A	Extent Competed	93.8%	96.1%	96.2%	97.5%	96.9%	98.2%	96.5%
10C	Reason Not Competed	92.4%	95.6%	96.3%	97.3%	97.5%	98.7%	96.3%
10D	Number of Offers Received	92.6%	95.9%	97%	98.3%	97.8%	98.9%	96.7%
10N	Type of Set Aside	96.1%	97.2%	96.8%	97.7%	97.5%	98.2%	97.3%
10R	Statutory Exception to Fair Opportunity	93.8%	95.1%	98.3%	98.7%	98.9%	99.1%	97.3%
11A	Contracting Officers Business Size Selection	96.2%	97.4%	97%	98.1%	97.9%	99%	97.6%
11B	Subcontract Plan	96.1%	97%	98.8%	98.6%	99.2%	99.1%	98.1%
12A	IDV Type	92.2%	97.8%	96.4%	97.8%	98.3%	98.2%	96.8%
12B	Award Type	98.2%	94.8%	98.4%	99.4%	99.1%	99.5%	98.2%