

U.S. Department of Energy Data Quality Plan

Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation (FPDS-NG) Data

In accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 4.604 and related guidance, agency Chief Acquisition Officers (CAOs) must certify annually each January to the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) and the General Services Administration (GSA) that their previous fiscal year's FPDS-NG records are complete and accurate.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has developed a process of approaching FPDS-NG data quality in accordance with OFPP Memorandum – Improving Acquisition Data Quality for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010. DOE's contracting offices are required to perform a quarterly data quality review of Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) data. This review requires that each contracting office identify an independent reviewer of the data having no affiliation with the contractual action under review. The reviewers are required to have working knowledge of, and experience with, federal procurement processes and the FPDS-NG system. The reviewers compare the FPDS-NG data elements required by OFPP for the end of the year Federal Procurement Data Verification and Validation certification against information in the contract award instrument and the related files, both paper and/or in the DOE's contract writing system, as applicable.

The following procedures are followed per OFPP guidance:

1. The sample design and sample size must be sufficient to produce statistically valid conclusions for the overall department at the 95% confidence level, with a margin of error of no more than ± 5 percentage points. For example, an overall accuracy rate of 92 percent for the sample would translate to an overall confidence level of 87% to 97% for agency-wide data.
2. The contract action reports sampled are selected randomly from a population of FPDS-NG records (excluding "draft" records) that includes all of the FPDS-NG use cases (i.e., transaction types) employed by the agency.

A sufficient number of contract action reports (CARs) are selected to review so that they can report accuracy rates separately for each of the required data elements with acceptable precision.

3. Each sampled CAR must be validated against the associated contract award instrument, including any associated data in the agency contract writing system record, by an individual other than the contracting officer who awarded the contract or the person entering the contract data for that contract action record. The reviewer must obtain sufficient information to validate any CAR data elements not contained in the contract award instrument or contract writing system (CWS). Data elements that cannot be validated must be considered incorrect and this includes CAR data elements that while they match data in the contract writing system, are determined to be inaccurate.

Each contracting activity's Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) approves the data quality review reports for submission. DOE started this process in FY 2007. Contracting Officers have been informed that the entry of correct data is their responsibility. Also, at the end of each year, the Department's Senior Procurement Executive (SPE) signs the Validation and Verification of DOE FPDS-NG data to OFPP and GSA.

Internal Controls for Data Quality

The Department's contract writing system, the Strategic Integrated Procurement Enterprise System (STRIPES), has automated routines to determine that the data meet specific parameters to enhance

accuracy. The system will not allow subsequent steps of a transaction to occur if data fields for the immediate step are not correct and valid for the field in which the data is entered. In addition, all data elements in all contract action reports (CARs) have to pass the FPDS-NG edits before the corresponding awards can be approved and issued in the Department's contract writing system for the 17 out of 18 offices at which the contract writing system has been implemented.

Also, Contracting Officers are responsible for reviewing data entered into the system at the time of award. Many field offices also have implemented regular monitoring reviews of FPDS-NG data to identify errors and work with the appropriate staff to correct the errors and make sure appropriate training is received. In addition, an FPDS-NG data quality assessment component has been implemented as part of the Department's peer review programs.

Reports available through FPDS-NG, such as anomaly reports that flag questionable data element values based on their relationship to other data elements, and the status of actions report that identifies draft, error, and void actions, are used to ensure the data is entered in an accurate and timely manner. And any issues identified from reviews conducted by the General Services Administration (GSA) and the Small Business Association (SBA) regarding FPDS-NG data are reviewed and corrected, as needed.

Training

Limited FPDS-NG training is available from GSA. Documentation such as the FPDS user's manual and data dictionary is used on an ongoing basis to ensure data is reported appropriately. The Department provides additional guidance, as needed, via various forums such as teleconferences and webinars.

As errors are identified, internal training is provided by the contracting activity or Headquarters to address these errors.

Financial Assistance Data

DOE's financial assistance offices are required to perform a quarterly data quality review of financial assistance data that is similar to the FPDS-NG data quality review, including the same sampling methodology. The financial assistance data is entered into STRIPES and the data is then fed to the Department's iManage Data Warehouse (IDW) which then feeds the data to the Procurement and Assistance Data System (PADS). PADS is used to create the Federal Assistance Award Data System PLUS (FAADS+) file that is submitted to USASpending.gov. Currently, the quarterly data quality review is conducted by pulling a sampling of financial assistance data from PADS. This review requires that each office identify an independent reviewer of the data having no affiliation with the financial assistance action under review. The reviewers are required to have working knowledge of, and experience with, federal financial assistance processes. The reviewers compare the financial assistance data elements pulled from PADS against the associated financial assistance award instrument, including any associated data in the STRIPES record.

Internal Controls for Data Quality

STRIPES is also used to process financial assistance actions, so the automated routines and validation edits described for FPDS-NG data quality also applies for financial assistance data quality. In addition, the Data Submission and Validation Tool (DSVT) used for submitting the financial assistance data to USASpending.gov contains validation edits to identify data quality issues.

Also, Contract Officers are responsible for reviewing data entered into STRIPES at the time of award. Many field offices also have implemented regular monitoring reviews of financial assistance data to identify errors and work with the appropriate staff to correct the errors and make sure appropriate training is received.

In addition, a financial assistance data quality assessment component has been implemented as part of the Department's peer review programs.

Training

As errors are identified, internal training is provided by the contracting activity or Headquarters to address these errors.

FPDS-NG and PADS Data Quality Review Instructions

The quarterly review of award information in the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) is required to ensure the data is complete and accurate per data certification requirements by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). In addition, the data quality review of the financial assistance information in PADS helps to ensure data is accurate as required by the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA) and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act).

The quarterly reviews of the data in FPDS-NG and PADS is due to be completed within 30 calendar days of the time a sampling of actions is provided for review from Headquarters.

Please continue to place importance for data quality on a daily basis. Award information will continue to be provided to usaspending.gov and will be provided to the recovery.gov website for review by the public. In particular, descriptions must be accurate, clear and concise to provide the transparency the President and public require from all federal agencies.

The first quarter review included new and modified actions that were entered between 10/01/2010 and 12/31/2010.

The second quarter review will include new and modified actions that are entered between 1/01/2011 and 03/31/2011.

The third quarter review will include new and modified actions that are entered between 4/01/2011 and 6/30/2011.

The fourth quarter review will include new and modified actions that are entered between 7/01/2011 and 9/30/2011.

Documentation Required for Quarterly Reviews of FPDS-NG and PADS Data:

A memorandum reviewed and signed by the Procurement Director including the following attachments:

1. Attachment 1 – 1st Quarter FPDS-NG FY2011 Data Quality Review Assessment
2. Attachment 2 – 1st Quarter FPDS-NG FY2011 Sample Actions Review
3. Attachment 3 – 1st Quarter PADS FY2011 Sample Actions Review (please note, this attachment will not be included if the office did not have financial assistance actions during this timeframe)

Please note, per instructions from the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), **special focus shall be placed on the “Description of Requirement” data element.** The description will need to be updated if the description of the goods/services that were procured is not clear and can be understood by the general public.

In addition, it is highly recommended that offices utilize FPDS-NG anomaly reports that flag questionable data element values based on their relationship to other data elements. A list of anomaly reports suggested by GSA is included as an attachment – (file name: ‘anomaly reports from GSA’).

The FPDS-NG Status of Actions reports are also provided as attachments to identify any actions that are currently in a draft or error status in FPDS. Please ensure all actions are finalized as part of the data quality review.

Also, the following are links to the FPDS-NG Data Dictionaries for Version 1.3 and Version 1.4, which provide information regarding how the fields in FPDS should be completed.

Version 1.3 Data Dictionary

https://www.fpds.gov/downloads/Version_1.3_specs/FPDSNG_DataDictionary_V1.3.pdf

Version 1.4 Data Dictionary

https://www.fpds.gov/downloads/Version_1.4_specs/FPDSNG_DataDictionary_V1.4.pdf

Agency Name: _____ **Fiscal Year of FPDS Data:** _____ **Overall Accuracy Rate:** _____%

Percent of Total Procurement Spend Covered by Sample: _____%

Accuracy Computation for Key Data Elements			Systemic Causes of Invalid Data			
Data Element Name	(Column A)	(Column B)	(Column B/ Column A as %)	(Check all that apply)		
	No. of CARs Reviewed ¹	No. of Correct CARs	Accuracy Rate	User	FPDS	Other
2A Date Signed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2C Completion Date	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2D Est. Ultimate Completion Date	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2E Last Date to Order	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3A Base and All Options Value	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3B Base and Exercised Options Value	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3C Action Obligation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4C Funding Agency ID	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6A Type of Contract	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6F Performance Based Service Acquisition	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6M Description of Requirement	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8A Product/Service Code	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8G Principal NAICS Code	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9A DUNS No	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9H Place of Manufacture	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9K Place of Performance ZIP Code (+4)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10A Extent Competed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10C Other than Full & Open Competition	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10D Number of Offers Received	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10N Type of Set Aside	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10R Fair Opportunity/Limited Sources	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11A CO's Determination of Business Size Selection	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11B Subcontract Plan	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12A IDV Type	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12B Award Type	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total Records Sampled	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

¹ Total number of contract action reports reviewed for which this data element was required.