

## Agency Procurement Data Quality Report

**Agency Name:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

**Fiscal Year of Reported Data:** 2012

### **Agency Data**

Total Procurement Obligations for the fiscal year (FY) reported: \$201,014,800.29  
Number of Actions Entered into Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS): 2,840

### **Part I - Data Quality Certification Statement**

I certify that:

- a) 95.8 percent of reportable contract actions awarded during FY 12 for our agency have been entered into FPDS within appropriate time frames and in accordance with applicable guidelines<sup>1</sup>;
- b) The results reported in the Accuracy Computation Chart 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 quality<sup>2</sup> 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 over 7 percent from FY 11 to FY 12. The primary causes of the inaccuracies seem to be:

- End user confusion with the information required by some of the data elements;
- The inability to change certain contract information 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);
- Lack of resources to research and repair old data issues, leading to erroneous reporting on new modifications or task orders under older contracts in FPDS-NG.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/financial_pdf/Open_Government_Directive_02082010.pdf)

NRC has a contractor on board to assist with correcting the errors in FPDS-NG in concert with the Contract Specialists. Corrections are already underway, with a target completion date of June 30, 2013.

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

- 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 and FY 12 data validation exercises. These updates will add additional detail to focus on the data elements which still have lower accuracy rates.
- Training sessions are scheduled during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quarters of FY 13 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 new 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 review of FPDS-NG data to ensure accuracy.
- 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

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. As mentioned in Part I above, NRC has implemented a new review process for NRC procurement actions, ensuring that every action is reviewed prior to award, including review of the FPDS-NG data. In addition, the data validation reviews have been completed on a quarterly basis rather than an annual basis. The Division of Contracts has also issued guidance and provided training on the reporting and use of past performance data.

NRC was able to improve the accuracy of almost every data element from FY 11 to FY 12. In large part this is due to the issuance of SOPs on use the system and multiple training sessions on areas of inaccuracy. The SOPs will continue to be updated and additional training sessions are schedule to continue improvement in reporting data to FPDS-NG.

As of this date, FY 12 procurement data in FPDS, including data related to small business procurements, are ready for use in government-wide data analysis and public reporting, such as the Small Business Procurement Scorecard.

**Required Signature**

Cynthia A. Carpenter  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE NAME (Printed)

/RA/ \_\_\_\_\_ January 30, 2013  
SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE SIGNATURE DATE



10D Number of Offers Received	164	159	96.95%	X	
10N Type of Set Aside	87	84	96.55%	X	
10R Statutory Exception to Fair Opportunity	103	99	96.12%	X	
11A CO's Business Size Selection	88	81	92.05%	X	
11B Subcontract Plan	88	86	97.73%	X	
12A IDV Type	36	33	91.67%	X	
12B Award Type	174	166	95.40%	X	
Total Records Sampled	5190	4976	95.88%		