



Department of Transportation
Office of the Senior Procurement Executive

No. APL-2010-09

Date 04/06/2010

DOT ACQUISITION POLICY LETTER

This Acquisition Policy Letter is issued under the authority of the Senior Procurement Executive of the Department of Transportation

Subject: Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation
Acquisition Data Quality Plan

References:

FAR 4.6	Contract Reporting
FAR 4.8	Government Contract Files
APL 2007-03	Federal Procurement Data Verification and Validation (D V and V)

When is this Acquisition Policy Letter (APL) Effective?

This APL is effective upon issuance.

When Does This APL Expire?

This APL remains in effect until the resulting policy is incorporated into the Transportation Acquisition Manual (TAM).

Who is the Point of Contact?

Contact Camille Reddick of the Office of the Senior Procurement Executive, Business Policy Division (202) 366-7511 or by email at camille.reddick@dot.gov.

Visit our website at <http://www.dot.gov/ost/m60> for additional information on DOT Acquisition Policy Letters and other policy issues.

What is the Purpose of this Acquisition Policy Letter?

The purpose of this Acquisition Policy Letter (APL) is to establish a department-wide plan for the continual improvement of the acquisition data reported to the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) and provide guidance regarding FPDS annual certification requirements.

What is the Background?

Successful completion of the FPDS-NG reporting process is heavily dependent on the efforts of DOT's acquisition professionals, each Operating Administration (OA) contracting office FPDS application coordinators, and the DOT FPDS-NG Application System Administrator.

On October 7, 2009, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) issued a memorandum requiring additional steps to verify and validate the accuracy of data in FPDS. The memorandum required each Chief Acquisition Officer (CAO) to establish requirements to ensure that the 2009 and 2010 FPDS acquisition data is reflected accurately and timely.

This plan incorporates the requirements of the OFPP memorandum and provides instructions to the Operating Administrations (OAs) for completion of tasks to support the data accuracy improvement effort.

What is the Guidance?

Effective immediately, each Operating Administration's, Head of the Contracting Activity (HCA) is required to establish procedures for and conduct quarterly sampling of the accuracy of each quarter's procurement data. The verification and validation of FPDS-NG data must be performed by an individual other than the contracting officer who awarded the contract action or the person entering the contract data for that contract action record.

OA Contracting Offices may perform sampling through peer reviews, contractor support, the OA FPDS-NG Administrator, or other quality assurance reviews. Reviews should include a statistically valid number of transactions, cover all data fields, and be documented. The Senior Procurement Executive (SPE) reserves the right to do a periodic review of FPDS-NG data submitted. The DOT FPDS-NG System Administrator will provide technical support and oversight of the FPDS-NG application and process all centralized and automated FPDS-NG entries. The DOT FPDS-NG System Administrator will also manage and disseminate errors to the appropriate application coordinators, who will ensure correction. Contracting Officers shall incorporate the processes and procedures identified by this plan into existing contract award review processes and procedures established within the Operating Administration (OA).

HCA certification of the completeness, currency, and accuracy of the prior fiscal year FPDS-NG data shall be submitted to the Associate Director of Acquisition Policy & Oversight, Office of the Senior Procurement Executive, not later than November 1 of each year using the guidance/format provided via Attachment B.



Cassandra G. Wells
Associate Director,
Acquisition Policy and Oversight,
Office of the Senior Procurement Executive

Attachment
bcc: M61,M60

DOT Verification and Validation (V&V) Methodology

How will samples of FPDS records be selected and by whom?

Using the strategy described below, once the sample size has been determined, a listing of records contained within the sample population shall be generated and forwarded to the Chief of the Contracting Office for identification/selection of actions for verification and validation. Once the listing of actions for verification and validation has been generated, the list is provided to the affected Contracting Officers for file retrieval and scheduling of data verification and validation.

How will statistical validity of the sample be determined?

Using stratified sampling, the statistical population size will be determined by generating an FPDS-NG Workload Report identifying the number of contract actions reported to FPDS-NG during the specified time period by award type (i.e., BPA, BPA Call, Delivery Order, etc.). Once the population has been determined, the sample size will be determined utilizing the statistical calculator found at <http://ezsurvey.com/samplesize.html>. Standard parameters employed across the department are a confidence level of 95% with a margin of error of 5%.

Who will conduct independent review of FPDS data quality?

Each Operating Administration's, Head of the Contracting Activity (HCA) is required to establish procedures for and conduct quarterly sampling of the accuracy of each quarter's procurement data. The verification and validation of FPDS-NG data must be performed by an individual other than the contracting officer who awarded the contract action or the person entering the contract data for that contract action record.

OA Contracting Offices may perform sampling through peer reviews, contractor support, the OA FPDS-NG Administrator, or other quality assurance reviews. Reviews should include a statistically valid number of transactions, cover all data fields, and be documented. The Senior Procurement Executive (SPE) reserves the right to do a periodic review of FPDS-NG data submitted. The DOT FPDS-NG System Administrator will provide technical support and oversight of the FPDS-NG application and process all centralized and automated FPDS-NG entries. The DOT FPDS-NG System Administrator will also manage and disseminate errors to the appropriate application coordinators, who will ensure correction.

The designated OA staff will perform the verification and validation requirement using the checklist provided by Attachment A. Reviews will be performed by a Contracting Officer/Specialist not associated with the award/review of the contract being verified and validated. Records of the verification and validations performed will be maintained with a quarterly report including a copy of the verification/validation checklist provided to the Office of the Senior Procurement Executive.

The following methodology should be followed when conducting the V&V:

1. Determine the sample size of contract actions to be reviewed using sample size calculator cited on the following URL: www.ezsurvey.com/samplesize.html
2. Create a Workload Report using Federal Procurement Data System - Next Generation (FPDS-NG) Standard Reporting System. This report should display all contract actions obligated within a particular time period (i.e., "FY2009").
3. Segment Workload Report into "Award Type", "Modification Number", "PIID", "Ref PIID", "Date Signed", "Effective Date", "Completion Date", "Action Obligation", "Base and Exercised Options Value", and "Base and All Options Value" fields.
4. Select contract actions, randomly, based on the pre-determined number (sample) needed to produce a statistically valid assessment.
5. Using the Acquisition Data Quality Checklist (Attach __) Conduct V&V by comparing each contract action to the appropriate FPDS-NG record and Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database.
6. Document any discrepancies or errors identified within FPDS-NG in the "Comments/Remarks" section of the Acquisition Data Quality Checklist.
7. Prepare a Summary of Findings Report for the Operating Administration's Chief of Contracting Office along with copies of the Acquisition Data Quality Checklists for each contract action reviewed highlighting the following:
 - "Number of Actions Sampled" vs. the "Number of Actions Reviewed"
 - "Number of Actions w/Errors" vs. the "Number of Actions w/o Errors"
 - "Percentage of Accurate Actions" vs. the "Percentage of Inaccurate Actions"

The Summary of Findings Report shall also contain a bar chart depicting error trends by Award Types (i.e., "Blanket Purchase Agreement", "Blanket Purchase Agreement Call", "Delivery Order", "Definitive Contract", "Purchase Order" and "Indefinite Delivery Contract") as well as a table of predominate errors classified by "Data Element".

8. All discrepancies/errors shall be mitigated within 30 days of identification.
9. NLT thirty days after the conclusion of the verification and validation cycle, provide the Office of the Senior Procurement Executive the following:
 - Summary of Findings Report
 - Acquisition Data Quality Checklist (Completed)
 - Notification of completion of required corrective actions

Making Statistically Valid Comparisons of FPDS Data and Contract Files

This Exhibit¹ provides guidance on how agencies are expected to conduct statistically valid comparisons of their FPDS data and the underlying contract files. This guidance includes the procedures required to conduct statistically valid, independent reviews of FPDS data, as well as definitions of key terms, e.g., accuracy rate.

Procedures:

Although departments and agencies are expected to establish their own internal procedures for sampling and validating their FPDS data, these procedures must conform to the following requirements:

1. The sample design and sample size must be sufficient to produce statistically valid conclusions for the overall department or agency 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 would have a 95 percent confidence interval of 87% to 97%. This degree of precision should be considered a minimum, and agencies are encouraged to utilize larger samples to increase precision and to obtain item and/or program level information that is more actionable or useful to the agency.
2. In designing their samples, agencies shall ensure that the contract action reports sampled are selected randomly from a population of FPDS records that includes all of the FPDS use cases (i.e., transaction types) employed by the agency (however, do not include “draft” FPDS records in the sample). Agencies are also strongly encouraged to stratify their samples and/or also target known problem areas for special scrutiny, provided that the sample size meets the statistical validity requirements in #1 above.

More specifically, agencies shall select a sufficient number of CARs to review so that they can report accuracy rates separately for each of the required data elements with acceptable precision. Agencies should also consider the amount of spending associated with the CAR in their sampling of CARS. This could be done by stratifying the CARS into different categories based on their level of spending or by sampling with probabilities proportional to the amount of spending.

Most large agencies will need to consult with a statistician experienced with complex sample designs in order to design an appropriate sample that will provide useful information to the agency and meet the precision requirements

3. Each sampled contract action report (CAR) must be validated against the associated contract file by an individual other than the contracting officer who awarded the contract or the person entering the contract data for that contract action record. Although some agencies may also validate their FPDS data against the corresponding data in their contract writing systems, ultimate data verification must be made against the official contract files. The reviewer must obtain sufficient information to validate any CAR data elements not contained in the contract file or contract writing system (CWS). Data elements that cannot be validated must be considered incorrect. This includes CAR data elements that match data in the contract file or CWS that the

¹ OMB Memo, of October 7th 2009, Improving Acquisition Data Quality for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010

reviewer and his/her supervisor determine to be inaccurate.

4. Each data element listed in the Attachment C shall be reviewed for accuracy when it is available for entry on the FPDS use case or brought forward on a Delivery/Task Order, BPA Call, or Modification from the base record,

5. Agencies shall only use personnel with a working knowledge of and experience with federal procurement processes and the FPDS system to conduct the data validation reviews.

6. Special focus shall be placed on the “Description of Requirement” data element, as it is the only data element during FY09 that specifically identifies contract actions that were funded in whole or in part by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act). When this field includes a Treasury Account Symbol (TAS) displayed in one of the two allowed formats (TAS::XX XXXX::TAS or TAS::XX XXXX XXX::TAS), the field shall also include a description of the goods/services that were procured that is clear and can be understood by the general public. If it does not, the field shall be considered inaccurate. Additionally, the TAS identified in the field shall be the predominant Recovery TAS used to fund the contract action if more than one Recovery TAS was used. If it is not, the field shall be considered inaccurate. Finally, if an award notice indicating a Recovery Act award has been posted to FedBizOpps for the contract action that is being reviewed; and the CAR does not indicate a Recovery Act TAS in the “Description of Requirement” field, the field shall be considered inaccurate.

Definitions:

Overall Accuracy Rate – The percent of all the FPDS data elements sampled which were determined to be correct, i.e., they matched the corresponding data in the contract files and the data in the contract files were correct. For purposes of this report, only compute the overall data accuracy for the data elements reported on the Attachment to Exhibit 1. Do not include in this computation the accuracy of other data elements the agency might choose to validate for its own purposes.

Data Element Accuracy Rate – The percentage of data elements in the sampled contract action records that were determined to be correct, i.e., the entry matched the corresponding data in the contract file and the data in the contract file was correct. Only data elements appropriate for the type of record (or “use case”) being validated should be counted in computing the accuracy rate. There are many data elements that are not required for certain types of records, e.g., data element 6A, Type of Contract, for a BPA Call. Such “not required” data elements should not appear in those records and therefore can’t be validated. Data elements that are required for the type of record being reviewed must not be blank and must be supported by information present in the contract file or contract writing system to be determined accurate. Certain data elements are optional for certain record types, e.g., data element 10A, Extent Competed, is optional for a Delivery Order. If there is a value for an optional data element, that data element must be treated as though it were required. If there is no value for an optional data element, it should be treated as though it were not required.

Total Sample Size – This is the total number of FPDS contract action records selected by all

subordinate reporting activities for comparison to the corresponding contract files. Agencies are expected to select these records randomly and in sufficient numbers to produce statistically valid conclusions about the accuracy of the data elements reported on the Attachment to Exhibit 1 at the 95% confidence level, with an error rate of no more than $\pm 5\%$.

Percent of Total Procurement Spend Covered by Sample – This is computed by dividing the total obligations associated with the contract action records sampled by the total obligations associated with all contract actions.

U.S. Department of Transportation
Office of the Senior Procurement Executive
Acquisition Data Quality Checklist

PIID: _____ # of Modifications in current FY: _____
REF IDV PIID: _____

Contract reflects _____# of modifications executed to date.
FPDS-NG reflects _____# of modifications reported to date.

Contract Identification/Dates/Dollar Values/Transaction Information

Seq. NO	Data Element	Data Source			N/A	Inaccurate	Remarks
		CWS	CCR	User			
1A	Procurement Identified	X					
1C	Referenced IDV PIID	X					
2A	Date Signed	X					
2B	Effective Date	X					
2C	Completion Date	X					
2D	Est. Ultimate Completion Date			X			
2E	Last Date to Order			X			
3A	Base and All Options Value			X			
3B	Base and Exercised Options Value			X			
3C	Action Obligation			X			
12A	IDV Type	X					
12B	Award Type	X					

Contractor Data

Seq. NO	Data Element	Data Source			N/A	Inaccurate	Remarks
		CWS	CCR	User			
9A	DUNS number	X					
9B	Contractor Name		X				
9C	Principal Place of Performance Code			X			
9H	Place of Manufacture- products only			X			
9J	CCR Exception			X			
9K	Place of Performance Zip +4			X			
13P	Small Disadvantaged Business		X				
13O	HUBzone Firm		X				
13U	Woman Owned Business		X				
13V	Veteran Owned Business		X				
13UA	Minority Owned Business		X				

Contract Information/Legislative Mandates

Seq. NO	Data Element	Data Source			N/A	Inaccurate	Remarks
		CWS	CCR	User			
6A	Type of Contract			X			
6M	Description of Requirement			X			
6N	Purchase Card Payment Method			X			
6R	National Interest Action			X			
7B	Walsh-Healy Act			X			
7C	Service Contract Act			X			
7D	Davis-Bacon Act			X			

FPDS Data Quality Report

Agency Name: U.S. Department of Transportation

Fiscal Year of FPDS Data: _____

Agency Data

Number of Contracting Offices Providing Data to FPDS: _____

Total Procurement Obligations for this fiscal year: _____ (\$ in millions)

Part I - Data Quality Certification

Certification Statement

I certify that _____% of all reportable contract actions awarded during FY _____ for my agency have been entered into FPDS as fully and accurately as possible as of the date of my signature. [Agencies unable to certify entry of 100% of their reportable contract actions must discuss the reasons for this and their plans to remedy this situation under the following section of this Part.]

Explanation of Data Missing from Certification

[Use additional pages as necessary to discuss any procurement data that are not included in this certification. Identify data belonging to organizations that have been unable to enter their data into FPDS as well as contract writing system (CWS) data and “draft” FPDS records that have not passed the FPDS data validation routines. For each category of missing FPDS records, indicate the number, dollar value, and age of the missing records and your milestone plans for bringing these records into FPDS.]

Part II - Assuring Data Input Accuracy

Agencies’ efforts to assure the input of high quality procurement data typically fall into three broad groups of activities. The first two groups consist of activities intended to: (1) assure that accountability for data accuracy is clearly defined and properly assigned, and (2) implement quality controls over data input. The third group consists of other measures that agencies may take to monitor and improve their data quality on a routine basis. Please discuss your agency’s activities to assure data input accuracy according to the following outline along with any other points you want to include.

Accountability for Data Accuracy

1. Address whether or not data quality was included as a critical element, included but not as a critical element, or not addressed in the performance evaluations of contract specialists, contracting officers, heads of contracting activities, senior procurement executives, and chief acquisition officers.

2. Describe any other ways in which personnel in the agency and its subordinate components were held accountable for ensuring FPDS data accuracy.
3. Discuss any barriers or challenges that your agency faced in implementing accountability for data accuracy throughout the agency, and any steps that the agency has taken, or is planning to take, in the future to improve such accountability.

Controls over Data Input

1. Provide the percent of the agency's FPDS contract action reports (CARs) entered directly from each contract writing system(s) used by the agency, the percent entered directly into FPDS through the web portal, and the percent entered by any other methods during this fiscal year:

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| a. Contract Writing System(s) (Identify name and version) | _____ % |
| _____ | _____ % |
| _____ | _____ % |
| _____ | _____ % |
| b. Web Portal (On-line logon) | _____ % |
| c. Other | _____ % |
| d. Total: | _____ <u>100%</u> |

If applicable, please describe any "other" method(s) used:

2. Identify the positions (e.g., contracting officer, contract specialist, clerk, etc.) of the individuals that **entered** the CARs into FPDS, by checking all that apply.

- | | |
|--|-------|
| a. Federal employee - contracting officer | _____ |
| b. Federal employee - contracting specialist | _____ |
| c. Federal employee - data entry clerk | _____ |
| d. Federal employee – other. Please specify | _____ |
| _____ | |
| e. Contractor-Program manager/key personnel | _____ |
| f. Contractor - data entry clerk | _____ |
| g. Contractor – other. Please specify | _____ |
| _____ | |

3. Identify the positions (e.g., contracting officer, contract specialist, clerk, etc.) of the individuals that approved the CARs entered into FPDS, by checking all that apply.

- | | |
|--|-------|
| a. Federal employee - contracting officer | _____ |
| b. Federal employee - contracting specialist | _____ |
| c. Federal employee - data entry clerk | _____ |
| d. Federal employee – other. Please specify | _____ |

-
- e. Contractor-Program manager/key personnel
 - f. Contractor - data entry clerk
 - g. Contractor – other. Please specify
-

4. Discuss the type and frequency of procurement and FPDS training provided to personnel who enter CARs into FPDS.
5. Identify whether all data elements in all CARs had to pass the FPDS edits before the corresponding awards could be issued by the agency's contract writing system. If only some data elements or some CARs were subject to the FPDS edits, identify them.
6. Discuss any other procedures, e.g., internal controls, used by the agency to ensure that data entered into contract writing systems and FPDS were correct when entered.
7. Discuss any barriers or challenges that your agency faced in establishing effective controls over the accuracy of data going into FPDS, and any steps that the agency is planning to take in subsequent fiscal years to establish such controls.

Other Data Quality Assurance Procedures

Discuss any other procedures used by the agency on a routine basis during the year to review the accuracy of its procurement data in contract writing systems and/or FPDS and to correct any errors found. Discuss separately any other such procedures that the agency is planning to implement in subsequent fiscal years. Examples of such procedures might include:

1. The use of anomaly reports that flag questionable data element values based on their relationship to other data elements. [NOTE: A list of anomaly reports suggested by GSA is posted in the “Data Quality Guidance” section of the MAX Collaboration Tool pages on FPDS Data Quality.]
2. Periodic Contract Review Boards.
3. Outside peer reviews.

Part III - Measuring and Reporting Data Accuracy

There are four factors that affect the quality of the data accuracy results reported on the Attachment to this Exhibit. The first two deal with the independence and qualification of the persons who review the FPDS records and contract files. The second two deal with the scope and adequacy of the review process itself. Please discuss your agency’s policies and procedures for measuring and reporting the accuracy of your FPDS data according to the following outline along with any other points you want to include.

Independence of Reviewers

1. Discuss whether the persons who reviewed and validated the FPDS data were government employees, contractors, or a combination thereof.

2. Were all sampled contract action reports (CARs) validated against the associated contract files by individuals other than the persons who entered the contract data for those CARs and the contracting officers who awarded those contracts? If not, explain why not. Also, discuss additional steps, if any, you have taken beyond those required by the OFPP guidance that address the independence issue.
3. Discuss any changes that the agency plans to make with respect to this issue in subsequent fiscal years.

Qualifications of Reviewers

1. Describe the qualifications reviewers were required to have with respect to contracting experience and FPDS.
2. Describe any special training on Federal procurement rules and procedures that was provided to the reviewers.
3. Describe any special training on FPDS that was provided to the reviewers.
4. Discuss any changes that the agency plans to make with respect to this issue in subsequent fiscal years.

Scope of Review

1. Describe whether the contract action report population from which the sample was selected included:
 - a. All transaction types (e.g., modifications, delivery orders, etc.);
 - b. All components of the agency that submit contract action reports to FPDS;
 - c. Data from all four quarters of the fiscal year; and
 - d. Transactions funded from non-appropriated funds. [NOTE: Transactions from non-appropriated funds should not be reported to FPDS unless approved by the GSA FPDS Program Office.]
2. Describe whether your agency validated at least all data elements identified in the OFPP guidance. If it did not, discuss why.
3. Identify any additional data elements reviewed beyond those requested in OFPP guidance.
4. Describe whether the agency reviewed all the records identified in the sample.
5. Discuss any changes that the agency plans to make with respect to this issue in subsequent fiscal years.

Adequacy of Review

1. Describe the sample design and methodology used to select the contract action reports for the sample. If the agency did not select a random sample of contract action reports, describe the sample selection method that was used and justify how the sample is providing useful information about the accuracy of data elements.

2. Identify whether the agency selected a sufficiently large sample to comply with the statistical precision standard requested by OFPP (i.e., a 95% confidence level of ± 5 percentage points around the accuracy rate), and provide the 95% confidence interval for the overall accuracy rate and the data element accuracy rates. If the requested standard was not achieved, explain why the current sample was used and why the standard could not be met.
3. Did your agency pull the sample and conduct its review at the overall agency level or at the component level? If at the component level, indicate the number of components that conducted reviews, whether the SPEs (or equivalent) at those components reported the confidence levels of their samples to you, and what those confidence levels were.
4. Identify whether the reviewers compared the data elements in FPDS to the information in the contract file. If not, describe how they validated the data elements.
5. Identify whether the review included additional steps to validate the FPDS data beyond a comparison to the contract file (e.g., logic tests of relationships among related data elements, anomaly reports, etc.). Describe the additional methods used.
6. Discuss any changes that the agency plans to make with respect to this issue in subsequent fiscal years.

Other Activities to Validate Data

Please summarize any other activities performed by the agency to measure and report the accuracy of its FPDS data that aren't included in the discussion of the preceding four factors.

Required Signature:

CHIEF OF CONTRACTING OFFICE NAME (Printed)

CHIEF OF CONTRACTING OFFICE SIGNATURE

DATE

NOTE: This Attachment provides a standard format for agencies to use in reporting the overall accuracy rate for the data elements being validated as well as the accuracy rate for each data element. (Note that the data element names are as they appear on the FPDS screens.) Please summarize the data accuracy results collected from all subordinate offices that validated and certified their own data into this Attachment. Please also discuss any systemic causes of invalid data in as much detail as you can, with particular attention to errors caused by FPDS or any other components of the Integrated Acquisition Environment. Use additional pages as needed.

Operating administration Name: _____ FY 2009 FPDS Data
 Overall Accuracy Rate: _____% Percent of Total Procurement Spend Covered by Sample: _____%

Accuracy Computation for Key Data Elements

Data Element Name	(Column A) No. of Records Reviewed	(Column B) No. Correct Records	(Column A/B) as % Accuracy Rate	Systemic Causes of invalid data (Check all that apply)		
				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 10						
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 Reason Not Competed						
10D Number of Offers Received***						
10N Type of Set Aside						
10R Statutory Exception to Fair Opportunity						
11A CO's Business Size Selection						
11B Subcontract Plan						
12A IDVType						
12B Award Type						
Total Records Sampled						

NOTE: This Attachment provides a standard format for agencies to use in reporting the overall accuracy rate for the data elements being validated as well as the accuracy rate for each data element. (Note that the data element names are as they appear on the FPDS screens.) Please summarize the data accuracy results collected from all subordinate offices that validated and certified their own data into this Attachment. Please also discuss any systemic causes of invalid data in as much detail as you can, with particular attention to errors caused by FPDS or any other components of the Integrated Acquisition Environment. Use additional pages as needed.

Data Quality Best Practices

In an effort to provide more explicit information to ensure the completeness of FPDS-NG V&V reviews and support the sharing of best practices the following practices and benefits are provided.

Practice	Benefit
FPDS-NG V&V reviews shall be considered complete upon receipt of hardcopies of corrections made in FPDS to rectify the errors found during the review.	Performing such practice will implement standard procedures to officially conclude FPDS-NG Reviews.
Contracting Specialists/Officers shall include "Base and Exercise Options Value" and "Base and All Options Value" data elements within contract file/documentation.	Implementing such policy will endorse more current and reliable financial reporting, and improve stewardship and acquisition transparency.
Contracting Specialists/Officers shall verify "Date Signed" and "Effective Date" data elements are per contract, on a monthly basis.	Performing this practice on a routine basis will eliminate erroneous data from being reported and possibly becoming public knowledge.
Contracting Specialist/Officers shall create and use a standard checklist for "close out" actions.	Requiring this practice will decrease the number "close out" modifications Standard Forms missing from contract files.
Contracting Specialist/Officers shall scan base contracts and modifications at the time of release and signature.	Performing this practice will reduce a significant number of duplicate copies within the contract file.
Contracting Specialists/Officers shall use the sample size calculation cited on the following URL www.ezsurvey.com/samplesize.html	Implementing this practice will foster a sampling standard for all Operating Administrations.
When an award is selected for verification/validation, all awarded actions (base and all modifications) will be reviewed in concert with the associated FPDS-NG record.	Performing this practice will ensure complete and accurate reporting of all contract actions.

Acquisition Data Quality Plan Milestones

Timeline	Milestone	Responsibility
Quarterly	Independent Verification & Validation	OA
Quarterly	----V&V Results Provided to OSPE	OA
Annually (September 30 th)	Review/Update Policy Guidance	OSPE
Annually (November 1 st)	Annual FPDS-NG Certification	OA
Annually (January 5 th)	Annual FPDS-NG Certification	SPE

Key:

OSPE-Office of the Senior Procurement Executive

OA-Operating Administration

SPE-Senior Procurement Executive