Country case: Vendor Performance Information in the United States

Description

In working to build the right supplier relationships, the United States focuses on doing business with contractors who place a premium on integrity, performance and quality. To this end, agencies have been directed to improve the quantity, quality, and utilization of vendor performance information. Vendor past performance information including an identification and description of the relevant contract, ratings across six dimensions (quality, schedule, cost, utilization of small business, etc.), and a narrative for each rating – is contained within the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). Additional information regarding certain business integrity issues - including contracts terminated for default or cause; information about criminal, civil, or administrative procedures related to a federal contract; and prior findings that a contractor is not responsible - is captured in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS). Agencies are taking steps to improve the value of both systems by providing information that is both more complete and more useful.

Agencies are required to report past performance information, which will then be available to other contracting officers within PPIRS, on all contracts and orders above USD 150,000 (with various exceptions). However, an initial analysis showed that compliance varied widely among agencies. As a result, in March of 2013, the United States established a tiered-model of annual performance targets to bring all agencies to 100% compliance by 2015. To improve reporting compliance in FAPIIS, the United States utilizes information contained in the Federal Procurement Data System — Next Generation (FPDS-NG) to identify contracts that should have entries within FAPIIS (e.g. those where the contract was terminated for default or terminated for cause on the part of the vendor). By cross-checking with existing data sources, agencies are provided with a cost-effective mechanism to improve compliance.

Finally, recognizing that both systems are only as useful as the quality of the data that is entered, agencies were directed to ensure that their acquisition professionals are knowledgeable regarding the past performance regulations and procedures, and trained to use the reporting tools appropriately. These are all important steps as the United States continues to explore ways to ensure that the most relevant and recent past performance information is accessible, useful, readily available, and transparent to acquisition officials before award decisions are made.
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