

AFIS Discussion Template - *Contracts & Grants Management*

Goals

- Service should use the off-the-shelf functionality wherever possible
- Service should be based on current (up-to-date) standards and therefore will support the MCC for the next several years
- Service should be “right-sized” for MCC

Objective

- Quantitatively, the AFIS implementation, inclusive of an automated contracts module, will allow the C&GM division to be able to track and manage to productivity rates, procurement lead times, error rates, in addition to reporting on types, quantities and values of contract actions. This will allow the division to readily report metrics to management and identify areas to realize increased process efficiencies.
- Qualitatively, this will allow C&GM to realize: a) reduced manual ‘contract package’ processes around action memos and requisitions (and manual revisions); b) improved quality and consistency of contract files due to compliance with electronic formats and filing protocols; c) reduced error rates from multiple raw data entries and human error in data by administrative personnel (databases) as well as specialists (contract vehicles); d) efficiencies, gained by Federalized contract formats and templates from automatic updates of FAR rules, guidance, provisions and clauses, both in preparation time and review time by “2nd” pair of eyes; e) reduced need for repetitive interaction and manual revisions to contract related documents from other divisions/departments, and; f) improved quality and accuracy of reporting.

Mandatory Requirements

| Requirement | Objective analysis *See Notes below |
|--|--|
| A. Automate manual requisition, solicitation, contract award and administration processes. | Risk without it: Tasks including initiation of requirements; data entry; document preparation; changes to all the above, and; reports all are manually driven by MCC staff (CGM and others). This results in potential human error, rework, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies in all areas. Cost is loss in optimal productivity. Hard to quantify. With it: Expected realized efficiencies, consistency, overall increase in productivity. Hard to quantify. |
| B. Automate manual request for assistance and assistance (grants & cooperative agreements) processes. | Same as above. |
| C. Integrate core financial functionality with requisition, solicitation, contract award and administration. | Risk without it: Lacking direct linkage between two core business processes (finance and contracting) which results in inefficiencies through necessary dual initiation, inaccuracies from human error in data entry and manual transference of financial information from the one system to the other manually generated documents. Added to that are inefficiencies caused by the need for required modifications to correct inaccurate transfer of information, as well as, inconsistent reports due to manually driven contracts processes. Cost is loss in optimal productivity. Hard to quantify. With it: Direct linkage and flow of information between source (commitments) and target (obligations) documents. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Expected increase in productivity for all involved in the processes due to less effort required for initiation, modification, and manual transference of data on documents, and for developing ad hoc or canned reports. Hard to quantify.</p> |
| <p>D. Automate tracking & reporting capabilities of contract and assistance vehicles for accurate and timely reporting – ad hoc for external or canned management reports.</p> | <p>Risk without it: Need to gather data from any number of multiple available sources, which normally requires manual manipulation of the data for ad hoc reports. Cost is loss in optimal productivity. Hard to quantify. With it: Less time developing ad hoc report formats, searching for data from different sources, increased accuracy of information directly accessed from the source, and increased satisfaction of requestors for reports already prepared in a meaningful management format. Expected increase in optimal staff productivity. Hard to quantify.</p> |
| <p>E. Automate accurate reporting of various, procurement action lead-times (PALT) for competitive actions (FAR 8.4, 15, 12.6, 13, 16.5, 36.6, 37 and 39), IAAs (17.5) or other sole source actions and modification (FAR 43) to existing vehicles.</p> | <p>Risk without it: Need to track PALT and monitor workload status using a separate procurement action log (PAL) system that is not linked to the database to track awarded contract actions. Current system has inaccuracies and reporting deficiencies against established PALTs. Hard to quantify. With it: Alleviate the need for the separate PAL and/or PPLC database system to track PALTs. Alleviating the need for double entries, reduction in inaccuracies, and improved reporting capabilities would increase optimal productivity. Hard to quantify. Cost to maintain and develop an adequate “stop-gap” system would be alleviated. Expected Savings: \$_____</p> |
| <p>F. Integrate core financial functionality and Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation, as well as, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, and Central Contractor Registration for responsibility determination and accuracy of reporting.</p> | <p>Risk without it: Need to enter and retrieve data into these systems manually which decreases productivity due to increased time for dual entries, risk of human error, manipulation of retrieved data for reporting. Hard to Quantify. With it: Information will flow automatically between Financial system the contract system and either FPDS-NG or CFDA or CCR. Increased productivity due to less data entries, more accurate reporting. Hard to quantify.</p> |
| <p>G. Integrate with federal biz opportunity government point of entry (GPE) (www.fbo.gov)</p> | <p>Risk without it: Need to manually post pre-solicitation notices, solicitations, amendments, award notices, and other related documentation which can cause some in-efficiencies, but not great. Hard to quantify. With it: Applicable documentation will be developed within the contract system and easily connect to fbo.gov, resulting in some increased efficiencies. The difference in time to post this from one system or the other is negligible. This would have very little impact on productivity rates. Hard to quantify.</p> |
| <p>H. Integrate with federal assistance opportunities GPE (www.grants.gov)</p> | <p>Relative to grants vice contracts but the same as above answer.</p> |
| <p>I. Automate quasi-manual invoice processing</p> | <p>Without it: Need to continue manual process for approval and transmittal of approved invoices via use of emails and share drives by NBC A/P, COTRs/PM, and CG&M. The delay associated with lag times will continue when G&GM must contact NBC for obligation balances on contracts. With it: Automated processing of invoices via one integrated system reduces errors, lag-times in obtaining account balances (1 to 2 day delays), and overall staff productivity increases. Hard to quantify.</p> |

Notes:

- (1) Efficiencies for personnel involved in the processes above will range from Department “requirements initiators”, to procurement assistants, contract specialists, contracting officers or managers in CG&M. Contract staffing levels are required for volume level of Contract actions. If the volume is adjusted less staff is needed. The efficiencies in the automation of the processes may allow for reduced staffing levels but more than likely it will be that actions are accomplished in less time. A staff member can only handle so many concurrent actions at one time. That ability varies by person.
- (2) Cost of Contract Support to the CG&M for FY 2011 is roughly \$2,082,161 per year. See below.
- (3) Cost of CG&M FTE salaries projected for FY 2011 is roughly \$1,121,232 per year. See below.

| Total Projected Cost for C&GM Division FY 2011 | Total Annual Costs (Contractors and FTEs) | Total Monthly Costs | Avg Yearly Cost per Position* | Avg Monthly Cost per Position* |
|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Contractors | \$2,082,160.83 | \$173,513.40 | \$231,351.20 | \$19,279.27 |
| FTEs | \$1,121,232.31 | \$93,436.03 | \$112,123.23 | \$9,343.60 |
| Total Costs | \$3,203,393.14 | \$266,949.43 | \$168,599.64 | \$28,622.87 |

*Note: This represents 9 contractor Employees and 10 FTEs

- (4) Contract Actions Awarded in FY-10 were varied in complexity, and numbered **975** for the year. Rough average of 51 actions per each person in C&GM per year. Since each action takes on average 3 months, hence, 17 actions on average per person per Qtr were accomplished.
- (5) Contract Actions Awarded so far in FY-11 varied in complexity, and number **85** to date with **75** more pending. This is an average of 5 awarded actions per person per month (15 per Qtr) based on 16 current staff members. 1st Qtr is slowest Qtr and actions per person, per month will increase beginning 2nd Qtr.
- (6) Any number of other customer service or administrative activities not captured in the PAL workload tool can take away from a specialist’s, assistants’, or manager’s time, aside from Contract Actions in PAL.
- (7) Productivity efficiencies will be realized both in C&GM and other divisions we interface with as the use of an automated system will make the need for data entry less repetitive, require less manual coordination and make accurate reporting more readily accomplished.

Overarching Considerations

- *Manual processes around Action Memo, SOW, IGCE, requisitions, obligations, etc. into system can continue until cutover. Accuracy of FPDS-NG data and CFDA data reporting, required by OMB/OFPP Policy, is manually accomplished by CS/COs for all actions.*
- *Manual processes relied upon for accuracy of FAR required updates to clauses & provisions in all contract actions.*
- *Development and deployment of a PALT-like and Active Contract Listing Access database system. Current system will only ingest data kept in current ACL file and does not include cost related data. Once System is deployed, cost data will need to be manually entered.*