

**THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**

**Fiscal Year 2003**

**Michael R. Bloomberg, Mayor**

**Marc V. Shaw, Deputy Mayor for Operations**

**Marla G. Simpson, Director, Mayor's Office of Contracts**



**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

**OFFICE OF CONTRACTS**

253 Broadway – 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 788-0018 Fax (212) 788-0049

MARLA G. SIMPSON  
*Director*

September 18, 2003

Dear Procurement Stakeholder,

Re: Agency Procurement Indicators – Fiscal Year 2003

This report contains the City of New York's Agency Procurement Indicators for Fiscal Year 2003. These indicators cover a cross-section of procurement activities for all Mayoral operating agencies: agency procurement actions by method of award; agency procurement actions by type of item procured; procurement processing cycle times; retroactive contracts; competitiveness in procurements; vendor protests; prompt payment; contract performance evaluations and defaulted contracts; and performance-based contracting.

This year, we are now well underway with Mayor Bloomberg's Procurement Reform Initiative, which is designed to streamline and strengthen the City's contracting process.

We have increased agency-level procurement authority, expanded the availability of flexible purchasing options such as small purchases and intergovernmental purchases, and leveraged technology resources to encourage best practices in procurement.

In addition, we have developed a more detailed set of performance indicators for Fiscal Year 2004, and we are beginning to collect a wider range of data that will begin to be made available in the years to come. Indicator reports such as the one shown here will continue to be an integral part of our efforts to raise the level of the City's procurement performance.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marla G. Simpson

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

This report presents Fiscal Year 2003 data on nine Agency Procurement Indicators for all Mayoral operating agencies, all as described below:

- Agency Procurement Actions By Method of Award
- Agency Procurement Actions By Type of Item Procured
- Procurement Processing Cycle Times
- Retroactive Contracts
- Competitiveness in Procurements
- Vendor Protests
- Prompt Payment
- Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts
- Performance-Based Contracting

## I. OVERVIEW OF CITY PROCUREMENT

### Agency Procurement Actions By Method of Award [See Notes]

This Indicator provides an overview of each agency's procurement volumes, by number and dollar value, during Fiscal Year 2003, categorized by the method of award used. This report is identical to the table included in the web-based version of the Fiscal Year 2003 Mayor's Management Report (MMR), setting forth data for the following methods: competitive sealed bids, competitive sealed proposals, renewal, sole source, emergency, line item appropriation, negotiated acquisition and other. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurements awarded, however, the data presented, as maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), excludes small purchases, intergovernmental awards, amendment extensions, purchase orders and encumbrances imposed for multi-year contracts awarded prior to Fiscal 2003. It should therefore not be relied upon as a statement of the full level of procurement actually funded by the City during Fiscal Year 2003.

### Agency Procurement Actions By Type of Item Procured

This Indicator provides an overview of each agency's procurement volumes, and includes data on the number and total original maximum dollar amount of procurements awarded during the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2003 (except as noted below) for all types of items procured: goods, construction/construction-related services, human services and other. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurements awarded. The data presented, as maintained in FMS, excludes the same categories as listed above, with respect to the Agency Procurement Actions by Method of Award chart, and should therefore not be relied upon as a statement of the full level of goods, construction and services actually funded by the City during Fiscal Year 2003.

## II. PROCUREMENT IMPLEMENTATION

### Procurement Processing Cycle Times

This Indicator includes data on the average number of calendar days required to process contracts awarded from "typical" procurements during Fiscal Year 2003 utilizing the three most common procurement methods – competitive sealed bids (commonly known as bids), competitive sealed proposals (commonly known as RFPs) and negotiated acquisition. The data was provided by FMS and the agencies. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurement processing cycle times. Processing cycle time is measured from the date a solicitation was publicly released (*i.e.*, the date on which an Invitation for Bids or Request for Proposals was issued or a notice of intent to enter into negotiations was published in the City Record, or, where public notice was not required, the date on which vendors were solicited) through the date the agency completed its processing (*i.e.*, the date a contract was submitted to the Comptroller's Office for registration). The processing cycle time for contracts awarded from "atypical" procurements, for example, those substantially delayed due to litigation, vendor protests, criminal investigations, adverse responsibility determinations or similar circumstances, is excluded.

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

The overall results from this Indicator, presented in a separate chart that follows, continue to show processing efficiency improvements citywide. The average cycle time for each method improved from Fiscal Year 2002 to Fiscal Year 2003, continuing the general pattern of the last five fiscal years. The average time for bids has hovered around 3½ months, and remains at 105 days. The average cycle time for RFPs in Fiscal Year 2003 was 204 days, and has been trending down from fiscal year 1998 to Fiscal Year 2000, except for an increase in Fiscal Year 2001. The average cycle time for negotiated acquisitions in Fiscal Year 2003, at 60 days, was more than a month shorter than the time for bids, and has been trending down since fiscal year 1998, when it nearly equaled that for RFPs. Unlike the bid process, in which selections are made strictly based upon price, the RFP process requires vendors to offer programs or technical approaches and agencies to take into account a variety of factors, including price; this leads to longer evaluation times for selection. Similarly, the negotiated acquisition process is a special process designed to be swifter than an RFP; this process typically truncates the solicitation time.

For Fiscal Year 2004, we have developed a more detailed set of indicators of agency performance, designed to pinpoint “bottlenecks” in the process. Since procurement requires interaction across many agency functions, as well as between operating agencies and oversight agencies, the new indicators “disaggregate” the process, so that we can measure and track each component precisely. We anticipate replacing this Procurement Cycle Time Indicator with these improved indicators next year.

## Retroactive Contracts [See Notes]

This Indicator includes data measuring contract retroactivity (*i.e.*, contracts that begin prior to the completion of the procurement process), by number and dollar value of contracts and by average number of retroactive days (*i.e.*, days elapsing between contract start date and contract registration date by the Comptroller’s Office), for all new and renewal contracts except emergency contracts and accelerated procurement contracts awarded during Fiscal Year 2003. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of contract retroactivity. The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart that follows, continue to reflect the need for improvement on this issue across-the-board, but particularly in the human services area.

As part of this administration’s Procurement Reform Initiative to streamline and strengthen the City’s procurement process, we have eliminated procurement approval steps in an effort to speed contract processing and reduce delays. Retroactive contracts, particularly successor contract actions for human client service providers, present serious challenges both for the contractor community and City agencies. While the average number of retroactive days for client services contracts during Fiscal Year 2003 remains at 105, this problem is now the focus of the new set of agency procurement indicators for which Fiscal Year 2004 data is being collected. Closer, more disaggregated tracking is intended to stimulate a heightened level of sensitivity and awareness that, in turn, will improve performance. During the upcoming Fiscal Year (2004), we are also implementing changes in the timing and content of the Human Services Annual Plan mandated by the PPB Rules to focus that tool, as well, on identifying and remedying contract retroactivity issues.

## Competitiveness in Procurements [See Notes]

This Indicator includes data measuring the level of vendor competitiveness – *i.e.*, receipt of three or more responses – for contracts awarded by competitive sealed bids, competitive sealed proposals or negotiated acquisition (excluding extensions of existing contracts for limited periods of time or continuation of multi-phase construction-related services contracts for ongoing complex construction projects) during Fiscal Year 2003. Data are separately reported for construction and/or construction-related services contracts awarded by any method of award (including sole source, renewal, line-item appropriation, etc.) during Fiscal Year 2003. Totals are provided across agencies to present an overall picture of vendor competitiveness. The results from this Indicator, presented in four separate charts that follow, show generally improved levels of vendor competitiveness compared with Fiscal Year 2002.

## Vendor Protests

This new Indicator provides additional information regarding vendors’ formally expressed concerns about the contracting process. The data, presented as provided by the agencies, includes the number of solicitations in which at least one vendor lodged a formal protest and the number of such solicitations in which a protest was sustained. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of vendor protests.

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## III. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

### Prompt Payment

This section, the prompt payment indicators, reflects agency timeliness in processing invoice payments to contractors. This information, which is maintained in FMS as provided by the Financial Information Services Agency (FISA), includes all payments from both general and capital funds during Fiscal 2003. Agency specific data are provided for the percent of all invoice payments, by dollar value and number of invoices, which were paid "on time" (i.e., generally within 30 calendar days of the required date) and the interest paid to contractors. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of prompt payment.

As mandated by the Charter, the Procurement Policy Board (PPB) Rules require all City agencies to include in their contracts a standard clause stating the City's policy to pay invoices in a timely fashion or to pay interest on the amounts not paid on time. Certain categories of payment, however, have not been subject to interest (e.g., certain payments to not-for-profit human service contractors), although this policy is slated to change during Fiscal Year 2004. PPB Rules establish the maximum time for payment to a contractor from the point when the contractor completes performance, the agency declares that performance was satisfactory and the contractor submits an invoice with appropriate supporting documentation, and also specify the length of time for agency determinations concerning acceptable performance and invoice adequacy. After such determinations, the City is permitted 30 calendar days to process payments (60 days for contract changes and for substantial completion payments or final payments for construction contracts). If disputes arise between the agency and the contractor concerning payment documents or performance, the time required to make corrections or resolve disputes is excluded. The PPB works with agencies to increase invoice and payment processing efficiency.

Agencies continue to make good progress in prompt payment, despite the elimination of the prior grace period so that the total "interest-free" payment period is now 30 days. The \$21,640 in interest paid in Fiscal Year 2003 represents a reduction of \$93,863 or 81% from the Fiscal Year 2002 amount.

<b>Trend in Prompt Payment Performance (a)</b>									
	Fiscal 1995	Fiscal 1996	Fiscal 1997	Fiscal 1998	Fiscal 1999	Fiscal 2000	Fiscal 2001	Fiscal 2002	Fiscal 2003
Invoice Dollar Value Paid on Time	84%	85%	91%	92%	95%	90%	98%	98%	<b>98%</b>
Invoice Dollar Value Paid by Grace Period	95%	96%	98%	99%	99%	98%	N/A (b)	N/A (b)	<b>N/A (b)</b>
Number of Invoices Paid on Time	58%	60%	81%	81%	85%	78%	92%	95%	<b>94%</b>
Number of Invoices Paid by Grace Period	91%	88%	95%	94%	96%	91%	N/A (b)	N/A (b)	<b>N/A (b)</b>
Interest Paid to Contractors	\$603,600	\$395,400	\$290,900	\$272,786	\$118,318	\$378,762	\$144,457	\$115,503	<b>\$21,640</b>

(a) Data for Fiscal 1995 and 1996 reflect data for all City agencies; data for Fiscal 1997 through 2003 reflects Mayoral operating agencies only. Data for Fiscal 2003 was provided by FISA on 8/8/01.

(b) NA – Not Applicable since the grace period was eliminated effective July 1, 2000.

### Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts

This Indicator includes data for those contracts for which comprehensive, fully documented Evaluations of Contractor Performance were required to be completed (i.e., submitted and entered into the VENDEX System) for Fiscal Year 2003, reflecting the number and percent of such evaluations that were completed and the number and percent for which the vendor's performance was rated as unsatisfactory. Data totals are also provided across agencies to present an overall picture of contract performance evaluations.

As required by the Charter, Administrative Code and PPB Rules, agencies must monitor and evaluate the performance of all contractors. Pursuant to Mayor's Office of Contracts procedures, for procurements of

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

goods by means of competitive sealed bidding and/or procurements at or below the small purchase limits set forth in the PPB Rules, performance evaluations are required to be completed only where vendor performance is unsatisfactory. Performance evaluations are required for all other procurements.

Agencies monitor and conduct performance evaluations in order to have the requisite information timely available for determining whether an existing contract should be renewed, continued, or terminated or whether a corrective action plan is needed to assure that the contractor fully complies with its contractual responsibilities. This is particularly relevant for the renewal of human service contracts, where evaluations are used to make renewal determinations.

The table includes the number of contracts each agency declared as defaulted during Fiscal Year 2003.

The overall results from this Indicator, presented in the separate chart that follows, remain comparable to last year's levels (78% in Fiscal Year 2003 vs. 79% in Fiscal Year 2002), although improvement is still warranted, particularly in the construction area.

## Performance-Based Contracting

In the Fiscal Year 2002 Agency Procurement Indicator report, we introduced a more nuanced view of performance-based contracting, to include a wider range of contracts. Under performance-based contracting, agencies (a) specify the desired goals in the contract, (b) measure the vendor's achievement of those goals, and (c) specify in the contract what consequences result from performance, to increase the probability that the agency's programmatic goals for the contract will be achieved. The initial effort to move agencies away from input-based contracts toward those focused on outcomes and outputs defined performance-based contracts in a more limited manner, focusing on linkages of payment to performance. Now, with several years of agency and vendor experience with outcome-based contracts, we have an opportunity for agencies, particularly the human services agencies, to evaluate both agency and vendor readiness for various kinds of performance-based contracts, including (but not limited to) those that link outcomes to payment.

It remains the City's policy that all contracts should be performance-based, in that agencies should be able to evaluate in some manner both vendor performance and the effectiveness of their contracted programs. This is the "baseline" for performance-based contracting. Where contracts include such performance-related objectives, so that instead of being input-driven they are outcome-driven, those contracts, even without direct linkages between payment and outcomes, are treated as performance-based for this indicator.

The critical factor in considering a contract as performance-based is its inclusion of appropriate outcome-related measures reflecting the agency's goals for the contract (e.g., completion by a certain date, service to X number of clients, X % occupancy level for a given facility, X% success rate for a specific outcome, deliverables by a certain date, etc.) In baseline performance-based contracts, the extent to which vendors achieve prescribed outcome measures is reflected in its eventual performance evaluation rating. Depending upon the degree to which agencies develop their own program indicators, agencies can move beyond the baseline to include them in RFPs, with the eventual goal that targets become part of the competition among contractors, so that those vendors offering higher levels of performance receive higher ratings. At the furthest end of the continuum, in "beyond-the-baseline" performance-based contracts, the extent to which vendors achieve prescribed outcome measures is also reflected in some manner within the payment structure of the contract. Thus, a performance-based contract is a beyond-the-baseline contract if, rather than simply reimbursing the vendor for its expenditures, it incorporates one or more of the following payment methods:

- Performance-based outcome measures and financial incentives and/or disincentives (e.g., bonuses or penalties).
- Unit payments tied to outcomes (e.g., prescribed fees per unit constructed).
- Milestone payments tied to outcomes (e.g., prescribed payments for levels of accomplishment).
- Liquidated damages tied to discouraged outcomes.

## AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

Beyond-the-baseline types of contracts are further classified as follows: substantially linked to payment (*i.e.*, where at least 75% of the total contract budget is linked to performance, which typically involves contracts where payment follows the achievement of specific milestones) OR partly linked to payment (*i.e.*, where less than 75% of the total contract budget is linked to performance, which typically involves contracts containing bonus, penalty or liquidated damages provisions).

To be effective over the long term, an agency's approach for moving beyond the beyond baseline should be dynamic rather than static, flexible (*i.e.*, recognize that "one size does not fit all"), based upon a phased-in approach and provide for mutual risk sharing. Among the factors relevant in determining the appropriate type or combination of types of performance-based tools to be incorporated into a contract, and the degree to use such tools within a contract, are: the nature of the services being provided; the extent to which the agency's goals (*i.e.*, anticipated outcomes) are measurable; and the degree to which previous contracts providing the subject services have been performance-based (e.g., previous contracts incorporated some degree of a performance-based payment structure vs. previous contracts were wholly based on line-item budget reimbursement). Agencies can also move beyond the baseline by explicitly making past contractor performance a factor for vendor evaluations in future awards.

This indicator includes data reflecting the level of performance-based contracting for all new contracts awarded for services and construction during Fiscal Year 2003. The data presented, which has been provided by the agencies, reflects the total number of contracts awarded, as well as the number and percent of those that were baseline performance-based, substantially beyond-the-baseline performance-based and partly beyond-the-baseline performance-based, respectively, as well as totals for all performance-based contract categories.

The results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, reflect that overall, 89% of new contracts for services and construction were performance-based – 22% baseline performance-based; 44% substantially beyond-the-baseline performance-based; and 23% partly beyond-the-baseline performance-based.

---

### Notes:

- Information is from the City's Financial Management System (FMS) and reflects original maximum dollar amounts and updates by the agencies. It should be noted, however, that the manner in which contracting data are maintained in FMS precludes analysis or meaningful conclusions about contracting trends from use of that database alone. For example, FMS reflects the total dollar amount of a contract in whatever year the contract was registered. Thus, depending upon when particular multi-year contracts expire and need to be re-let, there will be an increase in contracting activity reflected in FMS for the year in which the new multi-year contracts are registered, with no contracting activity reflected during the intervening years even though the goods, services or construction provided for in these contracts continue to be funded and provided.
- For all Indicators other than for "Retroactive Contracts" and "Procurement Processing Cycle Times" contracts are included if the Contract ID number includes the year 2003 and the Start Date is on or after 7/1/02. For "Retroactive Contracts" and "Procurement Processing Cycle Times," contracts are included if the contract was registered between 7/1/02 and 6/30/03, inclusive.
- For all Indicators small purchase procurements are excluded, as are purchase orders from New York State contracts. To exclude such intergovernmental contracts while retaining contracts city agencies enter into directly with other governments, contracts with Award Method 25 for "intergovernmental purchases" are excluded, unless the contractor could be identified as a government entity.
- The following types of actions shown on FMS were excluded from these compilations because they are not procurements: grants; re-registrations for payment purposes only; certain HPD contracts showing the New York City Housing Authority as the contractor and other HPD contracts used to pay Section 8 housing subsidies; and assignments (these are changes in contractors pursuant to the terms of the original contract); force accounts; and payments to landlords pursuant to leases (these are real property transactions).

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

Fiscal 2003

## AGENCY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS BY METHOD OF AWARD

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>HEALTH, EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>		
<b>Department of Health and Mental Hygiene</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>\$838,019,636</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	11	\$2,765,290
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	28	\$9,527,666
Renewal	97	\$739,750,676
Sole Source	3	\$6,989,400
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	50	\$9,115,778
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	58	\$69,870,826
<b>Human Resources Administration</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>\$1,376,963,422</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	23	\$864,770,785
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	7	\$16,871,535
Renewal	49	\$408,619,326
Sole Source	1	\$7,500,000
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	8	\$1,915,500
Negotiated Acquisition	54	\$69,889,794
Other**	7	\$7,396,482
<b>Administration for Children's Services</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>\$2,028,029,498</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	7	\$9,750,057
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	56	\$101,064,947
Renewal	234	\$1,651,724,069
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	1	\$491,372
Line-Item Appropriation*	1	\$1,000,000
Negotiated Acquisition	182	\$255,899,053
Other**	2	\$8,100,000
<b>Department of Homeless Services</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>\$405,215,417</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	9	\$12,962,122
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	14	\$206,327,010
Renewal	37	\$147,480,554
Sole Source	1	\$1,902,057
Emergency	1	\$3,970,722
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	8	\$7,315,872
Other**	13	\$25,257,081
<b>Department of Employment</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>\$54,338,554</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	16	\$11,074,979
Renewal	5	\$2,270,393
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	1	\$180,000
Negotiated Acquisition	49	\$40,813,182
Other**	0	\$0



# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal 2003

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>Department for the Aging</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>\$182,357,162</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	94	\$73,780,105
Renewal	147	\$97,813,677
Sole Source	1	\$234,690
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	102	\$10,351,516
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	2	\$177,174
<b>Department of Youth &amp; Community Development</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>\$110,240,329</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	309	\$43,244,291
Renewal	105	\$44,172,721
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	203	\$20,463,988
Negotiated Acquisition	150	\$2,359,329
Other**	0	\$0
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE, ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES</b>		
<b>Department of Environmental Protection</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>\$778,989,017</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	75	\$571,322,963
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	11	\$75,994,464
Renewal	18	\$7,540,575
Sole Source	5	\$26,862,629
Emergency	3	\$6,995,611
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	6	\$68,729,455
Other**	13	\$21,543,319
<b>Department of Transportation</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>\$457,128,665</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	84	\$329,674,297
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	29	\$86,321,026
Renewal	64	\$30,149,934
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	3	\$3,983,408
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	1	\$7,000,000
<b>Department of Buildings</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$10,168,550</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$303,050
Renewal	4	\$4,865,500
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	1	\$5,000,000
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal 2003

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>Department of Housing Preservation &amp; Development</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>\$35,037,500</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	28	\$12,429,020
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	2	\$1,063,328
Renewal	45	\$9,828,535
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	10	\$1,710,363
Line-Item Appropriation*	15	\$3,061,810
Negotiated Acquisition	5	\$5,474,783
Other**	1	\$1,469,661
<b>Department of Design &amp; Construction</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>\$886,778,843</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	160	\$408,131,113
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	29	\$351,926,535
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	23	\$126,721,195
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Department of Citywide Administrative Services</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>\$535,593,141</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	509	\$454,246,450
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	2	\$3,000,000
Renewal	12	\$29,052,815
Sole Source	4	\$425,324
Emergency	17	\$9,313,723
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	1	\$430,000
Other**	170	\$39,124,829
<b>Department of Information Technology &amp; Telecommunications</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>\$37,045,004</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	1	\$2,145,364
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	4	\$18,823,756
Renewal	3	\$7,998,000
Sole Source	1	\$1,039,884
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	3	\$6,438,000
Other**	1	\$600,000
<b>Department of Records and Information Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal 2003

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>Department of Sanitation</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>\$403,352,377</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	49	\$178,917,996
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	5	\$54,962,952
Renewal	5	\$120,132,123
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	32	\$2,350,000
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	3	\$44,645,811
Other**	2	\$2,343,495
<b>Department of Parks &amp; Recreation</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>\$109,780,634</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	135	\$94,989,985
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	25	\$10,946,711
Sole Source	2	\$2,128,511
Emergency	1	\$800,000
Line-Item Appropriation*	6	\$915,428
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Department of City Planning</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$3,530,415</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	1	\$155,415
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	1	\$3,375,000
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Landmarks Preservation Commission</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>City Civil Service Commission</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal 2003

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY &amp; LEGAL AFFAIRS</b>		
<b>Police Department</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$30,592,641</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	13	\$4,705,893
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	4	\$23,290,480
Renewal	3	\$2,596,268
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Fire Department</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>\$61,297,703</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	15	\$33,172,079
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$26,992,134
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	1	\$378,790
Line-Item Appropriation*	1	\$114,000
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	1	\$640,700
<b>Department of Correction</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>\$16,395,472</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	16	\$7,788,474
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$2,111,717
Renewal	2	\$2,878,792
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	4	\$3,545,489
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	1	\$71,000
<b>Department of Probation</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$9,183,223</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	9	\$1,707,067
Other**	1	\$7,476,156
<b>Department of Juvenile Justice</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>\$20,862,902</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	3	\$16,338,483
Renewal	8	\$4,524,419
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal 2003

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>Civilian Complaint Review Board</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Law Department</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>\$2,002,644</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	1	\$550,000
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	40	\$1,452,644
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Department of Investigation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>City Commission on Human Rights</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>BUSINESS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS</b>		
<b>Department of Finance</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>\$177,770,198</b>
<b>Competitive Sealed Bid</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$20,340,755</b>
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$156,439,192
Renewal	3	\$690,251
Sole Source	1	\$300,000
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal 2003

Agency and Award Method	Number of Contract Actions	Value of Contract Actions (Revised Maximum Amount)
<b>Department of Consumer Affairs</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Department of Small Business Services</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$559,933,200</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	1	\$9,865,000
Sole Source	5	\$550,068,200
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>Department of Cultural Affairs</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	0	\$0
Renewal	0	\$0
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>ADDITIONAL AGENCIES</b>		
<b>Taxi &amp; Limousine Commission</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$535,464</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	0	\$0
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	1	\$222,000
Renewal	1	\$313,464
Sole Source	0	\$0
Emergency	0	\$0
Line-Item Appropriation*	0	\$0
Negotiated Acquisition	0	\$0
Other**	0	\$0
<b>TOTAL, ALL AGENCIES</b>	<b>3924</b>	<b>\$9,131,141,610</b>
Competitive Sealed Bid	1144	\$3,008,112,641
Other Than Competitive Sealed Bid:		
Request for Proposal	618	\$1,279,679,650
Renewal	869	\$3,333,763,803
Sole Source	48	\$724,327,305
Emergency	70	\$34,993,989
Line-Item Appropriation*	391	\$50,663,509
Negotiated Acquisition	511	\$508,529,989
Other**	273	\$191,070,724Notes:

\* Allocation made during the budget process by Borough Presidents and Council Members for a contractor-specific line-item budget appropriation.

\*\* Contract actions in this category may include the following methods of award: required/authorized source; required method, including awards to a preferred source; demonstration projects; and certain government-to-government procurements.

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**  
**Fiscal Year 2003**

**PROCUREMENT ACTIONS BY TYPE OF ITEM PROCURED**  
**Number and Dollar Value of Awards**

Agency	Contracts For:				Total
	Goods	Construction and/or Construction-Related Services	Human Services	Other	
Administration for Children's Services					
# of Contracts	0	0	469	14	483
Value	\$0	\$0	\$2,052,411,023	\$23,874,543	\$2,076,285,566
City Civil Service Commission					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City Commission on Human Rights					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Complaint Review Board					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department for the Aging					
# of Contracts	1	0	334	11	346
Value	\$295,000	\$0	\$168,570,335	\$2,331,840	\$171,197,175
Department of Buildings					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	6	6
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,238,050	\$9,238,050
Department of City Planning					
# of Contracts	0	1	0	1	2
Value	\$0	\$3,375,000	\$0	\$155,415	\$3,530,415
Department of Citywide Administrative Services					
# of Contracts	644	42	0	29	715
Value	\$434,112,596	\$87,005,987	\$0	\$31,210,674	\$552,329,257
Department of Consumer Affairs					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Correction					
# of Contracts	0	11	6	7	24
Value	\$0	\$4,710,980	\$5,252,713	\$5,945,478	\$15,909,171
Department of Cultural Affairs					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Design & Construction					
# of Contracts	0	212	0	0	212
Value	\$0	\$885,219,421	\$0	\$0	\$885,219,421
Department of Employment					
# of Contracts	0	0	71	0	71
Value	\$0	\$0	\$41,138,943	\$0	\$41,138,943
Department of Environmental Protection					
# of Contracts	0	53	0	78	131
Value	\$0	\$559,088,025	\$0	\$219,142,487	\$778,230,512
Department of Finance					
# of Contracts	0	0	0	14	14
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$177,378,998	\$177,378,998
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene					
# of Contracts	0	1	217	29	247
Value	\$0	\$803,125	\$820,805,173	\$7,478,198	\$829,086,496
Department of Homeless Services					
# of Contracts	0	3	70	10	83
Value	\$0	\$4,616,990	\$384,286,972	\$11,443,427	\$400,347,389

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

Fiscal Year 2003

## PROCUREMENT ACTIONS BY TYPE OF ITEM PROCURED

Number and Dollar Value of Awards

Agency	Contracts For:				Total	
	Goods	Construction and/or Construction-Related Services	Human Services	Other		
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	33 \$13,898,640	1 \$2,080,500	72 \$18,298,435	106 \$34,277,574
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	13 \$34,905,004	13 \$34,905,004
Department of Investigation	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0
Department of Juvenile Justice	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	11 \$20,862,902	0 \$0	11 \$20,862,902
Department of Parks & Recreation	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	142 \$95,275,732	0 \$0	27 \$12,435,595	169 \$107,711,327
Department of Probation	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	10 \$9,183,223	0 \$0	10 \$9,183,223
Department of Records and Information Services	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0
Department of Sanitation	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	23 \$136,152,493	0 \$0	73 \$262,654,528	96 \$398,807,021
Department of Small Business Services	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	6 \$559,922,700	6 \$559,922,700
Department of Transportation	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	13 \$235,608,045	0 \$0	168 \$220,879,729	181 \$456,487,774
Department of Youth & Community Development	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	767 \$110,306,905	0 \$0	767 \$110,306,905
Fire Department	# of Contracts Value	1 \$114,000	3 \$915,531	0 \$0	15 \$60,268,172	19 \$61,297,703
Human Resources Administration	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	1 \$7,774,647	118 \$502,669,876	30 \$866,442,489	149 \$1,376,887,012
Landmark Preservation Commission	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0
Law Department	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	41 \$2,002,644	41 \$2,002,644
Police Department	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	9 \$2,949,827	0 \$0	11 \$27,468,242	20 \$30,418,069
Taxi & Limousine Commission	# of Contracts Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	2 \$535,464	2 \$535,464
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b># of Contracts Value</b>	<b>646 \$434,521,596</b>	<b>547 \$2,037,394,442</b>	<b>2074 \$4,117,568,565</b>	<b>657 \$2,554,012,112</b>	<b>3924 \$9,143,496,714</b>



**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**  
**Fiscal Year 2003**

**PROCUREMENT PROCESSING CYCLE TIMES**

Agency	Contracts Awarded via Competitive Sealed Bids		Contracts Awarded via Competitive Sealed Proposals		Contracts Awarded via Negotiated Acquisition	
	# of Contracts	Average Days	# of Contracts	Average Days	# of Contracts	Average Days
Administration for Children's Services	4	110	8	428	182	55
City Civil Service Commission	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
City Commission on Human Rights	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department for the Aging	0	N/A	94	125	0	N/A
Department of Buildings	0	N/A	1	175	0	N/A
Department of City Planning	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	340	70	1	319	1	22
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Correction	13	174	1	249	0	N/A
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Design & Construction	110	114	21	200	0	N/A
Department of Employment	0	N/A	16	200	44	82
Department of Environmental Protection	55	113	4	287	2	190
Department of Finance	5	112	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	5	157	16	259	1	47
Department of Homeless Services	15	164	12	275	6	67
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	21	148	1	248	4	186
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications.	1	139	3	247	3	170
Department of Investigation	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	N/A	2	332	0	N/A
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Parks & Recreation	115	107	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Probation	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Records and Information Services	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Sanitation	51	217	1	246	3	175
Department of Small Business Services	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Transportation	74	106	13	322	0	N/A
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	N/A	15	292	150	26
Fire Department	15	147	0	N/A	0	N/A
Human Resources Administration	10	234	5	244	82	141
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Law Department	0	N/A	0	N/A	78	104
Police Department	8	172	3	290	0	N/A
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>72</b>

## AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS Fiscal Year 2003

### RETROACTIVE CONTRACTS\* Contracts with a Start Date before their Registration Date

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Retroactive Contracts				
			Quantity	Pct. Of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value	Average Days Retroactive
Administration for Children's Services	488	\$2,079,734,243	251	51.4%	\$1,084,972,494	52.2%	60
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	352	\$171,491,525	207	58.8%	\$91,712,827	53.5%	92
Department of Buildings	5	\$4,238,050	2	40.0%	\$2,245,000	53.0%	46
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	558	\$583,416,818	6	1.1%	\$17,874,846	3.1%	162
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	26	\$16,505,863	15	57.7%	\$12,698,343	76.9%	163
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	208	\$843,192,667	2	1.0%	\$3,036,000	0.4%	188
Department of Employment	66	\$44,245,712	65	98.5%	\$44,156,062	99.8%	99
Department of Environmental Protection	136	\$868,272,788	43	31.6%	\$124,951,268	14.4%	72
Department of Finance	17	\$185,285,969	14	82.4%	\$27,258,062	14.7%	121
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	255	\$857,254,489	253	99.2%	\$856,820,708	99.9%	115
Department of Homeless Services	93	\$421,474,737	50	53.8%	\$258,922,239	61.4%	77
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	89	\$57,331,894	68	76.4%	\$49,355,240	86.1%	108
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications.	15	\$45,405,004	9	60.0%	\$24,377,884	53.7%	107
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	14	\$24,822,902	13	92.9%	\$21,984,402	88.6%	51
Department of Parks & Recreation	160	\$202,515,999	29	18.1%	\$122,398,240	60.4%	65
Department of Probation	7	\$11,037,095	7	100.0%	\$11,037,095	100.0%	442
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	75	\$364,876,213	12	16.0%	\$50,180,796	13.8%	92
Department of Small Business Services	6	\$559,922,700	6	100.0%	\$559,922,700	100.0%	218
Department of Transportation	194	\$543,912,611	22	11.3%	\$43,340,018	8.0%	34
Department of Youth & Community Development	781	\$116,369,837	668	85.5%	\$81,467,385	70.0%	106
Fire Department	19	\$63,529,453	5	26.3%	\$9,122,520	14.4%	112
Human Resources Administration	188	\$1,437,291,142	167	88.8%	\$1,363,744,178	94.9%	166
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	106	\$69,379,635	106	100.0%	\$69,379,635	100.0%	255
Police Department	19	\$29,484,431	2	10.5%	\$1,662,631	5.6%	321
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3877</b>	<b>\$9,600,991,776</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>\$4,932,620,573</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>112</b>

\* Includes all new and renewal contracts except emergency contracts and accelerated procurement contracts. Excludes 1 NYPD, 5 HPD, 8 DEP, 1 DOS, 1 DOT and 1 DCAS contracts which were procured jointly by the agency and the Law Department.

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**  
**Fiscal Year 2003**

**COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS:**  
**CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED BID**

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	7	\$9,750,057	4	57%	\$517,851	5%
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	509	\$471,010,553	487	96%	\$460,616,384	98%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	16	\$7,777,666	10	63%	\$4,480,286	58%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	160	\$406,571,691	156	98%	\$399,229,892	98%
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Environmental Protection	75	\$571,242,069	58	77%	\$535,655,811	94%
Department of Finance	9	\$20,300,755	6	67%	\$15,794,834	78%
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	11	\$2,765,290	3	27%	\$1,459,650	53%
Department of Homeless Services	9	\$12,955,222	8	89%	\$5,400,046	42%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	28	\$12,429,020	25	89%	\$11,340,448	91%
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	1	\$2,145,364	1	100%	\$2,145,364	100%
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Parks & Recreation	135	\$94,155,677	127	94%	\$88,722,304	94%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	49	\$178,785,800	39	80%	\$162,108,339	91%
Department of Small Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	84	\$329,062,556	75	89%	\$128,174,702	39%
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fire Department	15	\$33,172,079	13	87%	\$32,323,624	97%
Human Resources Administration	23	\$864,770,785	23	100%	\$864,770,785	100%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Police Department	13	\$4,531,320	8	62%	\$2,808,427	62%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1144</b>	<b>\$3,021,425,904</b>	<b>1043</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>\$2,715,548,748</b>	<b>90%</b>

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**  
**Fiscal Year 2003**

**COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS:**  
**CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL**

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	56	\$101,064,947	53	95%	\$97,908,329	97%
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	94	\$70,621,012	88	94%	\$66,660,856	94%
Department of Buildings	1	\$303,050	1	100%	\$303,050	100%
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	2	\$3,000,000	2	100%	\$3,000,000	100%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	1	\$2,111,717	1	100%	\$2,111,717	100%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	29	\$351,926,535	29	100%	\$351,926,535	100%
Department of Employment	16	\$11,074,980	16	100%	\$11,074,980	100%
Department of Environmental Protection	11	\$75,994,464	9	82%	\$31,075,404	41%
Department of Finance	1	\$156,439,192	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	28	\$9,532,492	24	86%	\$8,037,859	84%
Department of Homeless Services*	10	\$101,850,557	6	60%	\$15,486,880	15%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	2	\$321,902	2	100%	\$321,902	100%
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	4	\$18,823,756	1	25%	\$13,000,000	69%
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	3	\$16,338,483	3	100%	\$16,338,483	100%
Department of Parks & Recreation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	5	\$54,952,952	2	40%	\$904,311	2%
Department of Small Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	29	\$86,291,876	27	93%	\$84,931,769	98%
Department of Youth & Community Development	309	\$32,592,931	309	100%	\$32,592,931	100%
Fire Department	1	\$26,992,134	1	100%	\$26,992,134	100%
Human Resources Administration	7	\$16,871,535	7	100%	\$16,871,535	100%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Police Department	4	\$23,290,480	4	100%	\$23,290,480	100%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	1	\$222,000	1	100%	\$222,000	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>\$1,160,616,995</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>\$803,051,155</b>	<b>69%</b>

\* Excludes 4 awards under DHS's Open-Ended RFP pursuant to which proposers do not compete against each other but rather must meet prescribed agency standards

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS  
Fiscal Year 2003**

**COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS\*:  
CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATED ACQUISITION**

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	1	\$3,375,000	1	100%	\$3,375,000	100%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	1	\$430,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Environmental Protection	3	\$125,700	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Homeless Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	2	\$125,220	2	100%	\$125,220	100%
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Parks & Recreation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	1	\$35,773,100	1	100%	\$35,773,100	100%
Department of Small Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fire Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Human Resources Administration	28	\$26,663,722	24	86%	\$6,636,689	25%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	1	\$28,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Police Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>\$66,520,742</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>\$45,910,009</b>	<b>69%</b>

\* Excludes 474 contracts with a value of \$428,555,483 for which negotiated acquisition was used either to extend an existing contract for a limited period of time, to continue a multi-phase construction-related contract for an on-going complex construction project, or to procure legal or consulting services in support of current or anticipated litigation. In each of these circumstances, the PPB Rules authorize negotiations on a non-competitive basis.

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**  
**Fiscal Year 2003**

**COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS:**  
**CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND/OR CONSTRUCTION-RELATED SERVICES**  
**AWARDED BY ANY METHOD OF AWARD**

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Quantity	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Civil Service Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department for the Aging	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	1	\$3,375,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	42	\$87,005,987	40	95%	\$82,505,987	95%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	11	\$4,710,980	6	55%	\$2,175,968	46%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	212	\$885,219,421	185	87%	\$751,156,427	85%
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Environmental Protection	53	\$559,088,025	37	70%	\$505,480,175	90%
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	1	\$803,125	1	100%	\$803,125	100%
Department of Homeless Services	3	\$4,616,990	3	100%	\$4,616,990	100%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	33	\$13,898,640	23	70%	\$8,073,558	58%
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications.	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Parks & Recreation	142	\$95,275,732	123	87%	\$82,989,830	87%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	23	\$136,152,493	21	91%	\$134,917,248	99%
Department of Small Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	13	\$235,608,045	11	85%	\$48,853,897	21%
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fire Department	3	\$915,531	2	67%	\$484,822	53%
Human Resources Administration	1	\$7,774,647	1	100%	\$7,774,647	100%
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Police Department	9	\$2,949,827	7	78%	\$2,566,327	87%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>\$2,037,394,442</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>\$1,632,399,000</b>	<b>80%</b>

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS  
Fiscal Year 2003**

**VENDOR PROTESTS**

Agency	Procurements in which there was a Formal Vendor Protest	
	Total	Number in which the Protest was Sustained
Administration for Children's Services	0	0
Department for the Aging	0	0
Department of Buildings	0	0
Department of City Planning	0	0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	13	2
Department of Correction	0	0
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	0
Department of Design & Construction	0	0
Department of Employment	0	0
Department of Environmental Protection	4	0
Department of Finance	0	0
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	1	0
Department of Homeless Services	1	0
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	0	0
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications.	0	0
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	0
Department of Parks & Recreation	0	0
Department of Probation	0	0
Department of Sanitation	0	0
Department of Small Business Services	0	0
Department of Transportation	0	0
Department of Youth & Community Development	1	0
Fire Department	0	0
Human Resources Administration	0	0
Law Department	0	0
Police Department	1	1
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS**  
**Fiscal Year 2003**

**PROMPT PAYMENT**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Invoice Dollar Value Paid On Time</b>	<b>Number of Invoices Paid On Time</b>	<b>Interest Paid to Contractors</b>
Administration for Children Services	99%	98%	\$195
Commission on Human Rights	100%	100%	\$0
Department for the Aging	100%	99%	\$0
Department of Buildings	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Business Services	100%	100%	\$0
Department of City Planning	99%	99%	\$0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	95%	96%	\$0
Department of Consumer Affairs	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Correction	98%	99%	\$89
Department of Cultural Affairs	98%	96%	\$114
Department of Design and Construction	99%	97%	\$626
Department of Employment	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Environmental Protection	96%	97%	\$0
Department of Finance	100%	99%	\$0
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (including Office of the Chief Medical Examiner)	99%	98%	\$0
Department of Homeless Services	98%	97%	\$515
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	97%	97%	\$1,163
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	97%	97%	\$272
Department of Investigation	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Juvenile Justice	97%	94%	\$149
Department of Parks and Recreation	97%	92%	\$2,233
Department of Probation	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Records and Information Services	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Sanitation	99%	99%	\$0
Department of Transportation	96%	95%	\$492
Department of Youth and Community Development	98%	97%	\$0
Fire Department	100%	99%	\$602
Human Resources Administration	100%	98%	\$933
Landmarks Preservation Commission	99%	100%	\$0
Law Department	97%	98%	\$0
Office of Emergency Management	95%	92%	\$374
Police Department	92%	94%	\$13,883
Taxi and Limousine Commission	100%	100%	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>\$21,640</b>



## AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS Fiscal Year 2003

### CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS\* & DEFAULTED CONTRACTS

Agency	Contract Performance Evaluations Required to Be Completed for Fiscal 2003							Number of Contracts Defaulted
	Total Required	Total Completed		Total Completed with an Overall Rating of Less than Satisfactory		Total Rated as Satisfactory or Better which included Sub-rating(s) of Less than Satisfactory		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	
Administration for Children's Services	756	407	54%	5	1%	9	2%	0
City Civil Service Commission	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
City Commission on Human Rights	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
Department for the Aging	553	536	97%	3	1%	251	47%	0
Department of Buildings	11	11	100%	0	0%	2	18%	0
Department of Business Services	5	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Department of City Planning	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	151	141	93%	4	3%	42	30%	0
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
Department of Correction	30	7	23%	1	14%	0	0%	0
Department of Cultural Affairs	2	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Department of Design & Construction	390	335	86%	4	1%	76	23%	1
Department of Employment	125	37	30%	10	27%	0	0%	0
Department of Environmental Protection	410	285	70%	7	2%	55	19%	1
Department of Finance	25	25	100%	0	0%	2	8%	0
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	564	498	88%	2	0%	19	4%	0
Department of Homeless Services	238	228	96%	4	2%	38	17%	0
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	170	158	93%	4	3%	22	14%	0
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications.	49	48	98%	0	0%	1	2%	0
Department of Investigation	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
Department of Juvenile Justice	19	18	95%	1	6%	4	22%	0
Department of Parks & Recreation	168	133	79%	7	5%	13	10%	9
Department of Probation	17	17	100%	0	0%	3	18%	0
Department of Records and Information Services	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
Department of Sanitation	116	82	71%	3	4%	16	20%	1
Department of Transportation	287	287	100%	7	2%	31	11%	2
Department of Youth & Community Development	962	658	68%	0	0%	115	17%	0
Fire Department	79	77	97%	4	5%	6	8%	0
Human Resources Administration	508	394	78%	1	0%	32	8%	0
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0
Law Department	28	23	82%	0	0%	2	9%	0
Police Department	68	68	100%	3	4%	10	15%	0
Taxi & Limousine Commission	3	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5734</b>	<b>4481</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>14</b>

\* Includes contracts for which comprehensive, fully documented evaluations of contractor performance were required to be completed.

# AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

## Fiscal Year 2003

### PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING

Agency	New Service and Construction Contracts Awarded in FY 2003								
	Total Number Awarded	Number and Percent Performance-Based							
		Baseline		Beyond-the-Baseline				Total	
		#	%	Substantially (=/>75%)		Partly (<75%)		#	%
#	%			#	%				
Administration for Children's Services	248	236	95%	0	0%	2	1%	238	96%
City Commission on Human Rights	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Civil Service Commission	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department for the Aging	24	11	46%	13	54%	0	0%	24	100%
Department of Buildings	2	0	0	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Department of City Planning	1	0	0	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services *	59	8	14%	0	0%	51	86%	59	100%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Corrections	18	0	0	5	28%	13	72%	18	100%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Design and Construction	210	0	0	210	100%	0	0%	210	100%
Department of Employment	52	0	0	51	98%	1	2%	52	100%
Department of Environmental Protection	87	0	0	10	11%	60	69%	70	80%
Department of Finance	13	3	23%	0	0%	3	23%	6	46%
Department of Health and Mental Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	280	95	34%	114	41%	1	0%	210	75%
Department of Homeless Services	87	7	8%	48	55%	32	37%	87	100%
Department of Housing Preservation and Development	74	24	32%	14	19%	36	49%	74	100%
Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications	12	2	17%	6	50%	4	33%	12	100%
Department of Investigation	2	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Department of Juvenile Justice	3	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%
Department of Parks and Recreation	140	0	0%	140	100%	0	0%	140	100%
Department of Probation	7	4	57%	0	0%	2	29%	6	86%
Department of Records and Information Services	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Sanitation	113	18	16%	95	84%	0	0%	113	100%
Department of Small Business Services	6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Department of Transportation	133	0	0%	133	100%	0	0%	133	100%
Department of Youth and Community Development	267	0	0%	0	0%	267	100%	267	100%
Fire Department	32	0	0%	0	0%	32	100%	32	100%
Human Resources Administration	255	108	42%	147	58%	0	0%	255	100%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Law Department	149	0	0%	9	6%	0	0%	9	6%
Police Department	23	0	0%	7	30%	14	61%	21	91%
Taxi and Limousine Commission	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>2298</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>1008</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>2045</b>	<b>89%</b>

\* Excludes contracts awarded by the Department of Citywide Administrative Services/Division of Municipal Supply Services