

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS

FISCAL 2002

Michael R. Bloomberg, Mayor

Marc V. Shaw, Deputy Mayor for Operations

Jeffrey Weinstein, Acting Director, Mayor's Office of Contracts



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
OFFICE OF CONTRACTS

253 Broadway, 9th Floor
New York, New York 10007
Phone: (212) 788-0010

JEFFREY WEINSTEIN
Acting Director

September 24, 2002

Dear Procurement Stakeholder,

Re: Agency Procurement Indicators – Fiscal 2002

This report contains the City of New York's Agency Procurement Indicators for Fiscal 2002. These indicators, previously reported in the Mayor's Management Report (MMR), cover a cross-section of procurement activities for all Mayoral operating agencies: Competitiveness in Procurements; Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts; Performance-Based Contracting; Procurement Processing Cycle Times; Procurements Awarded; Prompt Payment; and Retroactive Contracts. An additional indicator, Agency Procurement Actions, is being separately reported on in the web based version of the Fiscal 2002 MMR.

The Bloomberg Administration has commenced a Procurement Reform Initiative to streamline and strengthen the City's procurement process. As the Procurement Reform Initiative rolls out, its impact will be measured by and reflected in the indicators being reported here and still others being developed. These indicator reports are and will continue to be an integral part of a systemic approach to continuously raise the level of the City's procurement performance.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Jeffrey Weinstein

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

INTRODUCTION

There are seven Agency Procurement Indicators reported on below for Fiscal 2002:

- Competitiveness in Procurements
- Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts
- Performance-Based Contracting
- Procurement Processing Cycle Times
- Procurements Awarded
- Prompt Payment
- Retroactive Contracts

Each of these Indicators is more fully described below and in the appended charts. Data for the seven Indicators include all Mayoral operating agencies. An eighth Indicator, Agency Procurement Actions, was separately reported on in the web based version of the Fiscal 2002 Mayor's Management Report.

Competitiveness in Procurements (See Notes)

This Indicator includes data measuring the level of vendor competitiveness achieved by all Mayoral operating agencies for all contracts awarded by competitive sealed bid, competitive sealed proposal or negotiated acquisition*, and for construction and/or construction-related services contracts awarded by any method of award (e.g., competitive sealed bid, competitive sealed proposal, negotiated acquisition, sole source, renewal, line-item appropriation, etc.) during Fiscal 2002. The data, which are maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), includes for each of these groupings: Total Number of Contracts Awarded; Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded; Number and Percent of Total Contracts Awarded for which there were 3 or more Responses; and Dollar Value and Percent of Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded for which there were 3 or more Responses. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of vendor competitiveness. (* Excludes contracts for which negotiated acquisition was used to either extend an existing contract for a limited period of time, or to continue a multi-phase construction-related services contract for an ongoing complex construction project. Under these circumstances, the Procurement Policy Board Rules contemplate conducting negotiations with only the incumbent contractor.)

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the four separate charts which follow, show robust levels of vendor competitiveness, albeit somewhat lower than in Fiscal 2001.

Contract Performance Evaluations and Defaulted Contracts

This Indicator includes the following data for all Mayoral operating agencies 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 2002 (i.e., the contract expiration, completion or termination date, as applicable, or the last day of the twelve-month contract period, occurred between March 3, 2001 and March 2, 2002): Total Number of Contract Performance Evaluations which were Required to be Completed for Fiscal 2002; Number and Percent of Total Required Contract Performance Evaluations which were Completed; and Number and Percent of Total Contract Performance Evaluations Completed which were Rated as Unsatisfactory. In addition, data, which was provided by the agencies, is presented on the number of contracts which were defaulted. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of contract performance evaluations and defaulted contracts. (Evaluations submitted outside of the 120-day period, described below, are also entered into the VENDEX System and included in the data reported below.)

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

As required by the City Charter, the Administrative Code and the Procurement Policy Board (PPB) Rules, agencies are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the performance of all contractors. Pursuant to established Mayor's Office of Contracts procedures: Contract performance evaluations are required to be completed for the categories listed below only where vendor performance is unsatisfactory, in which case a Report of Unsatisfactory Vendor Performance (i.e., "Form 5") is to be filed for entry into the VENDEX System.

- Procurements of goods by means of competitive sealed bidding.
- Procurements at or below the small purchase limits set forth in the PPB Rules.

Contract performance evaluations are required to be completed for all other procurements as follows:

- A comprehensive, fully documented Evaluation of Contractor Performance (i.e., "Form 1, 2, 2S, 3 or 4", as applicable) is to be filed for entry into the VENDEX System within 120 days, prior in certain cases, or subsequent to the contract's expiration, completion or termination date.
- In addition, for each such contract with an original or amended term of greater than 12 months, a comprehensive, fully documented Evaluation of Contractor Performance also is to be filed for entry into the VENDEX System within 120 days, prior in certain cases, or subsequent to the last day of each twelve-month period following the contract's effective date. (Where the interim and final performance evaluations are due within the same 120-day period, only one evaluation need be prepared.)
- 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 services contracts, where evaluations may be conducted prior to the expiration/ anniversary date so that the results can be used to make the renewal determination.

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, remain positive and reflect improvement over last year's levels. The percentage of contracts for which performance evaluations were required and submitted increased from 76% in Fiscal 2001 to 79% in Fiscal 2002.

Performance-Based Contracting

Agencies that perform some or all of their public purposes by contracting with other entities must manage and evaluate those contracts as they manage themselves, by outcome-based indicators. Agencies must hold their contractors accountable as they, the agencies, are held accountable by the public. Performance-based contracting, initiated in the Fiscal 2000 MMR, thus remains a critical policy objective for all City agencies.

Performance-based contracting consists of including outcome-based performance targets in contracts and comparing the resulting outcomes against the targets. The several purposes for comparison represent steps on a continuum, beginning with program evaluation and ending with linking payment to performance.

The **baseline** requirement for performance-based contracting is that a contract include measures to enable agencies to evaluate both contractor performance and the effectiveness of agency programs that are contracted out. Agencies must develop performance-based indicators so that they are directly related

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

to the agencies' own performance-based program indicators. Depending upon the degree to which agencies have developed their own program indicators, agencies can move **beyond the baseline** requirement to link payment to performance. In linking payment to contractor performance, agencies can draw upon a combination of tools that range from providing rewards for meeting or exceeding targeted performance to reducing the price paid for failing to meet targeted performance.

Descriptions of some performance-based payment structures (beyond the baseline) include:

- **Performance-based outcome measures and related financial incentives and/or disincentives**
 - A contractor would complete a construction project by a prescribed date but would receive a stated bonus (e.g., 10%) for completing it substantially ahead of schedule.
 - A contractor is contractually obligated to maintain a stated performance level (e.g., 95% occupancy level in an SRO). The agency would deduct a percentage (e.g., 2%) from the total payment earned by the contractor in any month that the stated performance level was not maintained.
- **Unit payments tied to outcomes.**
 - A contractor would receive a prescribed fee per stated unit of outcome (e.g., foot of road reconstructed).
 - A contractor is contractually obligated to provide a stated program objective (e.g., job-readiness training to all clients referred to it by the agency). The contractor would receive a negotiated fee for each participant that met a specified standard measuring the program objective (e.g., scored 75% or better on a final exam).
- **Milestone payments tied to outcomes**
 - A contractor is contractually obligated to provide services to effect a stated program objective that takes place over time. The contractor would receive a negotiated payment reflecting progress in meeting the objective over time (e.g., first payment when a client is initially placed in employment, and an additional payment when the client had been retained in the initial employment placement for 90 days).
- **Liquidated damages tied to outcomes.**
 - A contractor would be assessed a fixed amount (e.g., \$100 per day) for each day that a contracted deliverable (e.g., a prescribed monthly evaluation report; an audit report) is not submitted by the prescribed due date.

This Indicator includes data measuring the level of performance-based contracting (beyond the baseline) for all Mayoral operating agencies for new contracts awarded for services and construction during Fiscal 2002. [For the purposes of this Indicator, a contract is considered to be performance-based (beyond the baseline) if it incorporates one or more of the payment structures described above in whole or in large part.] The data presented, which has been provided by the agencies, includes: Total Number of Contracts Awarded; Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded; Number and Percent of Total Contracts Awarded which were Performance-Based; and Dollar Value and Percent of Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded which were Performance-Based.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

The results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, reflect continued positive progress. While there was some year-to-year variability for this emerging area, 75% by number and 68% by dollar value of Fiscal 2002's new contracts for services and construction were performance-based (beyond the baseline).

Procurement Processing Cycle Times

This Indicator includes data on the average number of calendar days that was required to process contracts awarded from "typical" procurements during the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2002 for all Mayoral operating agencies utilizing key methods of award (i.e., competitive sealed bid, competitive sealed proposal and negotiated acquisition). The data presented was provided by the agencies. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurement processing cycle times.

In order to meaningfully measure the efficiency of the procurement process itself, processing cycle time is measured from the date that a solicitation was publicly released (i.e., the date on which the Invitation for Bid or Request for Proposals was issued; or, as applicable, the date on which 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 procurement was completed by the agency (i.e., the date on which a contract was submitted to the Comptroller's Office for registration). The processing cycle time for contracts awarded from "atypical" procurements, for example, those that were substantially delayed due to litigation, court injunctions, vendor protests, vendor criminal investigations, adverse responsibility determinations or similarly aberrational circumstances, are excluded so that the average time calculations are representative of typical procurements.

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, continue to be positive citywide regarding processing efficiencies, particularly for the competitive sealed proposal and negotiated acquisition methods of award which, on average, were completed in about 50 days less than in Fiscal 2001. There was, however, an approximately 23 day increase in the average citywide processing cycle time for the competitive sealed bid method of award. This increase is principally due to the fact that the Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS), the agency that traditionally processes the highest volume of competitive sealed bid awards in the shortest amount of time, processed about one-third fewer competitive sealed bid awards in Fiscal 2002 than in Fiscal 2001, while its average cycle time increased by 20 days or about one-third. These variances are attributable to the events of September 11th, which necessitated that DCAS' highest priority be the award of 133 emergency contracts for goods (vs. 1 in Fiscal 2001) desperately needed to address the impact of the tragedy.

Procurements Awarded (See Notes)

The results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, include data on the number and total original maximum dollar amount of procurements awarded during the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2002, except as noted below, for all Mayoral operating agencies for all categories of contracts: goods, construction and/or construction-related services, human services and other. Agency data are totaled to present an overall picture of procurements awarded. However, the data presented, which are maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), exclude small purchases, purchase orders, and the encumbrances imposed for multi-year contracts that had been awarded prior to Fiscal 2002. The data presented 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 2002.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

Prompt Payment

This Indicator measures agency timeliness in processing invoice payments to the City's contractors. This information, which is maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), is provided by the Financial Information Services Agency (FISA) and includes all payments from both general and capital funds made during Fiscal 2002 for all Mayoral operating agencies. Agency specific data are provided for the percent of all invoice payments, both in terms of the dollar value and the 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 required by the City Charter, the Procurement Policy Board (PPB) Rules (Rules) concerning prompt payment took effect in 1991, requiring 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 even if not paid on time (e.g., advance payments to not-for-profit human services contractors). These categories of payment, however, will be re-assessed as part of this Administrations' Procurement Reform Initiative. The Rules establish the maximum time for payment to a contractor from the point when the contractor has completed performance, the agency has determined that performance was acceptable and the contractor has submitted an invoice with appropriate supporting documentation. The Rules also specify the length of time allowed to determine that performance is acceptable and to determine that invoices are properly submitted. After these determinations, the City, in most cases, is permitted 30 calendar days to process payments. The Rules allow 60 days for contract changes and 60 days 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 from the permitted agency processing time. Up until December 31, 1999, the Rules provided a 15-day grace period. If a payment was not made on time, but within the grace period, there was no interest paid. The PPB adopted a change in its Rules which phased out this "interest-free" 15-day grace period by reducing it to 7 days, effective January 1, 2000, and eliminated it entirely, effective July 1, 2000. The PPB works with agencies that are having problems making timely contractor payments to increase the efficiency of their invoice and payment processing.

As evidenced in the data presentations below and in the separate chart which follows, since the introduction of this Indicator in the Preliminary Fiscal 1996 Mayor's Management Report through Fiscal 1999, agencies, overall, had shown steady improvement in the timeliness of contractor payments. This trend, however, did not continue for Fiscal 2000 and was attributable to a number of systemic factors, some of which continued into Fiscal 2001:

- As a result of the transition to the new Y2K compliant Financial Management System (FMS), the City in general and the agencies in particular needed to adapt to the protocols of the new system, and go through the normal learning curve experience which typically results in a temporary decrease in performance. This was the reason that Prompt Payment Indicator data was not able to be presented in the Preliminary Fiscal 2000 Mayor's Management Report.
- The PPB Rules were changed to reduce the "interest-free" grace period from 15 days to 7 days, effective January 1, 2000. This 8 day reduction in the grace period meant that interest began to accrue within 37 days of the required payment date rather than within 45 days. The Prompt Payment Indicator was further impacted in Fiscal 2001 when the grace period was eliminated in its entirety on July 1, 2000 and interest therefore began to accrue within just 30 days of the required payment date.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

Agencies are continuing to successfully adapt to the use of FMS as well as to the elimination of the grace period, which in total reduced the "interest-free" payment period by 33%, from 45 days to 30 days. This is evidenced by the fact that the \$115,503 in interest paid during Fiscal 2002 represents a reduction of \$28,954 or 20% from the \$144,457 paid during Fiscal 2001 and is the lowest amount on record.

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

- (a) Figures are rounded to the nearest whole number.
- (b) Due to the factors cited above, prompt payment performance levels for Fiscal 2000 through Fiscal 2002 are not fully comparable to prior fiscal years.
- (c) Data for Fiscal 1995 and 1996 reflect data for all City agencies; data for Fiscal 1997 through Fiscal 2002 reflect data for Mayoral operating agencies only. Data for Fiscal 2002 was provided by FISA on 8/10/02.
- (d) NA – Not Applicable since the grace period was eliminated effective July 1, 2000.
- (e) If performance for Fiscal 2000 is calculated by applying the original 15 day grace period, the amount of interest that would be paid to contractors would decrease by approximately \$24,000.
- (f) If performance for Fiscal 2001 is calculated by applying the original 15 day grace period, the amount of interest that would be paid to contractors would decrease by approximately \$25,486; if performance for Fiscal 2001 is calculated by applying the subsequent 7 day grace period, the amount of interest that would be paid to contractors would decrease by approximately \$11,436.
- (g) If performance for Fiscal 2002 is calculated by applying the original 15 day grace period, the amount of interest that would be paid to contractors would decrease by approximately \$16,752; if performance for Fiscal 2002 is calculated by applying the subsequent 7 day grace period, the amount of interest that would be paid to contractors would decrease by approximately \$2,838.

Retroactive Contracts (See Notes)

This Indicator includes data measuring the level of contract retroactivity (i.e., contracts which started prior to the completion of the procurement process, that is, the date on which a contract was registered by the Comptroller's Office) for all Mayoral operating agencies for all new and renewal contracts, except emergency contracts and accelerated procurement contracts, awarded during Fiscal 2002. The data presented, which are maintained in the City's Financial Management System (FMS), includes: Total Number of Contracts Awarded; Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded; Number and Percent of Total Contracts Awarded which were Retroactive; Dollar Value and Percent of Total Dollar Value of Contracts Awarded which were Retroactive; and Average Number of Days that Elapsed Between the Contract Start Date and the Contract Registration Date.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

This Administration has commenced a Procurement Reform Initiative to streamline and strengthen the City's procurement process. One of the most important changes that we are looking to make as part of this effort is the structural reduction in the number of retroactive contracts. Given the importance of timely contracts to the City's procurement process, mitigating retroactivity is a major focus of the Procurement Reform Initiative. Retroactive contracts present serious challenges to both the contractor community and City agencies. That is why in the second half of Fiscal 2002 the City undertook a concerted effort to reduce the number of retroactive contracts among human services contracts which ended on June 30, 2002 and needed to continue into Fiscal 2003. This effort was facilitated by working with the agencies to proactively identify and track the progress of completing successor contract actions for these contracts. Based on experience that tracking stimulates a heightened level of sensitivity and awareness which in turn, improves performance, a reporting mechanism was set up to monitor the status of agency actions. Although not specifically reflected in the attached chart, the efforts on the part of the human services agencies resulted in a substantial increase in the percentage of human services contracts that were submitted to the Comptroller's Office for registration before the close of the fiscal year: 75% in Fiscal 2002 vs. 60% in Fiscal 2001.

The overall results from this Indicator, which are presented in the separate chart which follows, continue to reflect the structural nature of this issue; performance experienced additional deterioration compared to last year in two of the three indicators.

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.
- Includes data for emergency procurements related to the events of September 11th that were processed as emergency contracts through FMS. It does include such emergency procurements where the payments were processed by alternative means for the Department of Design and Construction (DDC) and other agencies, e.g., DDC had 5 such emergency actions, valued at \$507.6 million.
- The number and value of contracts shown in the "Procurements Awarded" chart differ from those published in the "Agency Procurement Actions" chart of the web based version of the Mayor's Management Report for two reasons: 1) further updates were made in the data after the submission of the information for publication in the MMR; and 2) the maximum amounts shown in the "Agency Procurement Actions" chart are "revised", not "original", and therefore reflect amendments to the contracts that were processed subsequent to the original contracts, if any. In contrast, the values shown in the "Procurements Awarded" chart are original maximum amounts and do not reflect any amendments.
- For all Indicators other than for "Retroactive Contracts", contracts are included if the Contract ID includes the year 2002 and the Start Date is on or after 7/1/01. For "Retroactive Contracts", contracts are included if the contract was registered between 7/2/01 and 7/1/02, inclusive.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS FISCAL 2002

- Small Purchase procurements are excluded.
- To exclude purchase orders from New York State contracts while retaining contracts with other governments, contracts with Award Method 25 for “Intergovernmental Purchases” are excluded unless the contractor could be identified as a government entity.
- HPD: Certain HPD contracts showing the New York City Housing Authority as the contractor were excluded because they are not procurements.
- All contract assignments were excluded, as these are not procurements, but a change in contractor pursuant to the terms of the original contract.
- Force Accounts were excluded because they are not procurements.
- Contracts that are payments to landlords pursuant to leases were excluded as being real property transactions, not procurements.

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002**

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

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Number	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	24	\$30,373,144	12	50%	\$15,857,483	52%
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	1	\$44,999	1	100%	\$44,999	100%
Department of Buildings	1	\$235,650	1	100%	\$235,650	100%
Department of Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	517	\$619,319,719	495	96%	\$595,322,248	96%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	6	\$18,013,704	2	33%	\$1,152,554	6%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	116	\$285,755,031	112	97%	\$278,743,534	98%
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Environmental Protection	101	\$933,646,371	74	73%	\$782,097,742	84%
Department of Finance	5	\$2,869,639	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	10	\$8,087,094	4	40%	\$1,859,825	23%
Department of Homeless Services	19	\$41,788,665	17	89%	\$41,617,488	100%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	27	\$24,448,614	26	96%	\$23,945,994	98%
Department of Info. Technology & Telecomm.	3	\$552,378	2	67%	\$330,377	60%
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	2	\$124,872	2	100%	\$124,872	100%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	1	\$233,360	1	100%	\$233,360	100%
Department of Parks & Recreation	117	\$75,236,928	107	91%	\$72,205,953	96%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	31	\$171,328,896	25	81%	\$167,448,626	98%
Department of Transportation	103	\$368,450,850	94	91%	\$231,747,616	63%
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fire Department	17	\$10,627,591	4	24%	\$1,308,365	12%
Human Resources Administration	43	\$166,091,092	39	91%	\$161,595,587	97%
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	1	\$208,998	0	0%	\$0	0%
Police Department	14	\$7,955,885	9	64%	\$5,772,767	73%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	1159	\$2,765,393,480	1027	89%	\$2,381,645,041	86%

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS:
CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Number	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	32	\$101,592,697	5	16%	\$11,808,243	12%
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	95	\$95,140,324	4	4%	\$5,171,615	5%
Department of Buildings	1	\$180,000	1	100%	\$180,000	100%
Department of Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	6	\$300,000	6	100%	\$300,000	100%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	22	\$33,456,912	19	86%	\$14,976,860	45%
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	39	\$258,380,190	30	77%	\$198,630,190	77%
Department of Employment	70	\$135,113,138	70	100%	\$135,113,138	100%
Department of Environmental Protection	17	\$154,419,642	14	82%	\$74,239,642	48%
Department of Finance	1	\$1,509,816	1	100%	\$1,509,816	100%
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	19	\$9,198,391	17	89%	\$8,557,591	93%
Department of Homeless Services	9	\$38,397,199	4	44%	\$10,674,203	28%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	6	\$85,085,500	6	100%	\$85,085,500	100%
Department of Info. Technology & Telecomm.	4	\$91,145,072	3	75%	\$6,814,320	7%
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	2	\$5,672,000	2	100%	\$5,672,000	100%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	18	\$10,280,221	7	39%	\$3,973,412	39%
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	\$2,391,653	1	100%	\$2,391,653	100%
Department of Transportation	15	\$82,023,087	15	100%	\$82,023,087	100%
Department of Youth & Community Development	54	\$10,622,472	53	98%	\$6,314,500	59%
Fire Department	2	\$6,228,565	2	100%	\$6,228,565	100%
Human Resources Administration	102	\$403,172,299	85	83%	\$338,204,652	84%
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Police Department	4	\$36,458,523	2	50%	\$35,275,523	97%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	519	\$1,560,767,702	347	67%	\$1,033,144,511	66%

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002

COMPETITIVENESS IN PROCUREMENTS:
CONTRACTS AWARDED BY COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATED ACQUISITION*

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Contracts Awarded with 3 or More Responses			
			Number	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	14	\$17,571,159	10	71%	\$11,617,987	66%
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 Business Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
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	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Homeless Services	1	\$1,921,547	1	100%	\$1,921,547	100%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	3	\$56,100	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Info. Technology & Telecomm.	1	\$1,000,914	1	100%	\$1,000,914	100%
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	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	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Transportation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Youth & Community Development	2	\$53,924	2	100%	\$53,924	100%
Fire Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Human Resources Administration	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	30	\$1,693,485	0	0%	\$0	0%
Police Department	3	\$52,126,198	3	100%	\$52,126,198	100%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	54	\$74,423,327	17	31%	\$66,720,569	90%

* Excludes 237 contracts with a value of \$303,289,507 for which negotiated acquisition was used either to extend an existing contract for a limited period of time or to continue a multi-phase construction-related contract for an on-going complex construction project. Under these circumstances, the PPB Rules contemplate negotiations with only the incumbent contractor.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002

**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			
			Number	Pct. of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. Of Total Value
Administration for Children's Services	1	\$3,603,826	1	100%	\$3,603,826	100%
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	1	\$50,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Buildings	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Business Services	1	\$16,202,000	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of City Planning	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	41	\$71,130,523	31	76%	\$56,403,930	79%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	1	\$772,234	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	179	\$739,455,338	144	80%	\$478,373,724	65%
Department of Employment	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Environmental Protection	74	\$964,309,198	51	69%	\$788,700,979	82%
Department of Finance	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	2	\$36,546,097	0	0%	\$0	0%
Department of Homeless Services	16	\$7,585,532	15	94%	\$6,082,612	80%
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	52	\$105,172,823	38	73%	\$95,667,733	91%
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 Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Parks & Recreation	157	\$95,022,222	105	67%	\$70,514,729	74%
Department of Probation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	19	\$51,065,977	18	95%	\$50,755,477	99%
Department of Transportation	27	\$283,283,591	24	89%	\$147,680,323	52%
Department of Youth & Community Development	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fire Department	7	\$8,015,730	3	43%	\$6,769,584	84%
Human Resources Administration	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Police Department	10	\$4,762,840	7	70%	\$3,482,672	73%
Taxi & Limousine Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	588	\$2,386,977,931	437	74%	\$1,708,035,589	72%

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002**

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS* & DEFAULTED CONTRACTS

Agency	Total # of Contact Performance Evaluations which were Required to be Completed for Fiscal 2002	# and % of Total Required Contract Performance Evaluations which were Completed		# and % of Total Required Contract Performance Evaluations Completed which were Rated as Unsatisfactory		Number of Contracts Defaulted
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Administration for Children's Services	743	501	67%	8	2%	0
City Civil Service Commission	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
City Commission on Human Rights	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department for the Aging	575	509	89%	0	0%	0
Department of Buildings	11	4	36%	0	0%	0
Department of Business Services	2	2	100%	0	0%	0
Department of City Planning	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	138	138	100%	4	3%	8
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Correction	40	6	15%	0	0%	0
Department of Cultural Affairs	3	2	67%	0	0%	0
Department of Design & Construction	418	351	84%	5	1%	1
Department of Employment	108	48	44%	0	0%	0
Department of Environmental Protection	409	292	71%	3	1%	5
Department of Finance	44	17	39%	0	0%	0
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	167	151	90%	0	0%	0
Department of Homeless Services	218	209	96%	3	1%	2
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	199	188	94%	4	2%	0
Department of Info. Technology & Telecomm.	54	6	11%	0	0%	0
Department of Investigation	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Juvenile Justice	18	16	89%	0	0%	0
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	384	331	86%	0	0%	0
Department of Parks & Recreation	247	194	79%	9	5%	6
Department of Probation	22	0	0%	0	NA	0
Department of Records and Information Services	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Department of Sanitation	134	69	51%	0	0%	0
Department of Transportation	309	280	91%	0	0%	0
Department of Youth & Community Development	815	744	91%	0	0%	0
Fire Department	80	61	76%	1	2%	0
Human Resources Administration	329	229	70%	3	1%	0
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
Law Department**	32	17	53%	0	0%	0
Police Department	50	40	80%	3	8%	0
Taxi & Limousine Commission	4	4	100%	0	0%	0
TOTAL	5553	4409	79%	43	1%	22

* Includes contracts for which comprehensive, fully documented Evaluations of contractor Performance were required to be completed.

** Excludes 21 contracts let by the Law Department for legal representation of City employees because conflicts of interest would exist if the Law Department provided that representation. In view of these conflicts and attorney-client privilege the Law Department does not supervise the contracts and, hence, cannot meaningfully evaluate them.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS Fiscal 2002

PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING

Agency	New Services and Construction Contracts Awarded					
	Total Number	Number and Percent Performance-Based		Total Dollar Value	Dollar Value and Percent Performance-Based	
		#	%		\$	%
Administration for Children's Services	240	24	10%	\$407,791,767	\$36,603,303	9%
City Commission on Human Rights	3	0	0%	\$44,136	\$0	0%
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Civil Service Commission	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Department for the Aging	59	27	46%	\$63,029,326	\$13,033,729	21%
Department of Buildings	1	0	0%	\$236,000	\$0	0%
Department of Business Services	89	0	0%	\$912,806,432	\$0	0%
Department of City Planning	6	0	0%	\$300,000	\$0	0%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services *	55	52	95%	\$97,133,625	\$66,151,713	68%
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Department of Correction	16	16	100%	\$19,171,912	\$19,171,912	100%
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Department of Design and Construction	183	169	92%	\$732,000,000	\$664,000,000	91%
Department of Employment	38	38	100%	\$93,314,953	\$93,314,953	100%
Department of Environmental Protection	111	111	100%	\$960,306,506	\$960,306,506	100%
Department of Finance	6	0	0%	\$7,548,686	\$0	0%
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	104	97	93%	\$270,774,571	\$45,238,165	17%
Department of Homeless Services	35	32	91%	\$62,777,005	\$56,316,241	90%
Department of Housing Preservation and Development	80	51	64%	\$125,987,095	\$122,461,446	97%
Telecommunications	14	14	100%	\$100,824,778	\$100,824,778	100%
Department of Investigation	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Department of Juvenile Justice	5	4	80%	\$8,796,872	\$8,737,000	99%
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	40	32	80%	\$18,214,496	\$14,096,810	77%
Department of Parks and Recreation	130	130	100%	\$80,900,801	\$80,900,801	100%
Department of Probation	1	1	100%	\$778,897	\$778,897	100%
Department of Records and Information Services	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Department of Sanitation	42	42	100%	\$113,822,898	\$113,822,898	100%
Department of Transportation	159	139	87%	\$474,146,459	\$437,181,449	92%
Development	392	392	100%	\$30,442,853	\$30,442,853	100%
Fire Department	23	20	87%	\$20,150,735	\$19,905,735	99%
Human Resources Administration	173	173	100%	\$595,911,517	\$595,911,517	100%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
Law Department	86	5	6%	\$6,073,140	\$318,998	5%
Police Department	24	24	100%	\$126,776,036	\$126,776,036	100%
Taxi and Limousine Commission	0	0	N/A	\$0	\$0	N/A
TOTAL	2115	1593	75%	\$5,330,061,496	\$3,606,295,740	68%

* Excludes contracts awarded by the Department of Citywide Administrative Services/Division of Municipal Supplies.

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002**

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	20	208	8	516	187	60
City Commission on Human Rights	0	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Civilian Complaint Review Board	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Civil Service Commission	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department for the Aging	0	N/A	59	112	0	N/A
Department of Buildings	1	120	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Business Services	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of City Planning	0	N/A	6	150	0	N/A
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	707	79	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Correction	13	215	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Design and Construction	60	96	27	198	0	N/A
Department of Employment	0	N/A	37	419	1	77
Department of Environmental Protection	85	185	5	466	3	234
Department of Finance	6	108	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	12	183	34	409	0	N/A
Department of Homeless Services	13	119	4	279	0	N/A
Department of Housing Preservation and Development	23	183	1	144	0	N/A
Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications	6	207	5	400	3	64
Department of Investigation	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Juvenile Justice	2	153	2	323	0	N/A
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services	0	N/A	40	277	0	N/A
Department of Parks and Recreation	101	110	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	38	142	0	N/A	0	N/A
Department of Transportation	139	112	9	401	0	N/A
Department of Youth and Community Development	0	N/A	50	394	36	100
Fire Department	18	140	2	291	0	N/A
Human Resources Administration	28	139	38	279	13	108
Landmarks Preservation Commission	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Law Department	1	103	0	N/A	82	187
Police Department	10	130	4	220	2	266
Taxi and Limousine Commission	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
TOTAL # OF CONTRACTS/OVERALL AVERAGE DAYS	1283	105	331	299	327	101

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002**

**PROCUREMENTS AWARDED*
NUMBER OF AWARDS AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS**

Agency	Contracts For:				TOTAL
	Goods	Construction and/or Construction-Related Services	Human Services	Other	
Administration for Children's Services					
Number	1	1	256	45	303
Value	\$100,000	\$3,603,826	\$472,888,729	\$55,351,333	\$531,943,888
City Civil Service Commission					
Number	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
City Commission on Human Rights					
Number	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Civilian Complaint Review Board					
Number	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department for the Aging					
Number	19	1	274	24	318
Value	\$959,594	\$50,000	\$134,873,484	\$2,996,407	\$138,879,485
Department of Buildings					
Number	0	0	0	3	3
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$573,450	\$573,450
Department of Business Services					
Number	0	1	0	5	6
Value	\$0	\$16,202,000	\$0	\$889,369,205	\$905,571,205
Department of City Planning					
Number	0	0	0	6	6
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000
Department of Citywide Administrative Services					
Number	870	41	0	44	955
Value	\$776,782,006	\$71,130,523	\$0	\$52,398,294	\$900,310,823
Department of Consumer Affairs					
Number	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Correction					
Number	0	1	4	12	17
Value	\$0	\$772,234	\$2,022,979	\$22,203,009	\$24,998,222
Department of Cultural Affairs					
Number	0	0	0	0	0
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Department of Design & Construction					
Number	0	179	0	0	179
Value	\$0	\$739,455,338	\$0	\$0	\$739,455,338
Department of Employment					
Number	0	0	100	0	100
Value	\$0	\$0	\$165,051,959	\$0	\$165,051,959
Department of Environmental Protection					
Number	0	74	0	110	184
Value	\$0	\$964,309,198	\$0	\$265,971,441	\$1,230,280,639
Department of Finance					
Number	0	0	0	6	6
Value	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,379,455	\$4,379,455
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner					
Number	0	2	41	36	79
Value	\$0	\$36,546,097	\$15,540,192	\$88,002,151	\$140,088,439
Department of Homeless Services					
Number	0	16	38	11	65
Value	\$0	\$7,585,532	\$225,693,038	\$957,221	\$234,235,791

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS Fiscal 2002

PROCUREMENTS AWARDED* NUMBER OF AWARDS AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS

Agency	Contracts For:				TOTAL	
	Goods	Construction and/or Construction-Related Services	Human Services	Other		
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	Number Value	0 \$0	52 \$105,172,823	0 \$0	58 \$38,397,781	110 \$143,570,604
Department of Info. Technology & Telecomm.	Number Value	3 \$7,812,530	0 \$0	0 \$0	28 \$130,965,921	31 \$138,778,452
Department of Investigation	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0
Department of Juvenile Justice	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	10 \$18,357,170	2 \$124,872	12 \$18,482,042
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	130 \$206,952,606	2 \$339,747	132 \$207,292,353
Department of Parks & Recreation	Number Value	0 \$0	157 \$95,022,222	3 \$496,500	13 \$4,812,343	173 \$100,331,065
Department of Probation	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	1 \$245,000	0 \$0	1 \$245,000
Department of Records and Information Services	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0
Department of Sanitation	Number Value	0 \$0	19 \$51,065,977	2 \$1,000,000	19 \$204,208,015	40 \$256,273,992
Department of Transportation	Number Value	1 \$333,630	27 \$283,283,591	0 \$0	176 \$208,853,127	204 \$492,470,348
Department of Youth & Community Development	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	617 \$75,765,545	1 \$4,307,972	618 \$80,073,517
Fire Department	Number Value	0 \$0	7 \$8,015,730	0 \$0	20 \$16,281,753	27 \$24,297,483
Human Resources Administration	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	174 \$568,573,118	44 \$162,177,225	218 \$730,750,343
Landmark Preservation Commission	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0
Law Department	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	35 \$3,380,031	35 \$3,380,031
Police Department	Number Value	6 \$90,701,721	10 \$4,762,840	0 \$0	10 \$21,915,204	26 \$117,379,764
Taxi & Limousine Commission	Number Value	0 \$0	0 \$0	0 \$0	4 \$657,044	4 \$657,044
TOTAL	Number Value	900 \$876,689,481	588 \$2,386,977,931	1650 \$1,887,460,320	714 \$2,178,923,000	3,852 \$7,330,050,732

* Excludes small purchases, purchase orders, and the encumbrances imposed for multi-year contracts awarded prior to Fiscal 2002.

AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002

PROMPT PAYMENT

Agency	Invoice Dollar Value Paid On Time	Number of Invoices Paid On Time	Interest Paid to Contractors
Administration for Children Services	99%	96%	\$1,651
City Civil Service Commission	NA	NA	NA
City Commission on Human Rights	100%	100%	\$0
Department for the Aging	99%	99%	\$114
Department of Buildings	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Business Services	98%	100%	\$2,501
Department of City Planning	99%	98%	\$0
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	96%	94%	\$724
Department of Consumer Affairs	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Correction	99%	99%	\$531
Department of Cultural Affairs	99%	99%	\$0
Department of Design and Construction	99%	97%	\$0
Department of Employment	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Environmental Protection	94%	98%	\$0
Department of Finance	99%	97%	\$0
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	99%	94%	\$318
Department of Homeless Services	98%	94%	\$7,008
Department of Housing Preservation & Development	94%	95%	\$2,122
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications	98%	95%	\$0
Department of Investigation	100%	100%	\$45
Department of Juvenile Justice	97%	94%	\$763
Department of Mental Health	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Parks and Recreation	98%	92%	\$1,505
Department of Probation	100%	99%	\$0
Department of Records and Information Services	100%	100%	\$0
Department of Sanitation	99%	99%	\$1,777
Department of Transportation	97%	91%	\$1,513
Department of Youth and Community Development	97%	96%	\$1,478
Fire Department	95%	98%	\$311
Human Resources Administration	98%	97%	\$9,795
Landmarks Preservation Commission	99%	99%	\$0
Law Department	99%	99%	\$0
Police Department	84%	85%	\$83,347
Taxi and Limousine Commission	100%	100%	\$0
Total	98%	95%	\$115,503

Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**AGENCY PROCUREMENT INDICATORS
Fiscal 2002**

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

Agency	Total Contracts	Total Value	Retroactive Contracts				
			Number	Pct. Of Total Contracts	Value	Pct. of Total Value	Average Days Retroactive
Administration for Children's Services	302	\$533,769,083	183	61%	\$411,244,344	77%	56
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	319	\$138,964,485	160	50%	\$39,869,674	29%	108
Department of Buildings	3	\$573,450	0	0%	\$0	0%	NA
Department of Business Services	6	\$905,571,205	5	83%	\$533,555,205	59%	236
Department of City Planning	6	\$300,000	1	17%	\$50,000	17%	91
Department of Citywide Administrative Services**	611	\$667,268,579	41	7%	\$84,832,703	13%	65
Department of Consumer Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Correction	17	\$24,998,222	13	76%	\$21,944,368	88%	105
Department of Cultural Affairs	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Design & Construction	220	\$936,356,824	1	0%	\$15,000,000	2%	402
Department of Employment	99	\$162,730,575	95	96%	\$157,306,485	97%	89
Department of Environmental Protection	157	\$1,199,156,788	28	18%	\$66,452,339	6%	221
Department of Finance	6	\$4,379,455	3	50%	\$2,063,499	47%	46
Department of Health/Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	97	\$133,399,570	96	99%	\$90,522,615	68%	240
Department of Homeless Services	54	\$204,726,428	15	28%	\$19,472,734	10%	88
Department of Housing Preservation & Development**	96	\$133,881,394	50	52%	\$103,410,355	77%	170
Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications.	28	\$139,730,396	19	68%	\$113,895,357	82%	108
Department of Investigation	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Juvenile Justice	13	\$18,582,042	13	100%	\$18,582,042	100%	83
Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Alcoholism Services	129	\$208,715,160	63	49%	\$65,176,732	31%	83
Department of Parks & Recreation	191	\$114,024,777	43	23%	\$20,303,574	18%	44
Department of Probation	2	\$834,582	2	100%	\$834,582	100%	401
Department of Records and Information Services	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department of Sanitation	38	\$302,574,214	7	18%	\$78,780,110	26%	49
Department of Transportation	220	\$451,355,969	84	38%	\$86,573,901	19%	111
Department of Youth & Community Development	695	\$80,131,377	604	87%	\$70,894,966	88%	152
Fire Department**	21	\$22,150,916	6	29%	\$12,502,588	56%	12
Human Resources Administration	218	\$730,289,449	175	80%	\$546,912,753	75%	118
Landmark Preservation Commission	0	\$0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Department	86	\$4,940,705	85	99%	\$4,731,707	96%	262
Police Department	25	\$98,730,478	1	4%	\$1,053,048	1%	16
Taxi & Limousine Commission	4	\$657,044	4	100%	\$657,044	100%	101
TOTAL	3663	\$7,218,793,168	1797	49%	\$2,566,622,724	36%	132

* Includes all new and renewal contracts except emergency contracts and accelerated procurement contracts.

** Excludes 6 HPD, 2 Fire Department, and 2 DCAS contracts which were procured jointly by the agency and the Law Department.