

Meeting Information

Meeting Name: PO4 Requisitions to RFQ
Scribe: DeVal Lott
Facilitator: Kyle Morton
Date: March 21, 2005
Time: 1:00pm – 4:20pm
Location: Suite 1514A West Tower

Invitees/Attendees

+ In attendance, - Absent, # Substitute, *Other

	Name	Organization/Department	Substituting For
+	Anita Hunnicutt	DOAS	
+	Debra Blount	DOAS	
-	Roxanne Perez	DOAS	
+	Charles Petty	DOAS	
+	Lawrence Bond	DOAS	
	Project Staff		Role
+	Kyle Morton	Accenture	AP/PO Lead
+	Rick Housworth	SAO	PO Lead
+	Henrietta Adams	SAO	AP Lead

Agenda

Item No.	Topic	Presenter
1.	Introduction	Kyle Morton
2.	Meeting Handouts	Kyle Morton
3.	Topics for Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Requisition to RFQ • B. Vendor Quote Groups • C. Enter RFQ Responses • D. Award RFQ and Create Contract 	Kyle Morton/Rick Housworth
4.	Conclusion	Kyle Morton

Meeting Summary

Agenda Item No.	Main Points, Conclusions/Discussions, Decisions, Next Steps, Issues, New Action Items
1,2	Introduction and Meeting Handouts Introductions were made and the meeting handouts were distributed and discussed.
3	Topics for Discussion

Agenda Item No.	Main Points, Conclusions/Discussions, Decisions, Next Steps, Issues, New Action Items
3A	<p>Requisition to RFQ</p> <p>Requisition – version 7.02</p> <p>Modifications made to version 7.02 were discussed and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modification was made to the Header Details panel, “Open Contract” Y/N flag. This modification was applied to version 7.02 in order to zero out price information on those contracts in which no pre-encumbrance was desired. <p>In order to delete this modification in version 8.8, it was recommended that the user not enter a price for those items in which a pre-encumbrance was not needed, and a comment would be entered to determine if the purchase was for an agency contract or not. Proper training would occur for the end users in this process.</p> <p>A discussion ensued wherein DOAS wanted to keep the flag to validate that the purchase is an open contract. There were doubts expressed that the end user would be able to determine the proper entries to the system. A customization may be needed to place a warning message that states “Is this an open agency contract? If yes, go back and enter amounts, etc.” This message would be given upon the ‘Save’ action if no amounts had been entered on the requisition. This would merely be a change to the delivered warning message text.</p> <p>After much discussion, it was determined that this modification of the “Open Contract Y/N” flag is still be requested by State Purchasing and they would like for it to be moved into version 8.8, but no system processing needs to take place behind the scenes. If the purchase is for an open contract, the price would be left blank and the system would not zero out pricing as in a pre-encumbrance. User must enter valid Chartfields as in version 7.02. If a price is entered into the amount field, the system will pre-encumber the funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modification was made to add a “State Requisition” checkbox. When checked on, this box would default “State Buyer” into the requisition lines. <p>In order to delete this modification in version 8.8, it was recommended that the “Retrofit” feature be used. This feature would permit “State Buyer” to be placed in the buyer field and then DOAS would change it to the State Purchasing buyer. Retrofit feature would allow the buyer to be changed.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Main Points, Conclusions/Discussions, Decisions, Next Steps, Issues, New Action Items
<p>3A (cont)</p>	<p>DOAS is still concerned about the clock start time for their processing. It was discussed that DOAS would have the final approval in the chain of workflow. This would mean that the agencies would place the requisition in a "valid" BCM status and a "pending approval" header status. Tracking dates would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Requisition Date ➤ Agency Pending Approval Date ➤ State Purchasing Approval Date (Clock would begin ticking) ➤ RFQ Creation date ➤ Bid Opening Date ➤ Bid Closing Date ➤ Bid Award Date <p>If State Purchasing denied the requisition purchase, the "Notify" button could be used to send emails back and forth between the agency and State Purchasing concerning the corrections or next steps to take with the requisition. These emails would not be tracked by the system.</p> <p>Note: By giving DOAS final approval rights, agencies that are not currently using 'workflow' in version 7.02, would be forced to use workflow in the requisition process in version 8.8.</p> <p>RFQ – version 7.02</p> <p>Header Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A modification was made to the 'Header' panel in version 7.02 to include a "Bid Return Location" and two checkboxes for "RFP" and/or "SWC". The modification to include a "Bid Return Location" will move forward into version 8.8. The two checkboxes for RFP and/or SWC may be replaced in version 8.8 since they are not currently used correctly in version 7.02. It was determined that if comments are added to the Standard Type/ID comment field to include certain verbiage concerning Request for Proposals and Statewide Contracts, that DOAS would be able to determine these purchase types using the comments section of the page. This was tested after the session and comment type information is not maintained in the system, so this option would not be viable. It still needs to be determined what, if any, informational flags are required on the RFQ Header. PeopleSoft Strategic Sourcing was mentioned as an alternative but isn't available during upgrade. A modification was also made to the 'Header' panel in version 7.02 to include "Addenda" processing. It was determined that all "Addenda" processing features which were applied in version 7.02 would be moved forward into version 8.8.
	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 4 of 8</p> <p style="text-align: right;">03/30/05, 8:05 AM</p>

Agenda Item No.	Main Points, Conclusions/Discussions, Decisions, Next Steps, Issues, New Action Items
<p>3A (cont)</p>	<p>Activities Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A modification was made to the 'Activities' panel to make it a required action during RFQ processing. This modification was to be used for bid descriptions on the Georgia Procurement Registry. This modification will not be moved into version 8.8. <p>Copy Criteria Page</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a checkbox to mark "Specific Contract". Will this copy contract lines into the RFQ? (See Action Item #1). <p>Vendor Association by NIGP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a totally customized panel. It was suggested that the 'Online Procurement Registry', which includes and available on-line queries and reports, be used to substitute the processing on this panel. One problem using the registry is that the vendor number in the registry doesn't match the PeopleSoft vendor number assigned by the system but this is not a problem with the online query and report. <p>Vendor List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a delivered panel and will carry forward into version 8.8 <p>Dispatch RFQ's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modifications to this panel include the "Print Header Only" and "Print Addenda Only" checkboxes. These modifications will carry forward into version 8.8. <p>DOAS wants to enlarge the font size for the word "ADDENDA" across the top of the printed RFQ document. They also mentioned that they would like to see auto-numbering for addenda's. This would be a major customization and is out of scope for this phase of the project. (Parking lot item?)</p>
<p>3B</p>	<p>Vendor Quote Groups</p> <p>This is a new feature in version 8.8. This functionality allows the user to group certain like vendors together for RFQ creation. There are several different fields/links that may be used for vendor lookup. The link of "Vendor Select by SIC" may be changed to read "Vendor Select by NIGP".</p> <p>EQuote would replace this functionality when available. DOAS wants the EQuote system to create purchase orders and to use PO Loader to load the purchase orders into the system. This would facilitate the need for a new interface, but is out of scope for this upgrade. Kyle will send Anita Hunnicutt the interface data for future revisions that they may make to the EQuote system.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Main Points, Conclusions/Discussions, Decisions, Next Steps, Issues, New Action Items
3C	<p>Enter RFQ responses</p> <p>Header Panel – the “Vendor Response” type is a customized field. DOAS will check with their staff to see if this field is critical to their processing. (See Action Item # 2)</p>
3D	<p>Award RFQ and Create PO/Contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no modifications to Analysis and Awards in version 7.02. <p>Contracts are auto-numbered in version 8.8. A modification would be necessary if users are to assign their own contract id numbers (as in Statewide Contracts). It was suggested that the RFQ ID may be defaulted to this field. There is a field ‘PO type’ on this page that DOAS would like to add “PO Contract” to the drop down listing. Currently, this field defaults the value of “general”. (See Action Item # 3)</p> <p>Create PO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no customizations in version 7.02 for this panel but in version 8.8 it has a feature that will allow either a “contract” or a “purchase order” to be created from this panel. <p>A discussion ensued concerning the flagging of Assets at the item level. Rick will talk with the Asset Management group to see if asset profiles could be assigned at the item level. (See Action Item # 4)</p> <p>DOAS requested a demonstration of the printing process to an html document. Kyle accessed the system and ran the process to print a purchase order to a html file. The process worked, although the format of the purchase order was slightly out of alignment.</p>
4	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Action Items were discussed and meeting was adjourned.</p>

Action Item Review

Action Item (AI) No.	Date Open	Description	Action/Response
AI1.	3/21/05	Copy Criteria Page version 8.8 – Will this copy contract lines into the RFQ?	The way this feature works would not be useful. If requisition lines referenced multiple contracts, this allows you to copy only the lines associated with a specified contract to be copied to the RFQ. Since we do not associate requisition lines with contracts (if there was a contract they would be creating PO), this would not be used. Even if in the future contracts were referenced at the requisition level, these Reqs would become PO's and not be copied into an RFQ.
AI2.	3/21/05	Enter RFQ Responses version 7.02 – customized field.	DOAS will check with their staff to see if this field is critical to their processing. DOAS response was that this customization is still needed but that the bid response categories can be reduced to only three: Bid Response, No Bid, and Late Bid. Requirement 209.
AI3.	3/21/05	Contracts are auto numbered in version 8.8. A customization would be needed if users are allowed to enter assigned contract id's (as in Statewide Contracts). DOAS also wants to add "PO Contract" to the 'PO Type' field on this page.	A customization may be done to allow users to specify the contract number and choose a contract award type of "Purchase Order" rather than "General" contract. It will also be investigated if it is possible to default a PO Type of "SWC" or "AC" on the PO releases when the contract number is selected on the release. Requirement 832.
AI4.	3/21/05	Flagging assets at the item level	Asset Management says they will continue to have different Asset Profiles based upon whether or not a Proprietary Agency is making the purchase. Asset Profiles could be assigned to items, but would have to be changed by Proprietary agencies procuring these items. This would be a training issue for these agencies.

Parking Lot items

Parking Lot Item No.	Parking Lot Items
PL1	Use PO Loader to load purchase orders from the EQuote system. Requirement 833.