



# Meeting Notes: PCA -July 17, 2019

## Vann Smiley – OneWA

- Why “reset” our program?
  - Not the right skill sets or people
  - Agencies not ready
  - Change management
  - Agency Partner – Strategic Advisor contract terminated
  
- Legislation Questions
  - Why does it take so long?
    - Gained new legislature support
    - Received funding for OneWA, but not for agency financial support or existing system maintenance
  - Can you bring the cost down?
    - Competition in the EMR marketplace will aid in bringing the cost down
    - Limited the want to customize will allow for an off-the-shelf product
  - What is going to be done differently?
    - Execution of project
    - No funding from legislation if we don’t modernize our business practices
    - Customization of existing programs has cost the agencies \$67 million
  - Are you leveraging technology and changing business processes?
    - OFM will replatform HRMS and Payroll to a SAP – we won’t notice it on the users side
    - Can we leverage the business connection with the SAP partnership with OFM?  
Possibly
  - Can you get this done?
    - Yes, we can get this done! Progress would be happening (see below)
  
- Approved budget of \$18.4M
  - Half of the \$18.4M is matched by federal funds
  - Approx. \$4M is for change management
  - NASPO has ERP vendors – Workday, Oracle, CGI
  - This would save time by not needing to develop an RFP
  - Bring a coherent plan to next leg session for (hopefully) an approval for funds
  
- System Integrator could be onboard this biennium
  - Focus on Finance Module - Narrow scope to finance and general ledger
  - Budget and Purchasing move into Finance Module
    - Need to define what is included in Purchasing.
    - Procurement and contracts would be next

- Procurement would include the full procurement cycle – inventory, assets, etc.
  
- Pilot Agencies – “Proof of Concept”
  - Finance onboard
  - IT shop ready
  - Agency leadership committed
  
- Partnered with several other agencies for best practices to have success by making the right decisions for WA ST
  - Improve communications from OneWa and business owners
  - Improve synchronization across OFM
    - OFM replatform could aid in OneWA decision
    - Focus on 80% of agency needs, not the 20% of unique needs
  
- Development of an “EO” and Supplemental DP
  - Currently, no mandate
  - Had conversation with Governor for support
  
- How is OneWa doing this?
  - In house goals is to complete a solutions process
    - Business owners will participate; OneWa will facilitate
  - Late August a vendor is going to coach us through the same process to validate our process and solution(s)
    - Demonstrate money spent
    - Provide solutions
  - Goal is to get a commitment of funding from Legislation
  
- What does this mean to me as a business owner?
  - (Keith) Need to do a dive into procurement versus a high level as seen in previous demos
  - (Jamie) Need to review the individual systems which have NASPO contracts
  - (ED) Change Management wasn’t in place during requirements finding; this limits our perspective on evaluating systems
    - (Jamie) This is where DES needs to identify the 80% when reviewing the demo; bring in the stakeholders for input
    - (Vann) Audience needs to focus on what the ERP does; use requirements as reference, not focus; Change management to adopt the technology that meets legal obligations

OneWA is willing to come to agencies for discussions – Reach out!

## **Rebecca Linnville - Contract Reporting Proviso**

**Due October 31, 2019**

The contract reporting proviso includes contracts that may just have IT as a piece of it.

Required reporting information (items in red DES is seeking clarification)

- Agency name
- Contract number
- Vendor name
- Contract term start and end dates
- Contract dollar amount in total
- **Contract dollar amount by state fiscal year (prorate for life of contract or spend by fiscal year)**
- **Type of service delivered (see the options 1-3 below)**

Options:

1. **Add Statewide Vendor Number to the Contract Reporting Template and Map to Industry NAICS Codes**
  - a. A vendor may have more than one NAICS code
  - b. Add a field for SWV to UBI to crosswalk to NAICS code
    - i. Sub-object codes would help identify non-IT companies conducting work based on IT contracts
2. **Require Agencies to Submit a Separate Report and Identify IT Towers**
  - a. Would have to identify towers: Applications, Data Center, Security, Storage, Computers, etc.
  - b. Cons:
    - i. data could be inconsistent year to year, person/person
    - ii. large lift for agencies
3. **Require Agencies to Submit a Separate Report and Identify the IT Service Type**
  - a. Cons:
    - i. data could be inconsistent year to year, person/person
    - ii. large lift for agencies

## **Rex Brown – Disparity Study**

Has transitioned over to OMWBE now the study is complete and ready for implementation.

Starting in 2015, the study was conducted to include the largest spend agencies and several partners.

Meetings:

June 19<sup>th</sup> – Civil Rights Collation meeting; study shared with public

July 30<sup>th</sup> – Civil Rights Collation at University of Phoenix

July 31<sup>st</sup> - Agency presentation in August at Veteran Affairs.

Partner with Veteran Affairs since it is difficult to get a sampling from this group.

P-Card analysis currently in progress to review

- Required to have a 1% sampling

Building a system, similar to the Federal government, to capture information.

Why can't the governor impose mandatory goals on all state agencies?

- He doesn't have the ability. He does have in the works to develop a community of practice. This will provide a uniform case for the program.

How long will it take to put work in place?

- We don't know how well we are doing in the state.
  - If agencies are meeting goals, continue business as usual.
  - If agencies cannot meet goals, there will be mandates imposed.
  - Another option would be an agency review if meeting some of the goals.

What is the timeline?

- Still reviewing study. It is like an onion. Peeling back the complex information.
- The state of the demographic data is not being tracked currently; individual efforts did help
- Action teams developing
- Model policy team will be developing policies and reviewing currently policies.
- Learn what the public is saying
  - Not interested in what we are doing
  - Want to know our capacity
  - Agencies do have restrictions due to I-200 for the next 21 years
    - I-200 exempts client services; Client services gives you an idea of what the numbers would look like if I-200 were not in place.

Data Collection

- Need to collect the right stuff
- B2G Now has integrated data;
  - Cons: clunky, need robust user group
  - Looking at other vendors to provide the business requirements we need
  - OMWBE has purchased B2G Now to collect the data to assist in certifications

Talk more about agency preparation

- Future targeted outreach framework
- Looking at this holistically as a state to make changes that communities can see

Clarify I-1000 and will it directly affect measures

- There are two groups – legal and bureaucrats. This is a legal question - AG. Bureaucrats are waiting to see if it goes into effect at the end of the month or if it goes for vote on November 6<sup>th</sup> unless AG approvals.

### **Farrell Presnell and Sundae Delgado – Policy/Training Update**

Next workshop is October 21<sup>st</sup> (not finalized)

- Public hearing will be part of the workshop concerning environmental policies

Developing a Process Routine:

- Present concept
- Share feedback
- Present package (training and policy)
- Launch training and policy

Policy Updates:

- 18-03
  - Launched policy and training on July 1
- Contract Management
  - October 2019 to present package
- Environmental
  - October 2019 to present package
- Direct Buy
  - DES meeting with stakeholders to collect more information in August

Training:

- Active training due dates:
  - PCB due July 1, 2019
  - CM due July 31, 2019
  - 18-03 due January 1, 2020
  - Submit exception request to Chris Liu from the agency head
    - Agencies pulling responsibilities if training not complete by due date
- Don't know where to find the latest communications
  - Click the purple box at the bottom of the DES home page
  - Click (in the header) latest training updates
  - It will take you to the training page where all the communications are listed.
- Required training
  - Contract & procurement professionals (all of us in the room or on the phone)
  - Contract monitors and managers (pre-award and post award)
  - Small Purchases (for P-Card users)

- Standard rule: Existing employees have 6 months to complete training; new employees have 90 days
- Goal to have training and policy rollout at the same time
- TAG members working on the training
  - Direct Buy Training - Review if needed
  - 11 Environmental Policies in place
    - PCBs
      - RCW39.26.280/290
    - Mercury free
      - RCW 70.95M.060(2)
    - Electronics Products Preference
      - RCW 39.26.265(1)
    - Environmentally responsible paper
      - RCW 39.24.050
      - RCW 39.26.255
      - RCW 39.30.050
      - RCW 43.19A.022(1)
      - WAC 200-300-085
      - EO 05.01
    - Electric Vehicles
      - RCW 39.26.090(10)
      - EO 14-04
    - PBDEs free
      - RCW 70.95M.080
    - PFA/PFC – Food packages and firefighting chemicals without per-fluorinated chemicals
      - RCWs: 70.75A.020, 70.95G. 070
    - HFC
      - RCW:TBD
    - Products not hazardous
      - RCW 43.19A.070(2)
    - Biofuels, clean fuels
      - RCW 43.19.642-647
      - RCW 43.19.637 & .648
    - Strawboard
      - RCW 43.19A.020(2)

**Other Topics:**

Interagency agreements –

- agencies to include both agency contract numbers on contracts
- training being developed on these agreements

Next meeting is August 21 Room 1213 Presentation Room

Facilitator: Brant Eddy, TESC