

Procurement Modernization Commission
Efficiencies Working Group

Friday April 1st, 2016
2-4 PM

1) Attendees:

Al Bullock -DoIT-
Devan Perry -BPW-
Doug Carrey-Beaver –DoIT-
Gabriel Gnall -BPW-
Herb Jordan -GOMA-
Mark Newgent -GOV-
Matthew Solomson –Anthem-
Mike Zimmerman -MDOT-
Rachel Hershey -DBM-
Rizwan Siddiqi - EBA Engineering, Inc.-
Susanne Brogan -Treasurer -
Jessica Hackett (representative for Sen. Steve Waugh)
Chantal Kai-Lewis -GOMA-
James King Jr -GOMA-
Suzette Moore -DGS-

2) eMaryland Marketplace (eMM)

- a. Tech solution
 - i. System for a universal State vendor account is not effective
 - ii. Possibility of smart solution that learns through use
 - iii. Commercial Off the Shelf solution- demo best 1 or 2
 - iv. Mike Zimmerman to take a look at Gartner Magic Quadrant**
- b. Status on eMM
 - i. Nearing the end of Periscope’s initial contract period
 - ii. Periscope to release new software in May
 - iii. Currently waiting to see new software before investing significant resources in searching for new solution
- c. Vendor Challenges with Current eMM (Rizwan Siddiqi)
 - i. Can’t search keywords
 - ii. Document uploading process is inefficient
 - iii. State Agencies do not have standard forms- are using different versions
 - iv. Redundancy in RFPs creates confusion
 - v. Page limit use isn’t consistent between agencies

3) Discussion of desired outcomes:

Reduce transaction costs.

Increase efficiencies and make procurement process more accessible to businesses.

Allow procurement staff to more effectively manage their time.

Make it easier for businesses to understand and respond.

- a. The group did not suggest any additional outcomes
- b. It was brought up that transaction costs apply to both the State and vendors
- c. The group will wait until the next meeting when more information is available to prioritize outcomes

4) Discussion of Opportunities

- a. Use new technologies
 - i. Replacement of FMIS
 - ii. eMM upgrade
 - iii. Electronic forms
 - iv. Cache of submitted forms so companies do not need to re-upload for every RFP
 - v. Use of tech to simplify process (tech vs. paper)
 - vi. May require updates to regulations and COMAR
- b. Simplify reporting requirements
 - i. Applies to State and vendors
 - ii. Internal reporting is time consuming due to tech resources
 - iii. Receive complaints from vendors about post award reporting
 - iv. Look into tech/automated solution- Gartner, NASCIO?**
 - v. Need a master list of Agency and Vendor Reporting**
 - 1. Mike Zimmerman started Agency list**
 - 2. Need vendor list**
- c. Simplify the Request for Proposal template
 - i. Templates vary between control agencies
 - 1. No mandatory requirement in COMAR to use template
 - ii. Control Agencies should get together to see if a unified template can be created with special provision clauses
 - 1. DoIT, DBM, and DGS began working together on a common template**
 - 2. Need to set up another meeting now that there have been staffing changes- include MDOT**
- d. Reduce number of documents businesses must submit before contract award
 - i. Suggested that the "Simplify reporting requirements" opportunity focus internally and amend this opportunity to also address issues with vendor paperwork and reporting**

- e. Determine how best to address clearly evident mistakes on procurement submissions
 - i. Common mistakes include missed signatures or check boxes- need tech solution that will not allow the user to proceed without completing those steps
 - ii. Use of a digital checklist was suggested
 - iii. Regulations need to be revisited
 - f. Review mandatory terms and conditions of procurement contracts
 - i. Need to revisit terms and conditions to determine their purpose and if they are meeting it- if not that needs to be addressed
 - ii. May be a need for special IT terms and conditions as IT procurements are inherently different
 - iii. Use of self-deleting requirements- for example, the need for insurance for work on government property
 - iv. Proposed change of opportunity to include all terms and conditions, not just the mandatory ones**
 - g. Develop mechanism to deter bidders from submitting frivolous protests
 - i. Discussed use of protest bond- concerns of deterring small businesses with legitimate complaints
 - ii. Need to research protest bond use in other states**
 - h. Need more information developed before prioritizing opportunities- tabled until next meeting**
- 5) Sub-Groups
- a. The group agreed with the idea of developing sub-groups
 - b. Need to take a look at secondary information before developing sub-groups- tabled until next meeting**
 - c. Mike and AI will ask participants for assistance with information gathering**
- 6) Resources needed and possible methodologies
- a. Many smaller departments are involved in the working group and have limited staff resources
 - b. Commissioners will need to put in their own time
 - c. BPW will serve as repository for all data for the work group
- 7) Discuss how the strategies will be prepared and presented
- a. Reporting required in early December
 - b. DoIT/MDOT to work to create rational development costs for sub-group solutions**
- 8) Additional Items

- a. Need to make sure everyone is working on the same assumptions (example centralized vs. decentralized solution)
 - b. All workgroup members should be informed of all sub-group progress
 - c. **Need centralized access point/folder with all documents and minutes**
 - i. **Possibly BPW or Lt. Governor's website**
- 9) Next Meeting
- a. Next meeting will be in-person
 - b. Scheduled for Friday, April 15, 2016
 - c. **Mike will secure a location and send out meeting invite**