Title: Purchasing Discovery Session #2

Date: August 9, 2016

Participants: Chad Cox, Brenda Keen, Christie Haynes, Lauren Holcomb, Michael Oldham, Cliff Merkell, Mary Eubanks, Bill Weyrich, Jeniece Vinson, Chad Cleveland, LaTosha Pittard, Susan McCullough, Jennifer Dobbs, Russell Hatfield, Kenneth Little, Annette Evans, Claire Boyd, Kathy McCarty, Brandi Shealy, Christy Bailey, Jessica Beri, Deanna Wang, Angela Varnes, Hall Gibson, Jennifer Dunlap, Ocie Anderson, Susan Cowart, Matthew Whitley, Teresa Page, Rick Marr, Dwayne Weaver, Sean Suskind

Topics discussed:

Item	Notes
Introductions & Overview	• Welcome and Introductions of new attendees were made. • Cliff Merkell explained what he's looking for in these meetings – He's listening for key test scenarios, conversion challenges, and decision points.
Purchasing Questionnaire: Quotes Review	• Confirmed that quotes are attached to requisitions and reside in SQ and the req plus quotes are then associated wiith the PO when it is created • There are several systems used by Procurement for competitive bidding (Quotes): Sourcing Director (SciQuest), e-Source, and the GPR (GA Procurement Registry). E-Source and the GPR are State of GA maintained systems. Sourcing Director quotes are automatically captured in SciQuest; however, quotes outside of Sourcing Director need to be scanned into SciQuest and attached to the applicable requisition. • Mainframe does not store requisition numbers, only PO numbers, which partially mirrors SQ PO numbers (there are a few extra characters) • PO numbers are alphanumeric in both SQ and mainframe • PS will need a list of units of measure from SQ to check for compatibility • TBD: Does PS have a records retention method for quotes/attachments (pdf and other file types) for data located in SQ?

Purchasing Questionnaire: Receipts Review	• All receipts/matching occurs in SQ • Upon receipt/inspection, inspection results are recorded in SQ
Purchasing Questionnaire: Purchasing Review	• Every contract release in SQ becomes its own PO • UGA PO type is transmitted to the mainframe and will continue to be needed for State/BOR reporting purposes ○ This information also goes to the BOR data warehouse – potential need for PS integration with BOR data warehouse • Updated PO types (revisions) also transmit to the mainframe – PS will need to determine business process for changing PO types after the fact • All PO's are issued by the Procurement Department only • TBD: Full conversation regarding business process for closing PO's prior to full receipt will be discussed later • AP currently closes encumbrances in the mainframe, outside of SQ • Mainframe provides report to AP for aging encumbrances with no activity for 90 days • UGA does not close POs in SQ • SQ revisions can add new line items to POs that were already closed on mainframe • Issued POs are added to mainframe hourly • We need to test the closed but partially used encumbrance scenario in PS • Electronic payments to vendors occur in the mainframe • AP is looking into ACH payments to vendors during this process • All payments/POs are issued in US dollars • Test inter-company purchasing scenario • VetView inventory is not housed on mainframe • TBD: At fiscal year-end, UGA's process of conversion to liability accounts means we lose visibility of the original accounting information – we would like to move away from this and need to define what can be done. With PS, both budget and encumbrance will need to get rolled over at fiscal year-end. • Partial POs currently pending will need to be converted to PS • Clarification: All historical PO information is important for daily operations across campus (not just for potential open records scenarios); sandwich model would likely need to carry all SQ data and attachments forward

	• TBD: Will POs need to exist in PS as full objects? • TBD: Will SQ be able to integrate PS changes within our existing SQ platform, or will another separate site have to be built?
Purchasing Questionnaire: Catalogs Review	• UGA catalog management does not currently require a lot of manual processing • PS requires a category designation for items on a PO – could potentially use NIGP codes like Georgia First (5 digits plus description) • If UGA goes with sandwich model, we would not want end-users to enter NIGP codes • TBD: How to define how assets are tagged; currently relying on object codes (manual process)
Purchasing Questionnaire: Items Review	• Skipped, these questions were covered in the discussions that occurred in reviewing the Catalog section of the questionnaire
Purchasing Questionnaire: Supplier Rebates Review	• Skipped, After Cliff Merkell gave an explanation of this module it was determined that UGA would most likely not implement the Supplier Rebate module of PS
Purchasing Questionnaire: Procurement Cards Review	• PS p-card module allows users to download all transactions and then log in to apply chart string • UGA uses WORKS from Bank of America to manage the p-card program and expects cardholders to assign UGA account numbers/object codes to each transaction. For those cardholders who don't assign an account number or object code, the default account number on the p-card is used and an appropriate object code is assigned by the Accounting department when no response is received after follow-up from the cardholder's department. • TBD: Whether Bank of America will be able to handle new chart string in WORKs • PS requires manual setup of all users in the PS p-card module, there is no known interface to get user profiles from WORKs into PS. ○ Bank of America requires the use of WORKs to initiate a p-card request

	○ Dual entry for some data will be required if UGA implements the PS p-card module • Currently Works data is downloaded weekly by Accounting and paid in full monthly by Accounts Payable • TBD: Can level three data (line item descriptions) be pushed into PS? Level three data is only provided by some merchants. Level three data mirrors what customers see on the receipt. • TBD: Does all of the merchant/vendor data (small, disadvantaged, vet owned, minority status, etc.) import into the PS module? • TBD: Does all of the p-card transaction data import into the PS module?
Purchasing Questionnaire: Workflow Review	• User login to SQ is validated by Payroll/HR • Could potential HCM integration within PS allow for automatic deactivation of users in SQ? • Voucher & manual journal entry workflow will be in PS • PS will be able to allow for multiple accounts on one check request • Most likely the Relocation and Moving Expense Payment Form stay in SQ
Other	• Anyone with additional questions, comments, concerns, or feedback – email directly to onesource@uga.edu, or visit the OneSource site and click the contact link (onesource.uga.edu).

Action Items:

Item	Due Date	Person(s) Responsible
<Item 1>	<date>	<name>
<Item 2>	<date>	<name>
<Item 3>	<date>	<name>

Decisions:

Description	Person(s) Responsible
<Item 1>	<name>
<Item 2>	<name>
<Item 3>	<name>

Change Management Items:

Description
<Item 1>
<Item 2>
<Item 3>

Parking Lot Items:

Description
<Item 1> UGA needs to decide if we will migrate to the PeopleSoft P-Card functionality, or continue to uses the Bank of America WORKs system.
<Item 2>
<Item 3>