OneSource

Title: Purchasing Discovery Session #3

Date: August 10, 2016

Participants: Chad Cox, 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, Christy Bailey, Jessica Beri, Deanna Wang, Angela Varnes, Hall Gibson, Jennifer Dunlap, Susan Cowart, Sean Suskind, Kim Seabolt

Topics discussed:

Item	Notes
Introductions & Overview	• Welcome and Introductions of new attendees were made.

Purchasing Questionnaire: Reporting Requirements Review	• Cycle Time Report – UGA would like to be able to choose customized timeframes for this report, as well as specify additional parameters such as department, workflow step, dollar value, urgency, and PO type. The final output for this report is a manual process.
	  ○ Receiving life cycle report (including redelivery time from Central Receiving to campus) would also be beneficial
	• Informational Note: Report consumers can be defined as customers on campus (departments), Procurement, management, and vendors
	• Vendor Database Report – The final output for this report is a manual process.
	  ○ TBD: Is this report being used by campus? Parameters may need to be changed to make this more useful
	• 14-Day Report – UGA needs to be able to more easily tell when a requisition reaches a Procurement approval step. This report is sent to about 38 people on a weekly basis.
	• In SQ, the Procurement/Buyer workflow step is where the approval trigger occurs that converts a requisition to a purchase order
	• Active Contracts – this is an export from SQ that Procurement uses to track Buyer contract assignment and when contracts will expire

	◦ The SQ contracts area is a separate document and includes dates, budget/spend information, and other key indicators. Requisitions, Purchase Orders and Invoices are flagged with the contract number to track spend. • I&S Report – most data comes from SQ, but some comes from p-card and e-check ◦ P-card and e-check data is manually maintained separately, then combined with SQ export ◦ Buyers manually type the e-verify number into requisitions ◦ Because contractors must provide the e-verify number for every PO, this number is not tied to the vendor in SQ for the purposes of pre-population ◦ PS has fields where we could potentially store the e-verify number in the vendor system to check for potential mistyped info or company name changes • Annual Management Report – statistics & measurements pulled from SQ to describe transactions; includes p-card (Works) and check request (manual). ◦ Some data comes from other reports (i.e. Cycle Time Report) • Yearly Self-Audit – data pulled from SQ and then fit into Excel template ◦ Would like to pull this from PS in the correct template format as long as all PO data gets transmitted to PS – other BOR institutions on PS are already using this method ◦ Only includes PO data – no p-card or e-check. ◦ PS will show all revisions, not just the latest – this is good, because this is SPD's preference • Federal Small Business Sub-Contract Report – applies to purchases using federal accounts that require this type of reporting. ◦ Business classifications are in UVDB and passed to SQ; some are manually updated at this time but will be built into new vendor system for automatic sync ◦ Report comes from mainframe, UVDB, and SQ ◦ TBD: Users must currently tell Procurement when an account requires the report; can PS automate this (perhaps with project level coding in the chart string)? To be

	discussed with both Post-Award Accounting and Procurement.
	• Monthly Self-Audit Report – SQ export is adequate; PO info only
	• Quarterly Report to BOR – the report contains business classifications (SBME spend report).
	  ○ Data pulls from mainframe for PO spend and Works for p-card spend
	  ○ Involves manual sorting/formatting
	• PS query tool should allow for searching on any available field
	• In PS, there may be a database created for query purposes (instead of live Production queries)
	• In PS, query tool allows everyone to see everything; however, there are some security settings/tables in place to restrict data if it is deemed necessary
	• It would be helpful if Procurement could see if vendors being set up as individuals were also employees – perhaps vendor system can check for payroll status?
	• PS allows for ad-hoc and saving reports
	• It would be helpful to be able to query across multiple document types (requisition, PO, etc.) – PS has something already that may do this, but it would require all document types to be transmitted to and stored in PS.

Purchasing Questionnaire: Interface Review	• PR Validation – includes chart string & account balance info • Custom Field Sync – chart of accounts maintenance • Login – profile info relayed every time a user logs in, but passwords are not transmitted; this will need to stay as-is until HCM comes online. • TBD: Self-registration system for vendors in PS – we'll have to look into how this will work • VetView – Currently PR's come from VetView into SQ, then PO gets sent back to VetView once issued. VetView can then poll SQ for order receipt notices (three integration points) • TBD: Should Works information be pulled into PS via voucher or GL function? Voucher would allow for richer data set, but require a budget check type of workflow. Each transaction would be a line on a voucher; how many line items can a voucher allow? • UGA must keep SQ connection to Team Georgia Marketplace (SPD)

Purchasing Questionnaire: Conversion Review	• Validation – someone will need to check to make sure data is being converted correctly. For example:
	  ○ Inactive vendors should not get converted
	  ○ NIGP codes should be retained
	• TBD – Will we need or be able to convert chart strings in old SQ records?

Purchasing Questionnaire: Roles and Security Review	• Currently roles exist and are solely managed in SQ. The list of roles was provided to PS and will be used at a later date.
Overview of Next Week's White Boarding Sessions	• These are not discussions per se; these sessions will be used to frame key issues and begin to develop implementation strategies • Will focus on both functional and technical aspects (from PR to check, for example) • Key question: How will encumbrances get created and liquidated in PS? • Compare full-suite and sandwich model strategies so that a decision can be made

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>

OneSource

Change Management Items:

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

Parking Lot Items:

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