



# MEETING MINUTES

## State of Louisiana ERP Project

*Blueprint Workshop/Vendor Evaluation Blueprint Workshop*

Session: LOG-MM-005

12/10/2008 @ 8:30 to 4:30

Location: ISB Building, Room 237, 1800 N. Third Street  
LaGov/Logistic Team

### Attendees

Jack Ladhur  
Adam LaTour  
Cathy Cutrer  
Sharon Schexnayder  
Llewellyn DeFoe  
Theresa Seal  
Sudhir Deshmukh  
Chrishel Shelton

### Agency Attendees:

No	Name	Agency	Invited ?	Attended ?	Comments
1.	Anderson, Shannon	DPS	Y	N	
2.	Bello, Jennifer	DPS	Y	N	
3.	Bloodworth, Dorene	DEQ	Y	N	
4.	Buckner, Yvette	WLF	Y	N	
5.	Eppes, Ginger	DOJ	Y	N	
6.	Fontenot, Duane	DSS	Y	N	
7.	Fruge, John	OYD	Y	Y	
8.	Galloway, Charlotte	CRT	Y	N	
9.	Hays, Robert	NELWV H	Y	N	
10.	Hernandez, Kathy	SOS	Y	N	
11.	Higgenbotham,	AG	Y	N	

	Margaret				
12.	Jones, Shanda	SOS	Y	N	
13.	Kees, Wynette	WLF	Y	N	
14.	Kemp, Tim	LED	Y	N	
15.	Kimmel, Linda	DOTD	Y	N	
16.	Kunjappy, Elizabeth	DOR	Y	N	
17.	Ladatto, Donnie	OSRP	Y	Y	
18.	Landry, Melodie	LDOL	Y	N	
19.	Lea, Denise	OSP	Y	N	
20.	Lewis, Karen	DNR	Y	N	
21.	LeBourgeois, Judy	DNR	N	N	
22.	Liford, J.D.	OTM	Y	N	
23.	Lumbard, Pat	PSC	Y	N	
24.	Marrero, Denise	OFP	Y	N	
25.	Miller, Diane	LDAF	Y	N	
26.	Miller, Lisa	DEQ	Y	N	
27.	Napoli, Paul	DOTD	Y	N	
28.	Naquin, Charlotte	WLF	Y	N	
29.	Newsom, Susan	WLF	Y	N	
30.	Nolan, Debbie	NELWV H	Y	N	
31.	Parent, Carla	DOTD	Y	Y	
32.	Prejean, Jeannie	DOTD	N	N	
33.	Pulliam, Sonya	DHH	Y	Y	
34.	Richardson, Lonnie	LDI	Y	Y	
35.	Sanders, Randy	DOTD	Y	N	
36.	Sewell, Kenyetta	DCSC	Y	N	
37.	Sharp, Suzanne	DOC	Y	N	
38.	Smith, Susan	OCR	Y	N	
39.	Sonnier, Felicia	OSP	Y	Y	
40.	Stewart, Chris	LED	Y	N	
41.	Stribling,	OYD	Y	N	

	Martina				
42.	Thomas, Gwen	DNR	Y	N	
43.	Tickles, Michelle	LDOL	Y	N	
44.	Wallace, Patti	DOE	Y	N	
45.	Ward, Wanda	LDAF	Y	N	
46.	Watson, Eve	DHH	Y	N	
47.	Wedge, Edward	DOTD	Y	Y	

<i>Agenda Item and Notes</i>	<i>Owner(s)</i>	<i>Action Items &amp; Assignments</i>	<i>Comments / Follow-up</i>
<b>1. Logistics, Ground Rules, &amp; Introductions</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Workshop Objectives</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Project Overview/Timeline</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Business Process Review</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Llewellyn DeFoe</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Key Decisions</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group Recommends VE's process Offline</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Action Items</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtain copies of Agency Vendor Evaluation Forms for Standardization</li> <li>• Meet with Kenya to discuss automated system developed by OIS for vendor evaluation tracking for OSP</li> <li>• Meet with Denise to determine if a system is needed to track vendor deficiency forms submitted by the agencies for commodity Purchases</li> <li>• Meet with Susan and Denise to determine what can be published statewide concerning vendor performance</li> <li>• Meet with Susan – do we want to continue security that does not allow agencies to enter vendor performance information in system relating to contracts that were approved by OCR</li> <li>• Check with OCR on what if anything needs to be published for vendor evaluation.</li> <li>• Check with OCR if they need to update the contracts for performance when they where the approval on the contracts, or can the agency do this?</li> <li>• Is there a mechanism to get back to the original web survey, currently the evaluation forms that are completed are made available if requested by the vendor (DOTD)</li> </ul>	

- Check with payables if they want to enter a vendor evaluation at the time of invoice, for payables specific questions.
- For P-Card purchases, if they don't have PO enter can we still enter a vendor evaluation?

**7. Organizational Impacts**

- Training Issues – VE Questionnaire Completion Requirements (WEB Survey)

**8. FRICE-W**

- C-Will there need to be a conversion of DOTD Legacy system RTNG (What is RTNG?)
- Per Adam, there are some options to be evaluation (this is not clear). One option is to bring in the current score of contractors as of the go live date for DOTD and continue averaging after that.
- DOTD could input data in BI
- C-Identify systems (LOTUS Notes, RTNG)
- WEB Surveys must be tracked by PO/Contract
- Law States that agencies must have Vendor Performance Evaluations completed 60 days after contract termination date
- Reminder Notifications for contract Vendor Performance Evaluation

**9. Parking Lot**

- None

**Discussion**

**As-IS DOTD Engineering Services**

Cost is not part of the initial evaluation; after the top 3 vendors have been selected then these bids are sent to an evaluation committee. The evaluation committee reviews these submittal, they also deal with any complaints of rating assigned to consulting companies at a hearing however this is rare (What is the criteria for a hearing?).

The vendor evaluation is part of the selection process which is governed by legislation.

Each job can have multiple rating categories; they examine the cost associated with the project and then apply categories in those proportions. These categories are associated with rating templates / forms. Each one of the categories will map to one of the 5 template forms. These templates are online forms (do we have examples of the templates?) (in RTNG) and they are moving towards web based application. The criteria on these forms are general as well as specific questions related to type of job (template). The PM (What is the PM?) will rate the performance on the form and this is done at major milestones, once a year or by end of the project whichever is earlier (Is there a criteria for milestones? Do we need to define what determines a milestone?). This rating /completion of the form are not mandatory. (Preferably would want this required) A generic email is sent to the

---

---

PM and vendors to remind them to complete the performance evaluation. This is sent by the contract administration (Ed Group) RTNG (What is RTNG?) is a home grown system that is used for vendor evaluation this contains a subset of vendors these vendors are manually added to this system.

The time period for an evaluation is 3 years. If new vendors are bidding for the job coming on board and do not have a prior vendor evaluation, then an average of the lowest rating is assigned from either the State rating or the average of the history of the job rating .

Multiple reports are available in this system; statewide average is posted to the website, the rating criteria are posted on the website and is not part of the RFP documentation.

Consulting companies can view the rating if requested, they have the ability to view the rating forms of themselves and other companies. Sometimes they request to review the rating and see how they can improve their past performance in a post review session.

### **As- IS Commodities**

3 offline forms are used

- Deficiency
- Contract
- Performance Evaluation

These forms are then filed with the vendor file offline. The deficiency process is not part of the vendor evaluation process, going forward we may have a question in which we could rate the vendor as unsatisfactory at a given timeframe as part of the vendor evaluation form. (This sentence is confusing; too long need to be concise to clarify concept)

Currently for commodities there is no formal vendor evaluation process if it was not procured through the RFP process, they have more of a deficiency process

### **Professional Services Contract**

Evaluations are required by legislation, these evaluations are by contract and needs to be completed within 60 days. The performance evaluation report is an offline word document. Once the document has been completed. Upon completion of the offline form, the agency approving the contract will update CFMS with the performance status. If within a defined timeframe, an external process is followed for surveys that have not been completed. The State has agency and OCR reports that they use to monitor this.

### **SAP Vendor Evaluation**

The questionnaires / template forms are configuration (was this added to the FRICE-W section). To use automated scoring there is an expectation that the data is entered in a timely manner. Once a scorecard is populated (something is missing; this is an incomplete thought)

The mechanism that is used to report back to the vendor is usually done via a BI report.

Evaluation reports are available to see if the surveys are completed, this is similar to OCR requirement where they monitor based on transactions.

The offline vendor evaluation is similar to the DOTD process and Professional Services. The current OCR report is not score based. They have comments and overall rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

For offline survey these would have to be entered in BW, by vendor by product category.

There is the ability to have different setting by PORG, this is usually used by global business who have different rules and regulations depending on location.

Want to have the flexibility to be able to enter web survey for commodities spent.

---

---

---

---

### **Web Surveys**

If Web surveys are to be used for commodities they have to be tracked by a PO at the time of final invoice. This process is currently offline. The evaluation process would be across the State vendors, not for agency transactions.

Vendor evaluations can be tracked by PO and commodity code

### **Decision**

Vendor evaluation will be conducted offline via a BI web survey.

Reports will be used to verify if evaluations are completed for professional services – similar today's process.

Vendor evaluations will not be required, the completion of these will be handled via a business process.

---