



**Workforce Information Technology Procurement Project
Executive Steering Committee
Conference Call Minutes**

Date: January 24, 2014		Time: 3:00 p.m.		Location: Department of Economic Opportunity	
Steering Committee Members Attending:		Lois Scott, Chair Richard Williams		Scott Fennell Becky Rust	
Members Absent from Meeting:		Rick Beasley			
Other Attendees		Barbara Griffin Linda Reel	Cliff Atkinson Gene Rhodes	Mable Hicks Michael Van Sickler (TBT)	
<p>Purpose: On-going meeting of the Workforce Information Technology Procurement Project Executive Steering Committee. The committee was created to provide direction and support to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) in its effort to procure a Software as a Service (SaaS) solution for Florida's Workforce System's programs and services. The current vendor contract expires December 2014.</p>					
<p>Discussion: Lois Scott, Committee Chair, called the conference call to order at 3:04 p.m. with three members of the Steering Committee on the call, Ms. Rebecca Rust joined the call at 3:07 p.m. Ms. Scott welcomed and thanked everyone for calling in and reminded them that the call was a public meeting and as such, was being recorded. Ms. Scott conducted a roll call of committee members to insure that it would be reflected in the minutes. Others on the phone and attending the meeting in person were asked to identify themselves. She then provided a brief overview of the agenda items for the call.</p> <p>Ms. Scott stated that the primary purpose of the meeting was to provide a status report regarding the procurement project and to listen to any feedback or input from the Executive Steering Committee members. She also mentioned that for reasons associated with procurement protocols, Barbara Griffin would record any input and share that information appropriately with the Negotiators in a Negotiators' meeting, and that Scott Fennell was participating in the meeting in his capacity as a member of the Executive Steering Committee only. Barbara Griffin was then asked to proceed with the update.</p>					
Project Update					
<p>Ms. Griffin shared that on November 8, 2013, DEO received sealed replies from prospective vendors to the Department's Invitation to Negotiate (14-ITN-001-KH). Proposals were received from Monster Government Solutions, Deloitte, Cloud Sherpas and Symplicity. All four responses were deemed responsive and referred to the Evaluators for review and scoring.</p>					

Reference checks were received from prior clients of the respondents in addition to reference checks conducted by DEO.

Evaluators completed the scoring and submitted their evaluations on time and on December 4th in a public meeting the Evaluators met and advanced Monster Government Solutions and Deloitte to the short-list of vendors based on their respective scores which automatically qualified them to move forward.

During January 6th through January 9th the two respondents provided two days of presentations and demonstrations. On January 15th the ITN Negotiators met and voted to advance Monster to the negotiation phase of the project. On January 24th, DEO conducted a conference call with Monster and plans to schedule the first negotiation on February 4, 2014.

The next steps will be that the Negotiators and Monster will have rounds of negotiations, the number to be determined by the progress made in those deliberations until either an agreement is reached or there is an impasse. Assuming an agreement is reached, it is anticipated that on March 6, 2014, there would be a public meeting for the Negotiation Team to discuss and recommend an intention to award. On March 13th it is anticipated the intent to award would be posted. These are tentative dates determined by the progress of the negotiations.

On March 19th through March 31st, the time is set aside in the plan for contract development, although everyone should be aware that during the negotiation process, much of the documentation of the contract is developed during that process. It is expected that by April 14th the contract will be executed and April 15th will be the start date of the project development with 'Go Live' expected to be January 1, 2015.

Ms. Griffin acknowledged and thanked the Negotiators, Evaluators and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) from across the state for all their hard work on this project. She stated that the project was currently on schedule however, predicting the exact length of time it will take is impossible because in the negotiation phase things can move very quickly and the process could be accelerated or there could be issues that require more time. Once an agreement is reached and the contract is processed and finalized the execution date is April 14th hopefully sooner but cannot guarantee.

Discussion of Priorities

Ms. Griffin informed committee members that the Project Team was not in a position to discuss the contents of the various respondents' proposals because that is not a part of the public record at this time. However, she would capture any input or priorities from committee members regarding the project and provide it to the Negotiators.

Before opening the meeting for concerns or recommendations from committee members Ms. Scott thanked the Project Team for keeping the project on schedule so far. She stated that the Team has done an exceptional job making certain that the information is available to all members of the State Workforce Team. She thanked the Legal Office for working with us as well as the Procurement Team in Purchasing to ensure that we remain on target in terms of what we are doing and that we do so and remain legal. Ms. Scott then asked for comments from committee members.

Richard Williams wanted to know, based on the responses received, how well we did in terms of getting answers to the priorities laid out in the ITN. On the advice of Legal Counsel, the question could not be answered. Mr. Williams then addressed a question to DEO and Workforce Florida, asking, as we move forward, looking at things we want in the system, are we making sure that things that may be going on outside of the system are also lining up to avoid duplication (example: CRM). Ms. Griffin responded that it is a matter of record that all the Regions have been requested to provide a list of all their projects and contracts so that everything possible can be done to ensure they are in-cooperated into an agreement. Responses have been received from almost all of the Regions and will be provided to the Negotiators. Ms. Griffin stated she would reach out to the Regions once again to ensure that all their information has been collected.

Mr. Williams then stated that his concern was not only regional but applied to WFI and DEO where WFI is working on a CRM tool that may not be a part of the new system, but if it is, it needs to be taken into consideration as to whether or not we move forward with it.

Ms. Griffin stated that as it relates to that specific project, she and Scott Fennell have had some discussions and no final decision has been made. Ms. Scott stated that we will continue to work with WFI and DEO staff to make certain that there are no projects underway or planned that might conflict or be replicated in the system.

Rebecca Rust was concerned about data consistency. She stated that Monster uses Wanted Technologies for their on-line ads for jobs in demand and DEO's Labor Market Statistics Bureau uses the Conference Board - Help Wanted On-Line which has a contract with Wanted Technologies. Wanted Technologies is the major input to Help Wanted On-Line but the Conference Board adds value to that data and makes it a better economic database indicator and applies concepts to the data that are conducive to labor market information. To ensure consistent data between what the vendor would have verses DEO we may want to have Conference Board in the system that is being developed.

Ms. Griffin responded that after discussions with Ms Rust and developing the ITN, the Team tried to make certain that in the requirements and the ITN itself, data and labor market information and appropriate attributions were discussed, her specific question had not been raised. She asked Ms. Rust to have someone on her Team document the question and it will be submitted to Monster along with a series of questions that are appropriate for the negotiation.

Mr. Williams asked about the data community colleges need and want our assistance in helping them track graduates and whether they are getting jobs related to their field of study. He wanted to know if ensuring that data was included was a point of negotiation so that it was available. Ms. Scott commented on the Economic Security Report generated annually that was mandated last year. The report is based on outcomes of education; how many graduates actually went to work in the field that they received their degree in and other data. The information comes from FETPIP, one of our partners. The data could be downloaded and the question on how can we incorporate the employment security data will be sent to the Negotiators.

Ms. Rust stated that for the report to provide training related employment, additional data would need to be collected and that LMS is currently working on a study to collect an occupational identifier on the RA wage record to tell if they are in training related employment. Ms. Scott stated that she would ask Barbara Griffin to provide the information to the Negotiators to discuss with the Respondent.

Regional Engagement

Ms. Griffin stated that as soon a contract is signed we will be moving into development, refining and deployment, testing, etc. This will call upon program staff at the state level but possibly more so at the regional level where regional and One-Stop staffs are the ones who use the system everyday assisting employers and job seekers. Ms. Griffin and Mr. Williams have discussed an approach to identify and recruit subject matter experts from across the state. Our goals are to have access to and utilize the talent and input of our best experts in Tallahassee and across the state. We want to make sure that the entire workforce system is engaged so that everyone understands and can contribute and give us the best input to make sure this is the high quality system we all desire. WFI will be asked for their expertise and engagement as well as Ms. Scott's Program Staff and others at the state level.

Ms. Griffin then addressed "Communication". As we move further into the project there will be rapid turn-around requests for information and each region has its own organizational structure for handling these requests. We want to make sure that the regions and the project are positioned in such a way as to get the information. We don't want to have to make decisions without the input from people across the state because it makes for a more quality product. We are going to be in situations where we will have to receive information quickly. Ms. Griffin asked Mr. Williams to assist in identifying who the Project Team needs to communicate with and ensuring that regional leadership is kept informed to make sure that whatever we do is reflective of their thinking.

Mr. Williams stated that the importance of this project has been stressed to regional leadership and that Ms. Griffin should notify him if requested information is not being provided in a timely manner.

Project Change Control

Cliff Atkinson discussed the change control process. When the contract with the vendor is signed we move into a new phase and occasionally there will be places where changes will need to be made to the system that are not necessarily within the original scope. In advance preparation a Change Control Board has been established. The process will be that as changes are identified at the project level that have scope or time impact, they will be elevated to the Change Control Board which will do a first cut at reviewing and approving if we can go forward with the changes (whether they are important enough to move forward with or maybe they are changes that we don't need to approve). If the changes are substantive, they would move up to the Executive Steering Committee if they are beyond the authority of the Change Control board.

He related that all of the members of the Change Control Board have been named and identified with the exception of WFI whose preference was to maintain a non-voting presence. The members were identified as: Linda Sumblin, Workforce Region 2; Tracy Lansberry, Workforce Region 24; Kevin Neil, Workforce Region 12; James Finch, DEO; Isabelle Potts, DEO; Daniel Harper, DEO; and Cliffin Atkinson, Chair, DEO.

Mr. Williams asked if the process would be similar post "go Live", to which Mr. Atkinson answered yes, the process would be similar. Ms. Scott noted that it could be possible that the same team remain in place and Mr. Atkinson stated that it is a very good team and we would be happy to have the same team moving forward.

Governor's Letter

Ms. Griffin stated that during the last Executive Steering Committee meeting the Project Team was charged with preparing a letter to university and college presidents for the Governor's signature. We were encouraging the universities and colleges to encourage their students and graduates to use our workforce labor exchange system and services and the universities and colleges to use the system to post job listings to support their recruitment efforts.

A letter was prepared by Gene Rhodes who crafted the original draft with input from committee members and WFI. We were advised that we needed to provide some success stories which we were able to do with the assistance of Richard Williams. The letter went through the Department's review process and is now in the Governor's Office awaiting approval. There are 39 separate letters, each Executive Director is mentioned in reference and contact information is included in the letter to the corresponding and appropriate college or university president. We will get the letters out as soon as the Governor signs off on them.

Other Issues

Richard Williams asked, when the negotiation process has been completed and we have a signed contract, would it be possible to sit down as a group and go over what was done in the process to see what worked and what didn't work so that there will be a record for review in the event the process has to be repeated in the future.

Barbara Griffin commented that it would be an excellent thing to do. We all learn as we go, new issues emerge with every procurement depending on what you are trying to accomplish, who is affected and public demands and the Project Team will work with him to get it done.

Ms. Scott asked for Public Comments Being none, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.