



MILLENNIUM
CHALLENGE CORPORATION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



MCC Contract Writing System Acquisition and Implementation: A small agency perspective

Jim Blades

Senior Procurement Executive, MCC

Initial Requirement

- Since agency inception (2004) MCC's ability to afford an automated contract management and writing system was precluded due to budget constraints
- FY 2011 MCC sought to procure a contract management and writing system in tandem with a financial services and system shared service provider
- Heavily detailed specification based on larger agency requirements included in original RFP to other potential servicing agencies

DOI Proposal

- Department of Interior's Interior (National) Business Center proposed Oracle CLM module in tandem with IBC financial management system and accounts payable service as an optional task
- Oracle CLM answered requirements, but was beyond agency FY 2011 budget constraints, would not be ready for development to commence until mid FY 2013, and (at the time) had not previously been implemented at any other agencies

Alternatives

- Given FY 2011 budget constraints, MCC sought alternatives to DOI/Oracle solution by developing streamlined requirements and posting RFI to GSA e-Buy in Spring of 2011
- Moved away from previously detailed specification and toward more broad Statement of Objectives (SOO) that focused on some core requirements based on MCC's business processes

Revised Requirements

- Program office (front) end for automating program office approval and budget approval process and procurement request packages – previously conducted via email
- Contract Writing System (FAR Requirements) – previously done manually in managed word document templates
- Connections to IAE – including FPDS (most important), CCR/SAM, and others (EPLS, FBO), previously done separately
- Workload Tracking – method for moving, assigning and tracking work in an automated fashion - previously done via custom access database (interim system created FY 2010) and emails
- Reporting – previously done through access database created in FY 2010 as an interim workload tracker
- Connections to Oracle for commitments, obligations and de-obligations
- Migration of legacy database



Analysis of RFI Responses

- MCC analyzed RFI responses, taking into account certain issues to refine SOO, providing additional detail for main requirements
- Identified multiple vendors that could meet requirements
- Briefed upper management on feasibility of alternatives to unaffordable DOI/Oracle solution
- Granted budget to do so, but only if able to award within FY 2011

Competition – GSA FSS e-Buy

- MCC conducted a fair opportunity competition via GSA FSS e-Buy, received multiple proposals in summer 2011 timeframe
- Evaluated proposals, including both oral presentations/demonstrations and written proposals
- Revised requirements and issued solicitation amendment to remove Oracle obligations interface due to cost and technical risk issues with all proposals received, maintained commitment interface requirements - this means we do not have a fully automated system and some processes remain manual
- Awarded contract in September 2011

Implementation

- Began implementation of system, MCC CGM Contract Management System (CCMS), using DSI's Automated Acquisition Management System (AAMS) for contracting office and Program Office Management Solution (POMS) for program office users to submit packages
- Implementation period from late September 2011 to February 2012 included business process analysis (BPA), data gathering
- Achieved crucial objectives, including automation of procurement package submission process, Oracle commitments interface, data migration from legacy database, and desired features as included in the SOO and the contractor PWS, inclusive of reporting
- Included System Configuration user roles and permissions, and C&A approval

Remaining Challenges

- **Limited capabilities** for complex CLIN structures within system
- **Data entry reduced by IAE interface**, but still significant (and increasing due to FPDS expansions)
- **Training of new users** - dealing with turnover that occurs, a likely challenge for small agencies without budgetary resources or personnel to dedicate to regular training
- **System solution** used by MCC is **transaction based** and does not collect much conformed contract data, making some data calls difficult to respond to
- **Technical issues** of operating web-based, hosted solution **in a constantly-changing IT operational environment** with new system images (e.g., MCC's recent Windows 7 transition, new PC/laptop rollouts)

Main Takeaways

- Understand your agency processes “as is” and what you expect them “to be”, this will be vital during BPA
- Use of an SOO vice trying to define every possible requirement - good approach with limited resources
- Ensure you have a person with knowledge of contracts, typical/critical business processes and the Knowledge Base, who understands the requirements and can manage the implementation
- Be sure to understand necessary interfaces, financial systems, hosting requirements, life-cycle costs to implement and maintain (including licenses and training), i.e., get IT, Finance and budget people involved

Reducing Poverty Through Growth

Back-up Information

1. COTS – primary model – transactional and feeds the federal model
2. FPDS – data model – transactional – Robust – hard data model to follow
3. Anything requested outside of these two models is non-transactional requires the non-transactional and transactional models to exist side by side – this requires double data entry and it is not cost effective

COTS
CCMS
Contracts

COTS
ORACLE
Finance

