

From: Soura, Christian
To: Veldran, Katherine <KatherineVeldran@gov.sc.gov>
Date: 2/14/2013 4:53:55 PM
Subject: RE: Test

Are we talking about this passage?

Central Procurement Official

Of all respondents, thirty-eight states have a Single Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) who prescribes procurement rules and regulations. The CPO reports to a cabinet-level official in twenty-six states. When asked about the role of the CPO in strategic planning for the state relative to the past five years, twenty-four procurement officials indicated that their role increased, including interfacing with the state's governor.

That answers a different question than what we discussed in our slide. So the paragraph above from NASPO says that the CPO reports to a cabinet-level official in 26 states, but that's not the critical question. For instance, in Pennsylvania, the CPO reports to the Deputy Secretary for Procurement (who in turn reports to a cabinet-level officer). So Pennsylvania isn't one of the 26 states...but procurement is within a cabinet agency, which is what we're talking about. NASPO looks at reporting relationships in this paragraph, not the branch of government.

For purposes of S.22, I'd argue that the NASPO figure is irrelevant, because it looks at where within the hierarchy of government the Chief Procurement Officer resides (so "vertically" in the organization chart). Our argument is that procurement belongs firmly and purely within a cabinet agency in the executive branch. S.22 is a fight over where the Chief Procurement Officer goes "horizontally" in the org chart...which box? DoA or SFAA? NASPO didn't speak to that here.

Our figure comes from NASCA, which is the National Association of State Chief Administrators (of which I'm obviously a former member). They keep pretty good tabs on what function each administrative agency performs in each state. As I've said in a verbal footnote a couple of times, the only place where their data gets a bit messy is when there are multiple cabinet agencies in a state that have different pieces of the backoffice. For instance, a few states have IT procurement largely governed out of an IT agency and the rest of procurement in another agency. If the latter agency is the NASCA member agency, then NASCA's list might make it look like IT procurement isn't part of the administrative agency in that state. For instance, some states have a separate Department of Information Resources as a partner agency to a Department of Administration or General Services.

So I think the NASCA figure is much more pertinent to this conversation than NASPO's. If folks are worried about the hierarchy question, I'm sure we'd be willing to work something out to leave procurement in the Department of Administration and put the "Chief Procurement Officer" position one step lower on the food chain.

CLS

Christian L. Soura
Deputy Chief of Staff

(803) 543-0792
ChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov

From: Veldran, Katherine
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 4:40 PM
To: Soura, Christian
Subject: FW: Test

She referenced page 3

From: Paula Benson [<mailto:PaulaBenson@scsenate.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Veldran, Katherine
Subject: RE: Test

Paula S. Benson

Paula Benson
Senior Staff Attorney
S.C. Senate Judiciary Committee
P.O. Box 142
Columbia, S.C. 29202
(803) 212-6636

From: Veldran, Katherine [<mailto:KatherineVeldran@gov.sc.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 4:36 PM
To: Paula Benson
Subject: Test

Katherine F. Veldran
Legislative Liaison | Office of Governor Nikki Haley
O: 803-734-5124 | C: 803-767-7583
KatherineVeldran@gov.sc.gov