



This document aims to capture key questions or action items from the most recent Senior Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG) meeting. Items may include questions that were not answered live, or perhaps required updates, adjustments, or additional research. To ensure clarity, this document is distributed to all SPAG participants who attended the respective meeting.

As always, should you have any questions, concerns, or further information to share related to procurement, please email central.procurement@maryland.gov. If you need to update your registration or add staff to the meetings, please complete the [online form](#).

June 2026

Question	Answer
Segment: Review Process for Award Submission Packages	
Does the award submission happen after agency approval?	The agency will first develop its award recommendation. Prior to notifying the recommended awardee, the agency must submit the procurement package, including the recommendation, to OSP for review.
For the Award submission, we typically include the signed contract. How will this affect that process? Will the BPW checklist be updated?	The agency will submit their package prior to notifying the recommended awardee and obtaining a signed contract. The OSP milestone tracker will be updated to add this step prior to submitting the final BPW approval package. Any other checklists or tools for the procurement officer will be updated.
How will that effect obtaining the vendors documents that normally are received post recommendation to award	Once OSP reviews and approves the award recommendation, the agency Procurement Officer would then continue the procurement steps to obtain a signed contract from the recommended awardee and then notify any non-awardees after the signed contract is received.

When does this new policy for the Agency Submission Package take effect? What is the effective date?	The target implementation date is July 1 for Fiscal Year 2027. However, agencies will be notified once the tools have been updated, along with guidance on the documentation Procurement Officers are required to submit and the timing of those submissions.
Does this include an updated tracker for the A/E Team that accurately reflects our current process?	This change is for agencies that are delegated to conduct their own procurements with OSP oversight. The OSP oversight step needs to occur earlier in the process than is currently noted in the milestone tracker and checklist tools.
If we ask them to sign the contract prior to submission, that would be a notice of award. How do we navigate this?	Agency POs may not obtain contract signatures for procurements over the small procurement threshold until after OSP approval has been obtained.
Confirm if this is after AAG approval?	AAG approval is not required for an award recommendation. That responsibility rests with the Procurement Officer and the Agency Head. The AAG's role is to review and approve the contract for legal sufficiency, which occurs after the OSP review and approval.
Does that mean there will be two submissions to OSP-Req prior to award and post award?	Yes, but the goal is the second submission review and approval will be shorter.
So this is a separate review process prior to the BPW submission and review process? What is the turnaround time on this new review process?	Yes. This timeline will be defined in the updated milestone tracker.
How long will the pre-award review take and what document should be submitted?	This information will be provided with the updated milestone tracker and OSP approval checklist.
Is this just for BPW submissions?	No, this is for all procurements over the small procurement threshold where OSP has delegated the agency to conduct their

	own procurement.
What is the time frame for DGS review/approval for the award letter?	This information will be provided with the updated milestone tracker and OSP approval checklist.
Is this pre-award notification review required only for awards that will require BPW approval?	No, this is for all procurements over the small procurement threshold where OSP has delegated the agency to conduct their own procurement.
When would the Table B documents be reviewed and approved by OSP?	After the award recommendation has been approved by OSP.
How much time can we anticipate this to add to the procurement process timeline?	The intent is that the overall timeline will not change; rather, certain review and approval activities will occur earlier in the procurement process. This shift may result in more efficient and faster final approvals.
Is this process just review notification or will we receive approval to proceed with award?	This review and approval are required for the award recommendation to allow the Procurement Officer to proceed with contract award.
Is there a checklist? Or something that will be added to the OSP site?	The milestone tracker and review checklists will be updated and posted on the OSP website.
How quickly are those approvals going to be turned around?	It depends on whether the agency submits all documentation and the procurement was conducted in accordance with SF&P, COMAR, and OSP Policies.
Is OSP expecting legal review prior to the package sent to OSP?	Not for the award recommendation review.
Does that include IQC's?	This is for any procurements conducted outside of OSP above the small procurement threshold.
Does this review apply to contracts including renewals?	No, only new procurement contracts.

Can you hold off until you fully flesh this new requirement out?	This requirement is already applicable under Level 1 delegated procurements; however, OSP has not previously enforced it. Enforcement of this requirement will now be implemented moving forward.
Segment: Small Business Preference (SBP) Policy	
If SBP is ONLY for Competitive Sealed Bids, then that would mean it isn't available for SP Cat III also, correct?	No, you can use SBP for any procurement conducted via bids or quotes. When a procurement is designated as Small Business Reserve (SBR), but no interest is received from eligible small businesses, or if the Rule of One applies, the SBR designation may be removed and Small Business Preference (SBP) language may instead be included in the solicitation. This guidance applies to procurements evaluated based solely on price.
Can SBP be utilized on PORFPs and TORFPs since they are secondary competition and treated as CSBs by COMAR (outside of altered award issuance provisions)	SBP can be used for PORFPs since they are equivalent to an IFB under secondary competition that is a request for bids/quotes under the master contracts. The award is based on price only. However, PORFPs are equivalent to an RFP, and the SBP language would not apply to an evaluation of technical proposals.
So if it's an RFP and it's not SBR-designated, would we need a waiver? Is that correct?	An RFP may be designated as a SBR procurement if the Rule of Two applies. The determination to remove the SBR designation, or to not include the SBR designation in the first place, would require a determination that the procurement is exempt or request a waiver. If there is no SBR designation for an RFP, the procurement still would not include the SBP language, because an RFP is an evaluation of technical proposals. The award is not just based on price.

What if you did your CAT3 Small Procurement as an IFB when advertising - can you use SBP then?	If a procurement conducted via bids or quotes is designated as Small Business Reserve (SBR), but no interest is received from eligible small businesses, or if the Rule of One applies, the SBR designation may be removed and Small Business Preference (SBP) language may instead be included in the solicitation. This guidance applies to procurements evaluated based solely on price.
Segment: Legislative Updates from 2026 Session	
Will there be a template document for the CPC solicitation?	The CPC tool is envisioned to be very flexible and unique to each specific procurement, so while OSP will be publishing policies, procedures, and guidance, we will not be providing a template document initially. In the future, we may revisit this once the State has more experience conducting CPCs.
Can this take the place of an RFI?	No. RFIs should be used to conduct market research to develop better procurements, whereas CPC should be used as a procurement method that results in a contract(s).
Will there be a process/policy released on how to utilize that proof of concept method? Because we have end users wanting us to use it and without direction, we cannot.	Yes, OSP anticipates publishing policies, procedures, and guidance soon.
Has another acronym been considered. Do you think the CPC acronym will be confusing with the CPC acronym for Corporate Purchasing Card?	We are considering different acronyms, and the final decision will be the acronym published in our policies. Realistically though, acronyms having different meanings in different contexts is somewhat unavoidable (e.g. POC, CSB, PO, SOP). Not everyone uses a P-Card.

Is a CPC expected to be potentially useful for complex IT Services requirements? Or is it more for IT systems?	Additional guidance will be published soon, but CPC solicitations will focus more on the problem to be solved, rather than detailed technical requirements. CPC may be ideally suited for testing software-as-a-service (SaaS), off-the-shelf software, new or innovative products or services, or a product/service conceived by an agency.
Segment: SBR/MBE/VSBE Policies	
What is the timeline for PRG review?	The PRG review is dependent on the quality and completeness of the agency's PRG documentation and its due diligence in identifying all opportunities to establish Small Business Reserve (SBR) designation and Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) and Veteran-Owned Small Business Enterprise (VSBE) participation goals for the procurement. When the agency's PRG submission includes thorough research and clear justification supporting the recommended goals, the OSP review can typically be completed in a relatively short timeframe. However, if OSP must conduct additional independent research to validate or determine appropriate goals, the review process will require additional time. In general, the extent of supplemental research required by OSP for each PRG submission directly impacts the overall review timeline. Thank you in advance for your agency's diligence and careful preparation in this process.

How can we get a copy of that memo?	A copy of the memo is being sent to all SPAG attendees, and will be made available via the OSP website for easy reference.
If the supplies are needed by the next day, can the employee justify that it is not practicable to do the market research and award to a non-CSB?	That would be a case-by-case determination, but yes that could be a justification; so long as the employee documents their decision and believes it is a reasonable explanation of why it is not practicable to perform the market research needed to identify potential CSBs. However, market research to identify CSBs should be done whenever possible. "Not practicable" is not defined but it may be understood to mean that setting aside the purchase for a certified small business would not make sense under the circumstances. The goal is to create real opportunities for small businesses, not to add unnecessary steps, costs, delays, or risks to the procurement process.
Segment: Submission of BPW Packages	
Will agenda templates for expedited and retroactive procurements be added?	Templates will be added for the Expedited Procurement Request and the Expedited Procurement Report. Reminder: Expedited Procurement Reports are due to BPW on a DGS OSP Agenda within 30 days of award (COMAR), meaning Expedited Procurement reports need to be submitted to dgs.osp-bpw@maryland.gov immediately after award. A template for retroactive procurements will not be added.
Is a checklist required for Non-BPW items?	Yes.
Can we still request 'Or Earlier' on the agenda?	Please see BPW Advisory 2006-1 ; Section 1.5.

General Questions	
Will the recording be available for this session?	While we do not record SPAG meetings, slide decks and supporting materials are shared with all attendees either during or in the days following the meeting.