

Meeting Minutes

Financial and Cash Management Policy Workgroup



Meeting Name:	Financial and Cash Management Policy Workgroup
Date:	10/08/08
Time:	9:00 – 11:00
Location:	2103, Capital
Requestor:	Kimberly McMurray, Project Director

Attendees:

Name	Entity
Jane Sowerby	AEIT
Christina Smith	DFS, A&A
Susan Sloan	DFS, A&A
Kimberly McMurray	DFS, Treasury
Bruce Gillander	DFS/Treasury
Charles Covington	DMS
David Disalvo	DMS
John Douglas	EOG-OPB
Eliza Hawkins	House
Sharon Bradford	House
Skip Martin	House
Joe Brigham	House / Senate
Erika Roth-Prado	OPB
Kristen Pingree	OPB
Renee Gunn	OPB
Cindy Kynoch	Senate

Work Products Reviewed:

Governance Document

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Review Financial and Cash Management Governance Document
 - Review Section 1.6 – Recommended Enterprise Governance Structure
 - Review Section 1.7 – Recommended Project Governance Structure

Meeting Minutes

Financial and Cash Management Policy Workgroup



- Other items of Interest
- Adjourn

DISCUSSION

Introduction

- Christina opened the meeting by beginning the review of the Governance Document.

Section 1.2 Background on Florida's Governance Entities

The purpose of the section was to review the current governance entities that are established in law. The group decided that it would be best to change the section title from "Background on Florida's Governance Entities" to "Florida's Governance Entities in Law".

Christina asked the group to review the last sentence in Section 1.2.2. The sentence was added to capture some of the concerns from the group that historically the FMIB did not seem to address many issues related to the FMIS systems. It appeared that the members were not in agreement and chose to do their own thing at one time or another. The Memorandum of Understand (MOU) that California has in place for their Cabinet members was discussed as a potential method for obtaining a commitment from the members to address issues. The group was not sure the MOU was the proper approach. The group had a discussion on the FMIB and FMIS Council's authority to make decisions.

Section 1.2.3 was discussed concerning the wording of the last paragraph and the words "prevented" and "negative impact". The recommendation was to remove these negative connotations in the paragraph.

Section 1.2.6 was discussed concerning the AEIT's current responsibilities related to enterprise information technology services. The group agreed that it was important to emphasize that AEIT's oversight is limited to the enterprise information technology services that are defined in law, specifically 282.141 F.S. The State's data center consolidation and IT security are the only enterprise IT services currently defined in law.

Section 1.3 Florida's "Defacto" Governance Structure



There was discussion on the last sentence in the first paragraph for Section 1.3 that stated “there is no consideration for end to end business processes.” There is a collaborative effort between the business owners to resolve issues and the recommendation was to remove the sentence. The group also felt the word “Defacto” in the title had a negative connotation and recommended that it be changed.

For Section 1.3.3, the group discussed the potential for the vendor to participate in the decision making process because of the contractual relationship with PeopleFirst and MyFloridaMarketPlace. Changes to the system are often subject to an amendment to the contract. The group had varying opinions on including or not including the vendor in this section.

For Section 1.3.5, the Governor needed to be added to the bullet for the Cabinet and include “defined in law” when referencing enterprise IT services.

The chart on page 9 was reviewed and it was decided that titles should be added at the top: Enterprise Business Systems and Enterprise IT Services.

Section 1.4 Known Failures in Florida and Public Sector Governance

There was a recommendation to review the Auditor General’s report related to Project Aspire that was published by Gary Vanlandingham. The group also recommended that a paragraph be added at the end of the section to wrap-up the section better. The group asked that a paragraph be added at the end of section 1.4 as a wrap up.

Section 1.6 Recommended Enterprise Governance Structure

The group had a lengthy discussion on business functions versus business processes. The group felt the core business functions listed in Section 1.6 needed to be defined further. There was a request to change “budget execution” to “budget control.” Budget execution is the responsibility the Governor’s office and it is the budget control that is performed by Governor’s Office, Department of Financial Services, and the State Agencies. It was also noted that revenue management is not included in the list.

The group requested that the phrase “The state chose best of breed” in the first paragraph of Section 1.6.2 be changed to reflect that the state is currently operating with separate systems not necessarily that the State chose to implement best of bread. In the first paragraph second sentence change “chose” to “currently”. The group had a discussion on what is the proper escalation process for the ERP Policy Council and if a dollar threshold would be applicable. Many in the group felt a dollar threshold

Meeting Minutes

Financial and Cash Management Policy Workgroup



would not be sufficient and result in entities circumventing the decision making process in appropriately.

The group also discussed who should have the deciding vote in the event of a tie. The current law gives the governor the deciding vote and the group was not sure that it should be changed for this circumstance.

The group had a lengthy discussion on the Strategic Business Plan outlined in Section 1.6.3. The group discussed business processes that cross business applications and business processes that are specific to a business application. Christina reminded the group that we do not want to continue to look at things as “system specific.” The group felt there is still a need to better define what will be the enterprise business processes. The group agreed that there may be a need to put some of the business standards in law where others could be addressed by the governor and cabinet as policy/procedures. The group had a lengthy discussion on the IT Environment, Enterprise Architecture Plan and IT standards components of the Strategic Enterprise Business Plan. The architecture plan is actually a depiction of the hardware and software applications that support the enterprise processes. The IT environment and IT standards are how the applications integrate. The group agreed that these items needed to be clarified in the document.

- The group did not have time to complete the review of the remaining sections of the document.
- The next policy workgroup meeting is Wednesday, October 15th. We will continue our discussion of the governance document.

Meeting was adjourned