

Date	07/24/2019	Time	2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Location	House of Representatives Knott Committee Room 116 402 South Monroe Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399		
Objective	July 24, 2019 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting Minutes		
Attendees	<p>Executive Steering Committee: Ryan West (DFS), Chair; Carlton Bassett (DFS); Jimmy Cox (DMS); Renee Hermeling (DFS); Rosalyn (Roz) Ingram (DMS); Maria Johnson (DOR); Mike Jones (EOG); Tony Lloyd (DCF); Angie Martin (DFS); Tanya McCarty (DFS); Darinda McLaughlin (DEP); Mark Merry (DFS); Robin Naitove (FDOT); Renee Tondee (EOG); Danta White (DFS).</p> <p>Speakers: Mark Fairbank (ISG); Scott Fennel (DFS); Paul Lavery (Accenture); Angie Robertson (DFS); Melissa Turner (DFS)</p> <p><i>*Members who were unable to attend are denoted by strikethrough text.</i></p>		
Attachments/ Related Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 17, 2019 ESC Meeting Minutes • July 24, 2019 ESC Meeting PowerPoint Presentation • Decision Form 		
Action Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardized Business Process Model – approval • Decision 128 – Requirements Confirmation – approval 		

Roll Call and Opening Remarks: Facilitated by Scott Fennell (DFS)

In place for Chairman Ryan West (*who joined the meeting later*), Project Sponsor Mr. Scott Fennell called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a roll call of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) members. A quorum was established. Mr. Fennell welcomed the group and handed the floor to Ms. Melissa Turner.

Review of Meeting Minutes: Facilitated by Melissa Turner (DFS)

Ms. Turner asked the ESC members if they had any comments on or revisions to the draft July 17, 2019 Meeting Minutes distributed prior to the meeting. There were no comments or revisions. The minutes will be posted to the Florida PALM website following the meeting.

Florida PALM Project Update: Facilitated by Angie Robertson (DFS); Melissa Turner (DFS)

Ms. Turner began by reminding members the meeting will be focused on the review of the Major Project Deliverables and Decision 128. She turned the floor over to Ms. Angie Robertson who began the review for the Standardized Business Process Models.

Ms. Robertson briefly mentioned all feedback given within the last week by ESC members has been incorporated in the deliverables. She explained she would walk through the edits in track changes so the group can discuss if necessary. Ms. Robertson encouraged discussion and interactive dialogue. Ms. Robertson mentioned the Business Process Standardization (BPS) Team Managers were in attendance to help with clarification or resolution to questions.

Prefacing most of the edits as administrative changes; such as grammar, spelling, consistent terminology, other edits included clarification of narratives and modifications to process steps, where necessary, Ms. Robertson shared all 32 business processes had been adjusted. Other administrative changes were due to the reporting frequency terminology changing from “on-demand” to the time-based terminology “periodic”, “monthly”, and “annually”. Other changes included the removal of interface frequency from narratives, the clarification of terms “process” and “subprocess”, adding revision history tables, and clarification for the source of forms that were referenced.

Ms. Robertson displayed the narratives or business process flows with edits in track changes and walked through the changes, giving time for members to ask questions or discuss.

Mr. Carlton Bassett asked Ms. Robertson to point out which edits are substantive, to which Ms. Robertson proceeded to do.

While discussing process 30.1, Ms. Angie Martin said the Department of Financial Services (DFS) currently accepts requests to receive payments via electronic file transfer by mail due to needing original signatures, not email. Ms. Robertson noted this change to the process.

Ms. Robertson continued discussing edits in Disbursement Management. Ms. Renee Hermeling sought clarification in 30.6 regarding the control for payments subject to 1099 reporting. Ms. Robertson explained there is a plan to identify vendors as 1099 reportable at the time of activation. Ms. Robertson also confirmed there is a control planned to review payments subject to 1099 reporting for vendors without a W9 on file. Ms. Angie Martin shared it was her understanding the business process models do not reflect stopping payment if a W9 was not on file for a vendor (current edit in FLAIR). Ms. Jennifer Reeves, BPS Team Manager, said the process has been documented to include a report that would be leveraged to review any payments made to object codes that are 1099 reportable to a vendor without a valid W9 on file. Ms. Martin acknowledged there may be opportunities for the State to use the same vendor for both 1099 reportable and non-1099 reportable activities. Ms. Turner asked if research was available regarding the frequency of how often the current edit in FLAIR is being performed. Ms. Martin indicated that agency behavior had changed as a result of the edit, with 1099 reportable payments being not initiated until a W9 is on file. Ms. Turner asked Mr. Paul Lavery, Accenture Project Manager, to speak on his experience in other states. He listed four likely options: 1) require every vendor to have an established W9 on file. California implements this policy; 2) validate vendors through approval process; 3) review in-flight payments through reporting and post audit; 4) implement a customization to replicate the edit in FLAIR. Ms. Turner confirmed the third option is reflected in the business process models. Ms. Maria Johnson asked for the effect of the State processing a 1099 reportable payment to a vendor without a valid W9. Ms. Martin responded the IRS will conduct audits and may hold the State liable for backup withholding tax. Ms. Martin discussed the impact applying to new vendors registering to do 1099 reportable business with the State. Mr. Fennell asked if the members chose to move forward with the business process models approval

as presented, does that prohibit making changes in the future. Ms. Turner said the Project would follow the established change process. Ms. Turner suggested the group proceed with the models as they are and have the Project Team return to discuss any additional alternatives. Ms. Rosalyn Ingram asked for the process of approving the business process models with an outstanding item. Ms. Turner said the group can make a provisional vote based on the future discussion of any additional 1099 controls. Mr. Jimmy Cox stated if the group moves forward with the models as stated, there may be a need for a policy change for all vendors to submit a W9.

Ms. Robertson completed the review of remaining edits and paused for final questions or comments. Having none, she transitioned to the Process and Transaction Mapping Analysis deliverable.

Ms. Robertson restated most edits were due to grammar and formatting. Ms. Robertson opened the document and began reviewing the edits in track changes. When reviewing the attractive items and depreciation, Ms. Robertson asked Ms. Hermeling to confirm the clarification, to which she did. During the review of manual deposit verification, Ms. Ingram asked for the difference between FLAIR and Florida PALM functionality. Ms. Deana Metcalf, BPS Project Team manager, stated an edit can be made to show there is no difference. Ms. Hermeling followed up seeking clarification on the automatic verification frequency per day and if this step was necessary. Ms. Metcalf said the step where Treasury verifies happens before the bank file is received. Ms. Tanya McCarty confirmed the Treasury process as described. Mr. Cox asked who reviewed the document and its intended use. Ms. Robertson responded the document was reviewed by the Project Team prior to submission to ESC members. Mr. Cox asked for the importance of approving the document during the meeting. Ms. Turner shared the document was planned for approval in the Project Schedule during this time period and could be used as a supporting documentation for a change management resource. However, if the document were not approved in today's meeting, the Project does not anticipate a significant impact. Mr. Bassett stated there were four missing Departmental FLAIR transactions in the crosswalk that are in the FLAIR manual. Ms. Robertson said the Project Team will review the FLAIR manual in greater detail, incorporating additional edits into the document. Ms. Turner suggested the group postpone the vote for this approval and return to the ESC at a future meeting with additional edits.

Ms. Turner moved to the next topic which was Decision 128 - Requirements Confirmation. The new and cancelled requirements were sent to the ESC prior to the meeting and the Project received few clarifying questions. Ms. Hermeling asked about the cancellation of the requirement related to the statewide customer file. Ms. Turner noted that from a data standpoint, the State doesn't currently have a master data file. Ms. Robertson explained agencies will have unique customer files, however through with a planned extension, offset functionality would still be available. Ms. Turner clarified that cancelling a requirement does not prevent functionality from implementation in the future. It would, however, remove the expectation on the Project from being expected to incorporate design and testing activities for the functionality that is not currently planned for implementation during Pilot, Wave 1, or Wave 2. Mr. Bassett stated the application monitoring tool requirement appeared to be split from one requirement into two. Ms. Robertson confirmed. Mr. Bassett said there appeared to be a cut and paste error in the last two table cells. Ms. Robertson noted and said the errors would be resolved. Ms. Hermeling asked for the reasoning for cancelling the point of sale requirements. Ms. Robertson responded the point of sale requirements were originally identified as a priority three, meaning the requirements were not necessary to complete the vision of Florida PALM. Additionally, PeopleSoft does not serve as

the point of sale solution. During negotiations, other specific point of sale requirements were removed but a few were missed.

Ms. Turner asked for additional questions. Having none, Ms. Turner handed the floor to Mr. Mark Fairbank for his assessment of the Major Project Deliverables and Decision.

Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Assessment: Mr. Mark Fairbank (ISG)

Mr. Fairbank spoke on his observations of the two Major Project Deliverables and Decision 128. He said they are both highly reflective of performance of the Project in trying to get the vision for Florida PALM implemented. Specifically, the Standardized Business Process Models represent a major transition with how Florida describes its business desires and needs into how PeopleSoft will execute. The models had many review cycles, with a high degree of transparency. The approach and results taken are unique and a blueprint for success.

The Process and Transaction Mapping Analysis is a document usually created late in other projects, however, by creating it early will benefit the State and the Project team.

Mr. Fairbank stated both Major Project Deliverables and the Decision for Requirements Confirmation are safe products to move forward with as a decision-making body.

Voting Action: Chairman Ryan West (DFS); Melissa Turner (DFS)

Ms. Turner recognized the arrival of the Chairman. Chairman West asked if there were any requests for public comment. Having none, Chairman West proceeded with the vote to provisionally approve the Standardized Business Process Models. The ECS members unanimously voted in favor of a provisional approval of the Standardized Business Process Models. Proceeding with the vote to approve Decision 128 – Requirements Confirmation, the ESC members unanimously voted in favor of approving Decision 128.

New Business: Ms. Melissa Turner (DFS)

Ms. Turner asked for new business. None was presented.

Next Meeting: Ms. Melissa Turner (DFS)

The next meeting is scheduled for August 28 where the Process and Transaction Mapping Analysis will be reviewed and presented for approval. Mr. Cox asked if the Project may consider sharing the document with Pilot organizations not represented on the ESC (Department of Economic Opportunity and Division of Administrative Hearings). Ms. Turner stated the Project Team would follow-up with Department of Economic Opportunity and Division of Administrative Hearings to obtain their feedback on the document prior to the next ESC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:48.