

<b>Date</b>	11/19/2025	<b>Time</b>	1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	First District Court of Appeal		
<b>Objective</b>	Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes		
<b>Committee Members</b>	Jason Adank (FDOT); Richard Evans (EOG); Rebecca Evers (DOR); Steven Fielder, Chair (DFS); Theresa Gagnon (EOG); Sally Huggins (DBPR); Charlotte Jerrett (FWC); <del>Jesse Johnston (DMS)</del> ; Matt Kirkland (DOE); Jon Manalo (AHCA); Jesse Marks (DMS); <del>Angie Martin (DFS)</del> ; Mark Merry (DFS); Jennifer Pelham (DFS); <del>Warren Sponholtz (FLDFS)</del> ; Scott Stewart (DFS)		
<b>Speakers</b>	Jimmy Cox (DFS); Sarah Crouch (PCG); Steven Fielder (DFS); Kimberly Kemp (DFS); Angie Robertson (DFS); Stacey Terry (Accenture)		
<b>Materials</b>	<a href="#">Meeting Presentation</a>		

## Meeting Recording

The meeting can be viewed on: <https://myfloridacfo.com/floridapalm/oversight>.

## Opening Remarks and Roll Call

*Steven Fielder, Chair*

Mr. Steven Fielder called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. with a roll call of the Executive Steering Committee (Committee) members. Twelve members were present for the meeting. (*Names of members not in attendance appear with strikethroughs in the above table.*) Mr. Fielder welcomed Mr. Richard Evans as a new member and Ms. Christina Smith's replacement in her retirement. Mr. Fielder acknowledged and thanked Ms. Christina Smith's for her contributions to the Project.

## Presentation

*Budget, Risks and Issues, and Charter Update; Angie Robertson*

Ms. Angie Robertson gave an update on the Florida PALM Spend Plan for fiscal year (FY) 25-26, with a detailed breakdown of expense categories, and advised the Committee that a Quarter 3 Budget amendment has been submitted, and once approved, Amendment 13 will impact (reduce) the Quarter 4 request. Ms. Robertson provided an update on Project Risks and Issues, noting that Issue 37 was opened regarding difficulty filling some key Project positions and is expected to close before in the next couple of months. Two Issues remain open: Issues 35 and 36. No new risks were opened or closed. The following Risks remain open; Risks 5, 6 and 11 have a score of six, and Risks 1, 2 and 4 have a score of nine. She noted a trend change for Risks 5 and 6 from stable to increasing, and a due date change for Risk 11 to December 19. Ms. Robertson also disclosed that a live view of current Risks and Issues is now available on the website. The Committee asked for clarification on some Risk items. Mr. Jimmy Cox explained that Risk 11 was opened a while ago because all Enterprise Partners needed more time in the Testing environment. The trend changed from stable to increasing is because Risks 5 and 6 are becoming more concerning. Ms. Robertson outlined the Risk scoring methodology for the Committee. Finally, updates to the ESC Charter were discussed and confirmed for adoption.

*Amendment 13; Jimmy Cox, Sarah Crouch, Steven Fielder*

Mr. Fielder provided a summary of Amendment 12 and highlighted a few key elements of Amendment 13. Mr. Cox explained the focus areas of Amendment 13, including moving the go-

live to January 2027, removing dual go-live options, shifting Deliverables and optional services, and enhancing testing by adding in-person User Acceptance Testing (UAT) support by the vendor and additional testing cycles.

Ms. Sarah Crouch shared the Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) summary and observations related to Amendment 13. She detailed that IV&V supports the approval of Amendment 13, citing reduced project risk and improved validation, and that the cost increases were deemed reasonable. She advised the Committee to carefully consider additional items (e.g., RICEFW, Project Change Requests) that may increase UAT risk. The Committee asked for clarification on the renewal process and whether the contract currently includes renewals. Ms. Crouch explained that there may be future negotiations on a contract renewal, and they should ensure that the savings from the changes made now are not included as costs in the renewal. Mr. Cox shared that there have been no renewals up to this point.

Mr. Cox reviewed details from the Amendment 13 attachments shared with the Committee prior to the meeting. Attachment 1 – Statement of Work included changes to the go-live date language for minor enhancements, the associated State Gate, and optional services; clarified RICEFW management and added Pre-UAT language; Data Warehouse access setup; a fourth Dry Run, an optional fifth Dry Run; and clarity for Tax Reporting Support. Details for Attachment 5.2 – Customizations, which includes minor updates based on changes after Amendment 12 and new customizations, were reviewed. The Committee asked whether these resulted from UAT and Mr. Cox confirmed they resulted from Pre-UAT and project functional testing in the UAT environment.

Attachment 8 – Deliverable Acceptance Criteria was discussed, which included updates, removals, and minor edits to select Deliverables. Deliverables supporting UAT Segment IV, in-person support during Project-hosted UAT sessions, Dry Run 4, Interface Testing Segment III, Performance Testing Segment II, and pre-cutover activities needed prior to Stage Gate 5 were added. Mr. Cox clarified that some Deliverables are being removed as they fall outside of the contract timeframe. These will be considered when a contract renewal is negotiated. Mr. Fielder provided some additional context on the lessons learned from Amendment 12 and their influence on pricing in Amendment 13.

Next, Mr. Cox detailed the clarifications and updates to Attachment 10 – Service Level Agreements to resolve any misinterpretations. He pointed out updates to the Production Support Service Level Credit Cap, Critical Performance Indicator (CPI) #2 percentage, and CPI #27, and described the effect if multiple CPIs are triggered. Amendment 2 – Payment Schedule was reviewed in depth, and the overall cost change through July 2027, including deferred and eliminated cost was shared. The Committee asked if a new schedule was coming. Mr. Fielder shared that there is a draft schedule, and a final version is being created.

### ***Amendment 13 Vote***

Proceeding with the vote, Mr. Fielder asked if there was a request for public comment. There being none, Mr. Fielder provided a quick reminder of the procedures outlined in the ESC Charter. The Committee had one final question related to agency engagement and Attachment 1. Mr. Cox explained that the language in question is related to preparing for deployment and that there is a separate stage gate for agency readiness. Amendment 13 was unanimously approved by the Committee. Two members that were not present submitted their vote of approval for Amendment 13 prior to the meeting.

### *Independent Verification and Validation Update; Sarah Crouch*

Ms. Crouch shared that the IV&V Risk Rating for the Project has a Medium-risk score. She noted the start of Pre-UAT is a significant milestone, as agencies' responsibilities are growing towards a more central role, and the agencies participating in Pre-UAT are finding it very valuable. The Committee asked whether the Medium-risk score is more of a medium-high or medium-low. Ms. Crouch expressed that it is trending at a medium-high as the execution process for Amendment 13 must be completed, and the lack of padding available in the timeline extension.

Ms. Crouch then provided IV&V updates on testing, interfaces, and Agency Readiness. She reported that open System Investigation Requests (SIRs) are being resolved at a similar pace to new SIRs being opened. She noted that the scheduled completion date for Interface Testing Cycle 2 was not met, and Finding 29 was escalated to an Issue. Ms. Crouch reminded the Committee of the 90 percent interface passing requirement to meet the Exit Criteria for interface testing and shared the number of interfaces that still need to pass by the new deadline of December 19, 2025. The Committee asked if this goal is realistic. Ms. Crouch agreed that the timeframe is tight, and this is more complex as it involves more collaboration but noted IV&V has observed the average pass rate per test increasing in other areas. Mr. Cox clarified that some of the numbers being shared have since been revised; they are a little better than reported, and the Project is working on reporting updated numbers. The Committee also asked for a definition of "pass" related to testing. Mr. Cox stated that it can mean different things depending on the test and is often complex, but for interface testing, an agency creates an inbound interface file and transmits it to Florida PALM, where it is picked up and successfully processed. The agency's processing status log is then provided to them. If a significant number of errors are generated, a ticket is created, and the test does not pass; it is retested, as needed.

Finally, Ms. Crouch covered Agency Readiness, sharing expectations for agencies participating in Pre-UAT and cross-agency groups. She also shared that IV&V reviews outstanding agency Risks and Issues and noted that they have observed an increase in Risks and Issues that are at least ten months old and are not being reassessed. She recommended that agencies reevaluate these.

### *Implementation Activities; Stacey Terry*

Ms. Stacey Terry gave an update on implementation activities, beginning with a DW/BI update. All outstanding tasks/topics for the DW/BI Action Plan items are complete. For additional DW/BI activities, two of 149 test scripts remain to be completed, but there is a 96.6 percent pass rate. An issue with Oracle was resolved last week, allowing the State team to continue their review. The UAT environment has been established and performance tuning will be an ongoing activity.

Ms. Terry shared an update on interface testing with enterprise partners, agencies, and third parties. There are a total of 477 interface connections being tested as part of the contract deliverable; 410 have been executed; 313 have passed and 37 have failed; 48 are being retested by partners, as seen in the details table. Ms. Terry explained the second table, detailing the 64 delayed interface executions from the first table which will be tested as part of a separate work product. She also gave a brief explanation of the various statuses (e.g., Planned to Date, Not Started). The Committee asked if this included spreadsheet uploads. Ms. Terry answered no and clarified that interface testing is for business systems, and spreadsheet uploads are considered online behavior.

Enterprise testing is progressing, with MFMP completing multiple rounds of testing that is expected to wrap up in the next couple of weeks. Twenty-eight (28) agencies have begun testing agency business systems. The two remaining agencies are working through the issues keeping

them from starting their testing. Third-party testing is underway. Updates were made to the way files are provided to JP Morgan, resulting in the processing of an ACH file. Testing with Corebridge is pending, with some items remaining to be addressed by the Project.

The Committee asked if the files in the system are actually being created from Florida PALM. Ms. Terry confirmed they are processed out of the dedicated interface testing environment. The Committee then requested further clarification on the difference between the status of Not Started and Delayed. Ms. Terry explained that Not Started is based on the Schedule, where the date has not been reached to begin the task. Delayed means the date has been reached in the Schedule, but the task is delayed for some reason.

Next, Ms. Terry reviewed the progress of Mock Conversion 4 with Financials testing 16 conversions, and Payroll testing 13 total, noting that these are on schedule, and describing the process to define an activity as complete. She also shared counts for SIRs related to data cleansing, status and Priority. Finally, a breakdown of the 92 Pre-UAT tickets opened by agencies was discussed. Ms. Terry clarified tickets that are auto-generated by the system, of a more technical nature, are not included here. She also shared that, while the resolution number appears small, there are more tickets being resolved than not. Often, things are discussed during Pre-UAT Office Hours and resolved there, while other issues must be validated and/or recreated before the ticket can be resolved.

### *Readiness Activities; Nikki Klein*

Ms. Nikki Klein shared the details of a campaign to help prepare agencies for UAT and the upcoming Sponsor Summit. Ms. Klein noted that many data-related tasks closed recently, and the data from these tasks is used to prepare for UAT. As a result, the approach for role mapping and Readiness Workplan have been updated. Agencies will now determine which end users they would prefer to have initially loaded into the UAT environment, with the remaining end users being loaded later, during a refresh of the environment.

Ms. Klein shared some Readiness Workplan task updates, including that the deadline to develop User Stores was extended into January 2026; however, the role mapping deadline remains December 19. Some tasks previously in a delayed status have been updated, including Readiness Certification #2 and loading end users into the Agency Active Directory. A new task for agencies to update their UAT Plan was created.

Then, Ms. Klein shared that the agencies' Bimonthly Status Report was submitted for the September-October reporting period. There are no red indicators for task timeliness or task completeness; however, as in the last Bimonthly Status Report, the number of yellow indicators (indicating incomplete work) is increasing on tasks with a direct impact on the Project. She also shared that, related to Risks and Issues, the methodology was updated to encourage agencies to confirm if reported Risks and Issues are still valid; however, Risks and Issues largely remain the same, with similar trends. Assumptions are similar to the previous reporting period, with themes including the impacts of UAT and the Project's communication of process steps, testing activities, and cutover details.

Finally, Ms. Robertson gave a quick Pre-UAT update, sharing that participation and engagement are going very well. She also reinforced the two aspects agencies should take away from Pre-UAT: Learning Florida PALM and preparing for All Agency UAT. Ms. Robertson also shared the results and an analysis of a Pre-UAT participant survey, noting that participants reported feeling prepared and supported, but time testing and User Stories development remain concerns.

***Training Activities; Kimberly Kemp***

Ms. Kimberly Kemp updated the Committee on the completion metrics for the UAT Prerequisite trainings and shared that 33 agencies have accessed the programs and completions have increased over last month. A breakdown of Business Process Groupings and published Process Steps were detailed.

Ms. Kemp reiterated how the Process Steps and Pre-Materials and Pre-Work pages in the Knowledge Center complement each other to support Pre-UAT. She also detailed how these documents are updated based on feedback received in Pre-UAT Office Hours.

***Next Meeting and Adjournment, Steven Fielder***

The meeting was adjourned at 3:42 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for December 17, 2025, at the Department of Environmental Protection's Carr Building.