

Meeting Details

Meeting Date	Thursday April 30, 2015
Meeting Time	9:00am - 12:00pm
Meeting Location	Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 152
Meeting Objective	Provide a Project overview and expectations for the level 2 Workgroup Meetings
Invitees	<p><u>Level 2 SMEs:</u> Kedra Lewis (DJJ), Letetia Wiley (DJJ), Thomas Poucher (DACs), Peggy Brown (DACs), Sabrina Donovan (DLA), Darlene Faris (DLA), Faye Jones (DBPR), Eric Thiele (DBPR), Charlotte Fraser (FDLE), Terri Speed (FDLE), Wendy Wu (DOR), Kim Straubinger (DOR), Matt Gilbert (DFS A&A), Mary Clark (DOH), Robert Herron (DOH)</p> <p><u>Florida Palm BPS Team:</u> Tanner Collins, Robert Bolton, Elizabeth Chao</p>
Attachments/ Related Documents	DRAFT Level 1 Process Flow and Narrative DRAFT Level 2 Process Flow and Narrative

#	Topic	Leader	Allotted Time
1	Introduction and Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Housekeeping • Participant Introductions • Level Setting 	Tanner Collins/ Robert Bolton	10 min (9:00am- 9:10am)
2	Level 1 Overview	Tanner Collins	45 min (9:15am-10:00am)
3	Review of Level 2 Workflows and Process Narrative	Tanner Collins/ Robert Bolton	45 min (10:00am- 10:45am)
4	Break		15 min (10:45am-11:00am)
5	Icebreaker	Tanner Collins	10 min (11:00am- 11:10am)
6	Level 2 Workflow Discussion	Tanner Collins	40 min (11:10am- 11:50am)
7	Close Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Items • Homework/Next meeting 	Tanner Collins/Elizabeth	10 min (11:50am- 12:00pm)

Notes:

- Introduction and Welcome
 - Julian's overview of the space/best approach for meeting and welcome to the meeting
 - Introductions around the room (name, agency and participation in Level 1)
 - BPS Team: Julian Gotreaux, Robin Chichester, Deana Metcalf, Deb Gries, Brenda Lovette, Angie Robertson, Janice Jackson, Eric Adair, Tanner Collins, Robert Bolton, Elizabeth Chao, Stanton Beazley, Sean Cooley
 - 15 SMEs: Kendra Lewis, Letetia Wiley, Thomas Poucher, Peggy Brown, Sabrina Donovan, Darlene Faris, Faye Jones, Eric Thiele, Charlotte Fraser, Terri Speed, Wendy Wu, Kim Straubinger, Matt Gilbert, Mary Clark, Robert Herron

•

2. Level 1 Overview

- Tanner went over the Level 1 flows (no narratives just the process flow)
- Federal regulation on offsets - certain federal programs have rules dictating that certain programs cannot be offset against, however other federal departments (IRS) will tell the state to offset (issue with the Federal agencies fighting itself), future enhancement – a way to cross check the offsets to flag if there are any conflicts
- Robert level set on what an ERP system is and how it's used
- The file sent to collections – Who will send that? It will be your agency's information being sent to the collection agencies. It will be sent by your agency, but through Florida PALM
- The largest assumption, you will record all receivable information at the customer level in PALM, we aren't taking the agency subsystem away, we are using PALM as a financial management system – there will be an interface built so that the agencies can interface their subsystems to upload this information into PALM
 - The requirements will detail the standard customer data that is needed to have enough detail to create the financial transaction (a standard customer record in terms of the required fields). Clarified that the data that is being captured will also be standardized (e.g. Last name, First name)
- Has there been discussion around taking in information that is outside of typical financial information? Yes, we do talk about settings (i.e. sliding fee schedules), this will be something that is customizable by agency-configuration topic. This was later clarified that information, such as HIPAA, may not be brought into that system if it does not add value to the financial transactions. (This is a policy decision)
- DOR has a very robust system, will their receivables go into PALM? – Tanner had a conversation with DOR counterpart (Kim Straubinger), centered it on the clerks policy issue (will they require the clerks to provide the customer detail information?)
 - Yes, we would like the receivable information in PALM, the collection process will be at the agency. This is a policy issue already on the table.
- What do we do with the AR booked only at year-end and is only created for year-end purposes? (i.e. Grant dollars) This would be taken care of at the Grants modules, or if it's not handled there it would be sent to A&A and would be adjusted along with the agencies yearend adjustments. Since the system is integrated, all the necessary information will be pulled from P2P or Grants and sent through to ARB to create the billing which will create an accounting event
 - When to book a receivable? – a policy issue already on the table

3. Review of Level 2 Workflows and Narratives

- Swimlane overview
- 1.1 – Policy issues around when to record a customer (already on the table)
- 1.2 – What will be the timing for a draw? Example was the daily report run in the morning that then tells the agencies the wire amount to request from the Fed.
 - Distinguish the major programs (whose data is captured) – there is a lump sum that comes down which is just one receivable now, in the future there will be multiple lines on the receivables (potential that it's parsed so you can know who is subject to CMIA and who is not instead of multiple receivables)
 - Customer setup with multiple accounts – one customer may have different bill types – currently they set up three different accounts based on the bill types

- 90% of the money (DOR) doesn't have a receivable – it's just booked as cash. We have built the flow so the customer information could be captured but whether/what level of detail is captured is a policy issue, could be handled by booking the receivable by tax type (not at the customer level – but a higher aggregation with some detail might be the end result i.e. DOR tax types monthly report)
- Will the fields for customer information be standardized? Yes, this is part of our requirements
- 1.1.1. – no comment
- 1.1.2 – no comment
- 1.1.3. –Is there functionality to do all this in the system? Yes, there is functionality to use the drawer balancing function in PALM
 - Credit card settlements that aren't related to any receivables (agency business system handles that now, but the ideal would be to have the information sent to PALM) ex: lump sum receivable of criminal background checks so there is no detail. There will be cases where some is pulled into PALM and some handled in agency subsystem. (Potential integration point on Aging and Collections)
 - Deana has looked at this but isn't sure if there is enough detail coming from all the agencies to do the matching automatically in PALM
 - Receipt of cash can be separate from the application (ex. Walmart pays for all of its stores that then needs to be applied to the customer – could be a location field that is updated like how DOR does it) → add more narrative to 1.1.1

BREAK

4. Level 2 Workflow Discussion (process flow overview)

- 1.1.4 – If the agency keeps their AR/billing systems, will they have the ability to upload to the system? Yes, this is an integration into PALM from the agency business systems (this is I1)
 - The time limit for the refund – will there be a place for an exception when it exceeds the timeframe? Right now they request the refund to DFS. → Add some more clarity to the narrative
- 1.1.5 – Rework the naming of the accounting event (further discussion for meeting #3)
- 1.3 – Will payment information be updated? Yes, that is on page 2 off of ARB 2.2
- 1.4 – General clarification questions
- 1.5 – no comment
- 1.5a (utilize billing) – Will it have the ability to generate the invoice? Yes, you'll be able to create agency specific invoices in different formats. Most systems will have robust system standards for invoice generation.
 - Are there rules to make sure that one agency doesn't use another's invoice – yes, this is a security configuration
- 1.6 – no comment
- 1.7 – no comment
- 1.8 – Setting up the agency specific defaults will help eliminate the due to/due transfer from at the end of the year, one agencies expenditure will match to another's revenue (Stanton indicated possible accounting entries)

5. Close Meeting

- Overview of the action items

Requirements	Additional Notes or Context
A way for the system to flag any contracting offsets (from either the state or the federal government)	This is a future enhancement

Action Items	Additional Notes or Context
Rename the accounting event at 1.1.5	
Add CSH number to ARB 1.1.3 home plate	Updates will be made once all process area process flows are finalized

Policy Issues	Additional Notes or Context
No new issues identified	