

**Meeting Details**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Monday, May 4th, 2015	<b>Meeting Time</b>	1:30pm – 3:30pm
<b>Meeting Location</b>	Betty Easley - Room 166		
<b>Meeting Objective</b>	Review and Discuss Draft Budget Level 2 Flows and Process Models		
<b>Invitees</b>	<p><u>Level 2 SMEs:</u>                  Asheema Vemuri (DCF), <del>Charlotte Fraser (FDLE)</del>, Cynthia Barr (FDLE), Emma Edwards (DC), Rebecca Evers (DOR), Sarah Goodman (DFS), Jennifer Barineau (DOT), Lisa Evans (DOT), Teri Madsen (DFS), Tanya McCarty (DFS), <del>Mechelle Marcum (DOT)</del>, Mike Wolfe (DCF), Lavitta Stanford (DC), Ronald VunKann (DOR), <del>Renee Tondoe (EOG/OPB)</del>, Erika Roth-Prado (EOG/OPB), <del>Melissa Patino (EOG/OPB)</del>, Jeanine Pumphrey (DOT), Teresa Gagnon (EOG/OPB), Teresa Brossette (EOG/OPB)</p> <p><u>Florida PALM BPS Team:</u>                  Janice Jackson, Stanton Beazley, Jack Manahan, Joanne Weber, <del>Tanner Collins</del>, Robert Hicks, <del>Deb Gries</del>, <del>Angie Robertson</del>, Sean Cooley, Deana Metcalf, Brenda Lovett</p>		
<b>Attachments/ Related Documents</b>	DRAFT Level 1 Process Flow and Narrative DRAFT Level 2 Process Flow and Narrative		

**Meeting Topics**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Allotted Time</b>
<b>Introduction and Welcome</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of Agenda</li> <li>• Participant Introductions</li> <li>• Recap of Action Items</li> </ul>	Robert A. Hicks	
<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <p>All participants attended in person. Sean spoke about general housekeeping items and suggested all attendees proactively participate in the BUD session.</p> <p>Agenda, Participants.</p> <p>Recap of Action Items – Robert covered these in detail &amp; Joanne added that the 1<sup>st</sup> page of Management and Control Process Flow also changed from the last time in that double arrows go between BUD 2.7 &amp; BUD 2.8 and that this is an automatic &amp; continual update from the Payables to the Budget/General Ledger “behind the scenes” based upon system configuration for hard &amp; soft stops for payments.</p>		
<b>Discussion of Changes made to Budget Process Flows</b>	Robert, Jack	

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
<p>Robert further explained the definition of Enterprise Performance Management (EPM) &amp; Business Intelligence (BI) tools. Many agencies currently have “dashboards” on Intranet and Internet websites where they publish budget information.</p> <p>No questions were asked during this time.</p>		
<p><b>Deeper Dive in Level 2 Flows and Narrative – Robert</b></p>	<p>Robert, Jack</p>	
<p>FLOW: Planning &amp; Forecasting:          Enterprise Swimlane:          BUD 1.2: Several action items taken below.</p> <p>The LBR deals with 3 years of data.</p> <p>LAS/BPS can only take a feed once per year now of final expenditures. Questions were raised on whether or not LAS/BPS can handle more than this frequency, as it is an antiquated system, per the workgroup. This is covered further below, as we are not considering timing in this set of flows, but will take it into consideration later.</p> <p>Stanton brought up that perhaps performance measurements or further information for the LRPP could be considered further for the system at a later date –it was stated that LAS/PBS does not hold this information now.</p> <p>There might be an issue in building LBR “Issues” (a field in LBR) into Florida PALM – agencies cannot create: budget entity codes, categories, funds, program components, etc. currently. The codes have to be requested first, then created in LAS/PBS before keyed into Florida PALM. Codes are system-generated in LAS/BPS. Janice Jackson referenced the Florida PALM GL (R2R) process flows for how new codes will be handled in the future between the old and the new systems. New codes are generated nightly in LAS/BPS, and in the future will be automatically fed into Florida PALM.</p> <p>The workgroup noted that they also get PeopleFirst data currently.</p> <p>BUD 1.3: No comments from workgroup.</p> <p>BUD 1.4: No comments from workgroup.</p> <p>BUD 1.5: Robert confirmed to workgroup that encumbrances are included here. Questions on “when date does this (BUD 1.4) occur”. The workgroup overall was concerned with timing on process flows.</p> <p>BUD 1.6: EPM – Jack stated that prior-year actuals and budgets are brought into the system. This will complicate loads of data if there has been a reorganization (a dept. will exist one year and not in the next). Sometimes States will use a “from this point forward” in their initial budget load because of this. Jack pointed out that workflow exists throughout the EPM systems. And that all EPMs will have a salary &amp; forecasting set of tools that will mimic the payroll system – allows</p>		

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
<p>estimating at the agency level e.g. full time, part time, etc. by grant or other selectors. (See BUD 1.10 - agency level).</p> <p>BUD 1.7: No comments from workgroup.</p> <p>Robert emphasized reporting exists all along the way at the Enterprise level.</p> <p>BUD 1.8 – A concern was raised here whether agencies would be able to “tinker” with the rates &amp; rules that were set in this box – Robert confirmed that this was possible. Jack also pointed out that “Revenue Assumptions” are typically made by economists (revenue estimating groups). A concern is whether the agency can change the rates later, and Jack confirmed that this is possible.</p> <p>BUD 1.9: No comments from workgroup.</p> <p>Agency Swimlane:</p> <p>BUD 1.10 to BUD 1.21 – The entire purpose of this stream is to deliver the LBR/LRPP/CIP per Robert. Jeanine pointed out that this process flow is currently A03 – an LBR request. Robert referenced Level 1 Process Flows several times to emphasize that LAS/BPS is out of scope.</p> <p>BUD 1.11 – Robert reviewed &amp; stated that this is a new box from last meeting – added primarily at this time for DOT, although other agencies will fall into this box as discovered. The workgroup stated that this was a problem point with Aspire, because there are “special needs” for nearly every agency. Robert stated that a common ground would be created for all agencies, and then the onus is on the agencies to be able to integrate. Stanton supported this by describing an interface that agencies would have to use to integrate. Jack discussed that the architecture of the data warehouse is important to this point – i.e. data normalization. The workgroup agreed that the agencies knew there would be cost for each agency to create these interfaces, and some are already planning to do so.</p> <p>The workgroup asked how this information would be communicated to agencies – Stanton expounded on what communication he knew was going on now at the CIO association meetings. Robert also stated that we had Eric Adair who is our technical lead. Deana pointed out that AST has been briefed as well. Janice as well pointed out that all agencies will get to view the new processes at the workshops in June. Some discussion on what agencies have been included in the discussions and who have not.</p> <p>Robert went through the process boxes, and Jack stated that these have not changed from last week. Emphasis was made that the data is secure by agency. (An LBR “Issue” is a justification for a change in budget.)</p> <p>Note was made that our starting budget is not necessarily our current year budget.</p>		

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
<p>Teri pointed out that audits would have to be out of LAS/BPS because all of the data does not exist there.</p> <p>Schedules 1's are also a concern about where we can run these.</p> <p>Summary on last point is that there might be currently existing statutory or operational constraints.</p>		
<p><b>Break &amp; Ice Breaker</b></p>		
<p><b>Deeper Dive in Level 2 Flows and Narrative</b></p>	<p>Robert, Jack</p>	
<p><b>Notes:</b>                  Sean opened back up – stated that the conversation has been good, productive.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Break</b></p>		
<p><b>Icebreaker</b></p>	<p>Robert</p>	
<p><b>Deeper Dive in Level 2 Flows and Narratives (Continued)</b></p>	<p>Robert, Jack</p>	
<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <p>Robert emphasized that BUD 1.2 will be tapped into throughout the process, and the workgroup agreed.</p> <p>FLOW: Management &amp; Control:                  Page 1 of 3:</p> <p>Enterprise Swimlane:                  BUD 2.2 – The workgroup asked if expenditure plan is included in this section. The workgroup confirmed that there is not one at the agency level. Action item taken regarding BUD 2.2, see below.</p> <p>Agency Swimlane:                  BUD 2.3 – No Questions. (NQ).                  BUD 2.4 – NQ                  BUD 2.5 – NQ                  BUD 2.6 – NQ</p> <p>Enterprise:                  BUD 2.7 – NQ</p>		

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
<p>Agency:                      BUD 2.8                      Robert explained by example the difference between a Hard &amp; Soft Stop budget check transactions or as seen in BUD 2.8 Complete or Stopped. Robert reiterated that there will be “shut off” of available Grant money by the interaction GAC modules.</p> <p>Enterprise:                      BUD 2.9 – NQ                      BUD 2.10 - NQ                      BUD 2.11:                      Q) Question around why BUD 2.11 is in the Enterprise level? Teri stated that these are only in agency level.                      A) An action item was taken regarding the Enterprise level definition, see below.</p> <p>BUD 2.12 – BUD 2.18 – covered. See action items below.</p> <p>Q) Can data be exported at certain points that is sensitive e.g. criminal data, police data?                      A) Yes.</p>		
<p><b>Close Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Items</li> <li>Homework</li> <li>Next Meeting Date / Time / Location</li> </ul>	Robert, Jack, Joanne	

Action Items			
Action Item #	Description of Item	Assigned To	Due Date
5/4: New			
1	On box BUD1.2, should contain “Adjusted Appropriation” instead of just “Appropriation”. The workgroup agreed for “current FY” (only), instead of current and prior fiscal years.	Joanne	Completed: 5/5/15
2	On box Bud 1.2 – pull out the “& Actuals” verbiage.	Joanne	Completed: 5/5/15
3	Robert requested calendar for current budget cycle from participants.	Robert, Erika	Completed: 5/5/15

Action Items			
Action Item #	Description of Item	Assigned To	Due Date
4	Teri requested and the workgroup agreed that a 2-way arrow needs drawn between BUD 1.19 & BUD 1.22.	Joanne	Completed: 5/5/15
5	BUD 1.20 should say "Final" and arrow should go from BUD 1.20 to BUD 1.21, no arrow from BUD 1.18 to BUD 1.21. As well replicate Reports circle above BUD 1.18	Joanne	Completed: 5/5/15
6	BUD 2.1 should include word "Adjusted".	Joanne	Completed: 5/5/15
7	Robert will provide definition for Approved Budget (is appropriation less reserved) to the EOG/OPB group & a joint finalization will occur.	Robert, Erika	Completed: 5/5/15
8	Change narrative BUD 2.2 and strike everything after the words "Release Schedule"	Robert	Completed: 5/5/15
9	Define that Enterprise Level data is available to agency within the narrative.  Jack will further define to the workgroup security protocols rather than writing in the narrative.	Jack	Completed: 5/11/15
10	BUD 2.18 - change verbiage to include Export points (raised by Cynthia).  The State BPS Team discussed that this capability is included with the BI/Data warehouse. Query & downloading is inherent within the system. Therefore, verbiage on the flows will not be changed, but this capability will be captured within the requirements.	Joanne	Completed: 5/6/15
11	Research other state's ERP implementations that included legacy systems.	Jack	Completed: 5/5/15
12	Workgroup to email to Robert any suggested KPIs before next meeting.	Robert, Workgroup	

**Needs/Requirements Identified or Discussed During Meeting:**

None added.