

**Meeting Details**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Tuesday April 21, 2015	<b>Meeting Time</b>	1:30 pm to 4:30 pm
<b>Meeting Location</b>	Betty Easley - Room 180		
<b>Meeting Objective</b>	Review and Discuss Draft R2R Level 2 Flows and Process Models		
<b>Attendees</b>	<p><u>Level 2 SMEs:</u>                  Thomas Poucher (DACS), Becky Devlin (DACS), <del>Stephen Hobbs (DEO)</del>, Alex Szigeti (DEO), Mike Wolfe (DCF), Asheema Vemuri (DCF), <del>Alisa Golden (DOE)</del>, Matt Kirkland (DOE), <del>Michael White (DOE)</del>, <del>Bert Wilkerson (Treasury)</del>, Melisa Hevey (Treasury), Kathy Ward-Adkins (Treasury), Mike Mentillo (LEG), <del>Gina Ballard (A&amp;A)</del>, Rose Salinas (APD), <del>Dee Ann Warren (APD)</del>, Barbara Trombino (Lottery), Veronica Bishop (AHCA)</p> <p><u>Florida PALM BPS Team:</u>                  Janice Jackson, Stanton Beazley, Robert Bolton, Elizabeth Chao, Tanner Collins, Robert Hicks, Deb Gries, Deana Metcalf, Angie Robertson</p>		
<b>Attachments/ Related Documents</b>	DRAFT Level 1 Process Flow and Narrative DRAFT Level 2 Process Flow and Narrative Level 1 R2R Definitions		

**Meeting Topics**

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
Introduction and Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General Housekeeping</li> <li>Participant Introductions</li> </ul>	Julian Gotreaux, Janice Jackson	<b>15 min</b> (1:30 pm-1:45 pm)
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction - Julian laid out the rules of engagement (squirrel story)</li> <li>Roll Call/Introduction of SME participants (12 total): Thomas Poucher, Becky Devlin, Alex Szigeti, Mike Wolfe, Asheema Vemuri, Mike Mentillo, Rose Salinas, Barbara Trombino, Veronica Bishop, Blake Goodwin (subbing for Gina), Kathy Ward-Adkins, Melisa Hevey</li> <li>Janice discussed the business process area diagram – most of the state’s business is conducted in the areas surrounding R2R, R2R is the general ledger and serves as a repository for the accounting events generated in the process areas. That is the key difference between R2R and the other process areas (like PJT). R2R is a management process that consolidates all of the financial information so that there can be consistent reporting to give a clear financial picture for the state.</li> </ul>		
Review of Draft Level 1 Flows	Janice	<b>20 min</b> (1:45 pm-2:05 pm)
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1s: This process flow is what came out of the R2R Level 1 workgroup. The first step is to start with the GL accounting structure. Then business is conducted and the ledgers are updated. Then we walk through the period end closes. Year End follows the monthly close activity box.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy Issue – will all of the agencies be required to do month end close?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Trial balance, schedule allotment reports – question about where those reports would come in (not after the period end close)? Those are represented by the R2 shape on the process flow.</li> <li>○ Typical questions that come from management during year end: Do I have the money to buy this? How much money do I have left?</li> </ul>		
Overview of Level 2 Flows and Narrative	Janice, Stanton Beazley, Robert Bolton	<b>55 min</b> (2:05 pm – 3:00 pm)
<p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 2 Overview: Robert covered the level settings slides that provided a brief overview of what an ERP system is and the advantages it brings because of the tightly integrated modules, standardized naming conventions, and standard Chart of Accounts. He also covered the basic system functionality in terms of capability and controls (Systems requirements slide). He then covered integrations and emphasized that an ERP system is highly integrated (also covered what integrations and interfaces are). Reporting Slide – there are hundreds of standard reports that come with the ERP, but an advantage of the new system is that you will need fewer reports to pull the information you need to complete your job.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concern brought up that the agency might not have all of the information because the information is not correctly tagged – this is an implementation issue</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Break</b>		<b>10 min</b> (3:00 pm – 3:10 pm)
Icebreaker	Janice	<b>10 min</b> (3:10 pm-3:20 pm)
Overview of Level 2 Flows and Narratives (Continued)	Janice, Stanton, Robert	<b>60 min</b> (3:20 pm – 4:20 pm)
<p>Notes:</p> <p>Janice gave a brief overview of the changes from Level 1 to Level 2 in terms of how the flow is structured and the use of the different shapes and their meanings. She also covered the difference between in line and floaters. She also walked through the KPI sections overview, governing laws/policies section, and future enhancements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a question about if the first assumption included the notes – no, this does not include the full notes, but there will be parts of the information for the notes that are in the system</li> <li>- How will the reports pull out the information necessary to generate reports like Schedule 1? This is a configuration issue and will be determined during that phase.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Key Standardization issue – audit adjustment entries will be needed to be made at a much more granular level</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Added in “effective dating of accounting codes” to the second to last assumptions</li> </ul>		

Topic	Presenter	Allotted Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarified that the last bullet is intended to identify the responsible party for providing the information to PALM</li> </ul> <p><u>General Ledger Maintenance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R2R 1.1/1.1.1 – no comment</li> <li>1.2 – no comment</li> <li>1.3 – no comment</li> <li>1.4 – no comment</li> <li>1.5 – A concern was voiced over visibility into this process (suggested a status report), enhancement functionality. Potential requirement –history of the workflow or current status of the workflow stage</li> <li>1.6 – this would include effective dating</li> <li>1.7 – articulate in the narrative that there is an approval/validation of the user access               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the final approval process for the actual code and the setup within the system and show that if the code setup is not valid that the process would restart</li> <li>Does deletion of codes follow this same update? – add clarification, it would be a de-activation not a deletion</li> </ul> </li> <li>1.8 – no comment</li> <li>1.9 – no comment</li> </ul>		
<p>Close Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Items</li> <li>Homework</li> <li>Next Meeting Date / Time / Location</li> </ul>	<p>Janice, Robert, Elizabeth Chao</p>	<p><b>10 min</b> (4:20 pm-4:30 pm)</p>

Action Items			
Number	Description of Item	Assigned To	Due Date
1.	Clarify CP 1.7 and the related narrative	Robert	04/28/2015
2.	Revise flow where needed to clarify the process	Robert, Elizabeth, Janice	04/28/2015
3.	Identify key standardization changes in the documents	Robert, Elizabeth, Janice	04/28/2015
4.	Potential requirement –history of the workflow or current status of the workflow stage	Robert, Elizabeth	04/28/2015

Requirement	Additional Notes or Context
General ledger maintenance workflow status updates	User could see the history of the workflow or current status of the workflow stage