Date	09/14/2016	Time	2 p.m.
Location	Department of Revenue Building 1, Room 1220/1221 2450 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399		
Objective	September 14, 2016 Executive Steering Committee Meeting		
Attendees	**Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Members*:** Robert (Budd) Kneip (DFS), Chair; Tanner Collins (DFS); ~~David DiSalvo (DMS)~~; Rosalyn (Roz) Ingram (DMS); Maria Johnson (DOR); ~~Mike Jones (EOG)~~; ~~Cynthia Kelly (EOG)~~; Robin Kinsey (DFS); Rachael Lieblick (DFS); Angie Martin (DFS); ~~Kimberly McMurray (DCF)~~; Robin Naitove (FDOT); Jennifer Reeves Foster (DFS); Danta White (DFS); Bob Wilson (DEP) **Other Speakers:** Danielle Kosberg (DFS), Angie Robertson (DFS), Melissa Turner (DFS) *Members who were unable to attend are denoted by strikethrough text.*		
Attachments/ Related Documents	• August 2016 Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes • Presentation for September 14, 2016 Executive Steering Committee Meeting		
Action Items	N/A		

Roll Call and Opening Remarks: Facilitated by Robert (Budd) Kneip, DFS, Chair
Chair Robert (Budd) Kneip called the meeting to order at 2 p.m. starting with a roll call of the ESC members. Eleven of the 15 ESC members were present.

Review of August 2016 Meeting Minutes: Facilitated by Melissa Turner, DFS
The ESC was provided the August 2016 Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes. There were no revisions or objections. The ESC was informed the meeting minutes would be posted on the Florida PALM Project (Project) website following the meeting.

Florida PALM Project Update: Facilitated by Danielle Kosberg, DFS; Angie Robertson, DFS; and Melissa Turner, DFS
Ms. Melissa Turner provided a budget update through the end of August 2016. The Project is still within the current spending plan and, per proviso, the next budget release is based on the approval of the Business Requirements.

Ms. Angie Robertson stated the Project has continued to meet with Legislative and Governor's Office partners, focusing on four groups of Functional Business Requirements. The Project presented a list of policy items to the Department of Financial Services' (DFS) Financial Policy Committee that reflects decisions to consider in design and implementation, some of which may

warrant changes to Florida Statute. Four Business Requirements tied to policy decisions were reviewed with the ESC. Various uses of the term "core" were discussed. Three "core" references (i.e., current state, future state, and ERP modules) and their definitions were reviewed with the ESC.

Group one of the Functional Business Requirements was completed and posted on the Florida PALM website August 30, 2016. The summary of 28 changes to group one were reviewed with the ESC, as were the column headers in the Business Requirements Update (Parts 1 and 2) spreadsheet. Ms. Robertson asked if this was an acceptable way to communicate changes to the ESC and everyone agreed that it was.

Ms. Robertson described that ESC members provided 172 lines of feedback during their review of Business Requirements, which resulted in 99 changes to Business Requirements. The Functional and Technical Summary of Resolutions based on ESC Feedback were reviewed with the ESC. Most changes were to re-write existing requirements, followed by deletion of requirements, then priority changes. The results of the changes will be reflected in the combined file that will be posted on the Florida PALM website.

Over the next two weeks, the Project will continue to meet with Governor's Office and Legislative partners to complete groups two, three and four of the Functional Business Requirements and discuss Technical Business Requirements, if needed. The next ESC meeting will include a discussion of any questions regarding changes to Business Requirements and a request for acceptance by the ESC. Ms. Robertson concluded by reviewing the remaining activities and timeframes in the Business Requirements timeline with the ESC.

Ms. Rachael Lieblick asked if ESC members should hold questions until the September 28, 2016 meeting. Ms. Robertson replied the members can submit questions to the Project but they cannot be presented to the ESC until the 28th.

Ms. Maria Johnson asked if Florida PALM will be sending or posting the feedback. Ms. Robertson replied it will be sent to the ESC via email.

Ms. Danielle Kosberg gave an overview of the ITN process and discussed the framework in order to prepare the ESC for their upcoming review of the documents. Several partners including a procurement support vendor, Project sponsors, and two law firms have assisted in the development of the ITN documents. DFS Purchasing will post and manage the procurement and perform mandatory minimum qualification and administrative reviews (e.g., statutory requirements, documents signed, number of binders were provided) of replies to the ITN. Replies not meeting mandatory minimum qualifications will be deemed non-responsive and will not proceed to evaluation. The ESC was advised the Business Requirements are a critical part of the ITN and are incorporated into the ITN as a reference. The ESC will approve them prior to the ITN and therefore will not need to approve them during the ITN document review.

A brief description of the ITN document and the evaluation of replies was presented to the ESC. The ITN document contains Project background, mandatory minimum qualifications, timeline, procurement process, disclosure of reply contents, and response format. Evaluators will be provided all reply information including responses in DD2, with the exception of Cost Replies. Respondents whose replies meet mandatory minimum qualifications will be invited to provide demonstrations of proposed software and team presentations during the evaluation phase.

_____

Evaluators will use a consistent approach to assigning points based on a scale of one to five, creating a competitive range. Following evaluation, DFS may select one or more respondents within the competitive range with which to commence negotiations (concurrently or sequentially). A brief description of ITN Attachments A through H was presented to the ESC.

Ms. Maria Johnson asked if an example of a Solution Deliverable would be parallel testing. Ms. Kosberg advised the Project has defined what it thinks Project and Solution Deliverables are, but wants to be flexible and is leaving it up to respondents to define. Ms. Turner added to focus on Solution Deliverables as outcomes or results.

Ms. Roz Ingram asked if respondents could include any value added services. Ms. Kosberg responded yes. Ms. Turner clarified there could also be alternative services that don't have a cost value.

Ms. Lieblick inquired about vendors indicating costs for customizations in DD2 and trying to reconcile DD2 to ITN responses. Ms. Kosberg stated a reference number will provide a three-way match among sources.

Ms. Kosberg read the procurement expectations to the ESC and stated that consistent with the communication prohibition in section 287.057(23), Florida Statute, any attempt to influence the procurement by contacting executive or legislative branch employees will be grounds for rejecting a response to the solicitation.

Ms. Ingram added they cannot speak to anyone except DFS Purchasing, asked if the evaluation team had been determined, would the ESC would go "dark", if anyone on the ESC would be an evaluator, and for a realistic timeframe for the ITN. Ms. Kosberg replied the Evaluation Team had not been determined yet and a realistic timeframe for the ITN was November 2016 to January 2017. Ms. Turner responded the Project was still working through the mechanics of communication with the ESC and would like to continue to communicate as appropriate. Ms. Turner also added the need to consider having someone else fill in if an ESC member was an evaluator.

Mr. Tanner Collins asked if agencies would be operating in two systems during rollout if a phased approach was used. Ms. Turner said it is not the Project's intention to have agencies work in two systems, but that the vendors will propose their recommendation, which may include temporary interfaces which could be utilized during rollout.

Ms. Kosberg reviewed the remaining activities and timeframes in the SSI ITN document timeline with the ESC. Ms. Kosberg concluded by asking what the Project's best avenue to receive ESC feedback would be and proposed visiting members similar to the Project's approach to Business Requirements. The ESC agreed to individual meetings beginning Monday, October 10th and a mid-month meeting for questions on Wednesday, October 12th. The Project will conduct the regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, October 26th. Another meeting is planned for Monday, October 31, 2016 ESC meeting will include a request for approval by the ESC.

Ms. Robin Naitove asked how many evaluators there will be across agencies. Ms. Kosberg replied the Evaluation Team had not been determined yet.

_____

Upcoming Activities: Facilitated by Melissa Turner, DFS
Ms. Turner reviewed the Project's upcoming activities and again offered the ESC an opportunity to meet with Brian Eppig, Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V), on an individual basis.

New Business and Open Discussion: Facilitated by Melissa Turner, DFS
No new business was presented by meeting participants.

Next Meeting: Facilitated by Melissa Turner, DFS
The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 28, 2016 beginning at 1 p.m. It will be a three-hour meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.