



Meeting Minutes

Meeting Title:	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
Date:	September 25, 2006
Time:	11:00 AM ET
Location:	McFall Chart Room

Invitees/Attendees (* in attendance, # absent, + substitute, = by conference call)

Names			
*	Bruce Petryshak	*	Phyllis Short
#	Linda Dobb	*	John G Gleason
*	Chris Dalton	*	Melissa Hudson-Nowak
*	Ron Lancaster	#	John G Folkins
*	Gaylyn Finn	*	Chris Cox
*	Bill Gerwin	*	Ginny Pinkelman
#	Toby Singer		
*	Cindy Fuller		

Opening Statements

Bruce called the meeting to order at 11:05AM.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the September 11 meeting were approved and can be posted to the website.

Bruce stated the project office asked departments to self-identify roles and responsibilities within FMS. To assure the appropriate individuals are involved; departments were also asked to complete surveys. Department inventory and existing budget administrators was the base; followed by a review of roles and responsibilities in the new system; automated workflows and then begin looking at potential gaps in departments. An example of a gap; would be responsibility assigned to one person or people missing. Gaps will be filled and expect to train an estimated 500 people. **Mel** asked if there is a need for support relative to the teaching. **Mel** is glad to help and **Bruce** will keep this in mind.

Bruce stated a formal process for delegation of task will also be developed. A formal document will be created and require vice presidential approval to delegate. **Mel** asked if the signature is someone else outside of the chain and **Bruce** stated yes; it must be someone outside of the chain and in addition that individual would document their involvement as well. **Mel** is concerned with the auditing aspect of this process. Every transaction that is approved that involves delegations will require **Mel** to manually find the backup. **Mel** stated the department must know they must retain the manual approvals for the same retention period as the electronic. **Mel** will view this as a non-approved transaction if the department can't support it. **Bruce** will work with **Mel** on the process. **Bruce** noted it will require vice presidential approval. **Chris D** suggested a waiting period. **Mel** is surprised to have the exception. **Bruce** is concerned without the exception people will go around the system and result in flaws. The process will be clear and require vice presidential approval. **Chris D** asked that the approval require both **Bruce** and vice presidential approval. **Mel** stated in addition to the processes, the number of people using the exception needs to be monitored and their location. **Chris D** stated every exception needs to be communicated to internal auditing. **Bruce** stated the process could go from vice president to

internal auditing. **Mel** expressed the need to know the document exists; not necessarily to sign-off on the documents. **Bruce** indicated the easiest way is for Mel to sign-off on the documents to guarantee Mel is aware it exists.

Ron stated there needs to be a clear understanding of the process roles and the serious consequences for using someone else's ID. **Bruce** agreed and stated this would be a policy violation. **Chris C** noted this will play a part in the student system as well. As an example, students provide their ID information to parents. **Bruce** indicated options are under review for guest ID's.

PeopleSoft Project Status Update

John G stated as of last week the project is at 72% work hours complete. At the last meeting **John G** stated the team was averaging a gain of 7% a month. **John G** indicated in July the project was at 53%, August 64% and September 72%; with a gain this time of 8%.

In terms of moving forward, business process flow presentations will be scheduled. The intent is for senior management to prepare for the new business process flows and the change in how the university does business. **Mel** noted a Board of Trustee meeting will be held October 13, and may run into scheduling conflicts.

John G stated the plan is to begin integrated user system testing in early October. This will involve loading the complete set of vendors, assets, budgets, customers and process transactions through requisitions, project grants and also through interfaces that have been developed. **John G** stated the bookstore interface is ready and working on dining services as well. This will follow a user acceptance test in early November. **Jerry Ameling** is developing a set of representative users from each department along with the project team. After user acceptance testing is complete; will ask appropriate people to sign-off for clarification the system is doing what is expected.

A parallel test is planned for early December. A select group of department cost centers will process parallel data from the August accounting period. The month of January will involve clean-up and preparation for go-live in February.

Mel asked if the individual departments will be dual entering or will it involve rolling through the transactions to see if they work. **John G** stated yes, will emulate the environments as of the beginning of August, process the transactions for August and hope the transactions match AFIN for select departments. **Gaylyn** asked who is inputting the data and **John G** believes individuals from user departments. **Mel** asked if the departments are aware in order to plan workflow appropriately and plan for December. **Bill** believes **Jerry Ameling** communicated this to all individuals involved. The plan is to train early and fold several items together.

John G stated **Faye Nicholson** worked for a couple weeks to complete reconciliation on departmental budgets for fiscal year 2006 between AFIN and FMS; there were 15 reconcilable issues. In addition, the balance forward for the beginning of this period was also reconciled and there were no issues. Efforts are now focusing on open issues in projects and grants for loading of budgets and beginning balances. **John G** anticipates project grants will be loaded today or tomorrow.

John G stated OBOR transactions previously categorized as projects in AFIN are in the process of being recategorized as departments. **Bill** clarified this as OBOR equipment purchases.

Mel asked if the funds are earmarked for a particular expense or is there a method in the system to indicate how it can be spent? **Gaylyn** stated this is actually processed after the fact; the money does not move. **Mel** is concerned with how the money is spent. **Chris** stated OBOR

does review this and if it does not meet the specific criteria for instructional equipment it is not reimbursed.

John G stated vendor data was loaded into the CNV database. The analysis revealed only 30 vendors with more than 3 address lines. There was a previous dilemma with addresses and tying the address to a location. A process was created through conversion for one main location for each vendor. In many cases there were other addresses in AFIN that resulted in a problem tying it to something. It was decided to create one location and leave the addresses to tie to an appropriate location in the future. Further analysis revealed 30 vendors with more than 3 address lines.

Bruce asked if it is possible there are individual vendor records that are the same vendor and **John G** stated there is a vendor cleanup underway and hopefully it will identify this. **Bruce** asked how many vendors were consolidated. **John G** stated currently 8,750 vendors were extracted; 3,210 are suppliers, 3,715 are employee or student reimbursements, 980 are consultants, 631 additional suppliers without tax identification or social security number, 121 benefit payroll providers, 65 foreign vendors and 28 petty cash individuals. **Bill** expressed concern regarding the 631 additional suppliers without tax identification or social security number and properly report 1099's for this group. **Ron** asked if the students (in the vendor group) will be converted over and **John G** stated yes. Students who have had a check cut in the last 12 months will be converted over. **Mel** suggested the need for a broader discussion on unique payables as it may not be a good fit for ongoing vendor payments. **Chris D** asked if the 8,750 vendors were active within the last year and **John G** stated yes.

John G stated FMS control tables were moved into production. There were a few issues and **John G** expects by midweek it will be reconciled and then copy the control tables into the Q&A Database.

John G stated production security is catching up and went from 55-61% complete. The surveys are in and will analyze the data for input.

Bob Allen begins today as the new Ciber Consultant replacing Bruce Blandino. **Mel** asked if Bob will be here for an extended amount of time and **John G** stated Bob will be here through the end of the project.

John G is concerned about two areas in modeling; General Ledger and Grants. Tom Kornacki and Trish had to revert back to translation questions last week which resulted in some lost time. **John G** asked for a representative from the Business Office to assist with translations questions which will allow Tom and Trish to do modeling for General Ledger and Grants. **Bruce** asked how soon **John G** would like an answer and **John G** indicated soon. **Gaylyn** asked how long this would continue and **Bill** stated throughout the end of the project. **Gaylyn** will speak with Jim regarding translations. It was suggested this person also take on the role of entering translation values. **Gaylyn** will look into.

Action/Information Items

Bill presented Information Item FMS-0007; Budget Security by Department. There will be some differences between security as it is today in AFIN and FMS. There are issues with query in FMS; those with access can run queries on any data within FMS.

John G stated currently in AFIN those with access to department cost centers can only view department journals for that cost center; however, PeopleSoft users can view all budget journals if the user has access to the journal entry screen.

A big difference between PeopleSoft and AFIN is Security and Focus. The security is the same as it is currently in AFIN; however, PeopleSoft security is not correlated. PeopleSoft delivers table level security to restrict access to budget table, but is unable to restrict as delivered access to rows in that table. Users with access to budgets will also be able to view this information through query.

Mel asked if this piece is also the case for the HR component and **John G** stated no, the HR component is designed with row level security.

Mel asked if there are methods to restrict the information that have not been chosen and **Bill** stated there would be drawbacks with those options and it could result in reporting problems.

John G stated the problem results when the user access is rolled out to different budget administrators. If the query is restricted and not rolled out, the security would be relatively safe. Once the query is rolled out everyone has access.

In terms of budget related screens in AFIN, the user is unable to view budget journals outside the user's authorization, but can view it in PeopleSoft. PeopleSoft allows restrictions in budget entries to a specific department, but it will show all budget journals. In PeopleSoft, users will be able to transfer within their department, but not between departments.

Commitment control security can be enabled to restrict access to making journal entries and adjustments. **John G** stated in AFIN, the user can view all requisitions and purchase orders. There is really no difference between the two systems.

Ron and **Chris D** noted budget information is available to the public.

Bill stated the intent is to bring awareness to the committee that there are some minor differences, but the plan was to go forward with this during the implementation. **Bill** stated the project team discussed the differences and comfortable moving forward.

Bill stated the large areas will want query for special Adhoc reporting on their division. **Mel** suggested a separate access sheet document for query and **Bill** stated a separate document can be created. **Bill** stated query access in FMS will not guarantee access in student.

Ron stated the student presentations went very well last week.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 12:09PM.

Next Meeting Date:	October 23, 2006
Next Meeting Location:	McFall Chart Room
Minutes Prepared by:	Ginny Pinkelman