



MEETING MINUTES

State of Louisiana LaGov Project

Operating Budget: Details and Systems Timeline

August 27 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. / August 28 8:30 – 3:30

Location: 1-138 (Colorado Rm.), Claiborne Building

Attendees:

| No. | Name | Invited? | Attended? | Comments |
|-----|------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| 1. | Hodges, Beverly | Y | N | LaGov |
| 2. | Thigpen, Drew | Y | N | LaGov |
| 3. | Ramsrud, Mary | Y | N | LaGov |
| 4. | Hodnett, John | Y | N | LaGov |
| 5. | Dusse, Barry | Y | N | OPB |
| 6. | Barbier, Mike | Y | Y | OPB |
| 7. | Vaught, Sylvia | Y | Y | LaGov |
| 8. | Boyd, David | Y | N | LaGov |
| 9. | Kelly, Will | Y | Y | LaGov |
| 10. | Fernandez, Paul | Y | Y | LaGov |
| 11. | Jacob-John, Manoj (JJ) | Y | Y | LaGov |
| 12. | Peak, Ashley | Y | Y | LaGov |
| 13. | Montes, Rene | Y | Y | LaGov |
| 14. | Schmitt, L.J. | Y | N | OPB * |
| 15. | Whyde, Janet | N | Y | LaGov |
| 16. | Mumphrey, Jeff | Y | Y | OPB |
| 17. | Murray, Michael | Y | Y | OPB |
| 18. | Granier, Katherine | Y | Y | OPB |
| 19. | Hildago, Lucy | N | Y | LaGov |
| 20. | Rives, Cindy | Y | N | OPB |
| 21. | Burch , John | Y | N | |
| 22. | Hutchinson, Ternisa | Y | N | OPB |
| 23. | Bunch, Stephen | N | Y | LaGov |

| <i>Agenda Item and Notes</i> | <i>Owner(s)</i> | <i>Action Items & Assignments</i> | <i>Comments / Follow-up</i> |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Logistics, Ground Rules, & Introduction | Paul Fernandez | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | |
| 2. Project Timeline | Paul Fernandez | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | |
| 3. Workshop Objectives | Paul Fernandez Manoj Jacob-John | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | |
| 4. Business Process Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As-Is Process Process Improvement Opportunities SAP Glossary SAP concepts & functionality Leading practices Business process flow Enterprise readiness challenges | Paul Fernandez Manoj Jacob-John | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See action items & assignments below. | Hard copies provided - Future Budget Prep Sessions, As-Is Process (Executive Budget Development - Detail), SAP Glossary (current and future terms), Master Data Integration, Business Process Flow, BP-FM Design: Versions |
| 5. Action Items | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Manoj Jacob-John/LJ Schmitt/ Paul Fernandez - Review Higher Ed. submission into Brass (July 1st) Systems: Peoplesoft, Banner, Other homemade systems (HCSD) Funds: General Fund/Stat Ded. (Scope of Integration to accounting systems) Per Paul Fernandez should be covered in reporting - Check State Budget (Executive Budget plus amendments) details Rene Montes - Change As-Is process for Executive Budget Development, add 15 day check after publishing to the web | |

-
4. Will Kelly -
 - a. Review impact of Microsoft Vista operating system on SAP ECC and BI/BP systems
 - b. Check upload/download from Lotus 123
 - c. Excel version to be used by end user with BeX tool
 - d. Web Browser to be used by end user
 5. Paul Fernandez/ LJ Schmitt - Check BR9B report data for Higher Ed/HCSO (hospital) / (Agency date to be determined)
 6. Manoj Jacob-John / Fernando Figueroa - Specific Control (FM) for Agency/Program vs. Self Generated Revenue (GL codes) e.g. Control on 1685 – Fees hunting & fishing licenses
 7. Paul Fernandez/OPB - Changes to Budget forms need to be finalized by Jan. 2009
 8. Manoj Jacob-John/Paul Fernandez - Check data for Commissioner/Legislature for previous year waves Accept/Reject/Modify (BSLT)
 9. Barry Dusse - Check for DNR Coastal Restoration Project, as included in the Operating Budget
 10. Manoj Jacob-John/Paul Fernandez - During Realization, review impact of (versions in the leg. phase)
 - a. \$500 delta approach
 - b. Change base _??
 - c. Base + (plus)
 11. Manoj Jacob-John/Paul Fernandez Non-Recurring – flag to carry over(to be process)

-
-
12. Manoj Jacob-John -
Check DSO field for
security authority
 13. Manoj Jacob-John Check
Notes for OPB analysts
on Forms
 14. Paul Fernandez - Review
BSLT table (As-Is) for To-
Be
 15. Manoj Jacob-John/Paul
Fernandez/Mary Ramsrud
- Can we create a Budget
Revenue Object Review
Rollup Commitment
Items in GL account List
-
-

6. Key Decisions

1. Check Agency submission
using validations (tbd)
 2. No change to the DI
table/process including
re-numbering every year
 3. Possibly no conversion of
DI table from BRASS
 4. Break up (Misc. Revenue
1835) to facilitate budget
prep details
 5. MOF to be in all layout
entries
-
-

7. Parking Lot

1. Contracts data in budget
 2. Grants – Special
Legislative Projects /Non
Government
Organizations. Possibly
to be included in a field in
the DI/BSLT.
 - a. Also in capital
outlay budget
 3. Budgeting of One-Time
Revenue
 4. Check on Copy function
e.g. BR15 from Version
copy from A2 to B1A at a
certain date, for any one
Agency and/or Program
 5. Entries for Continuation &
Executive: 1 or 2 entries?
 6. OPB option to cut (\$1 m)
at Object Category Level
on the Agency's detailed
Budget (time constraint)
-
-

8. Enterprise Readiness

1. Legislative Staff to be
trained on New SAP acct
code –e.g. MOF-Gen
Fund by:
 2. Training reports to be
-
-

qualified to use budget
prep tool.

9. **Policy Impact**

1. What is the legislature involvement for changing Budget Forms/Layouts/Reports Committee(Legislature)
 2. RS 39:32/36 may need change. Also check if budget needs to be balanced at the program or agency level
 3. MOF/Rev at Expenditure Level
-

10. **F.R.I.C.E.- W**

1. Reporting for NGO's (Non Governmental Organizations) /SLP (Special Legislative Projects. Non OPB amendment reporting
 2. Text capture of long text
 - a. BSLT
 - b. DI
 - c. Agency Submission
 - d. Including spell check
 - e. Attached to program
-

Discussion Points:

- There was discussion by all regarding the legislature and their acceptance/inclusion into the blueprint phase, LJ Schmitt, brought up the point that this was a chance to get rid of paper forms by putting the budget entry forms online. Paul Fernandez suggested bringing in the legislature into the validation sessions and selling them on the changes to forms, layouts etc. Everything that can be electronic should be, however not everything will be paperless (e.g. Legislature still wanted paper forms from Vehicle Database) Will Kelly said that there is incompatibility now between DOA and the legislature with the word processing software. The DOA uses Microsoft Word and the Legislature uses WordPerfect. House Bill II is produced in Microsoft Word but is reformatted into WordPerfect. Will Kelly said that if changes are going to affect the legislature, the changes should be brought up early in order for them to have time to consider.
- Means of Financing was discussed by all and revolved around several issues, including
 - Balancing Means of Financing by Agency and Program for Actuals and Budget
 - Balancing Means of Financing by Revenue and Expenditures for Actuals/Budget
 - The legal requirement to produce House Bill I by Means of Financing, Agency and Program (this was added as an action item)

Jeff Mumphrey asked what the purpose of tying Means of Financing to Expenditures was, since the agencies only track stat ded. , and federal, the agencies put their money in one pot; they don't distinguish the kind of money they spend. Additionally, Jeff Mumphrey pointed out that ISIS (AFS) does not tie (or enforce to tie) by Means of Finance. Paul Fernandez asked how the BR6S was produced since the form is by means of finance. The response by OPB was that the means of finance was a guesstimate, expenditures are prorated. Mike Barbier made reference to the fact that the law requires OPB to produce the Executive Budget by means of Finance. Will Kelly made the point that it would be best to keep means

of financing since the commissioner will ask for expenditures by means of finance; because even if this administration decided it did not need it, then the next administration could required it and means of finance would have to be in the system. Paul Fernandez said that if producing the budget by means of financing was law then the agencies would have to comply. JJ asked what would be best practice for the state and also noted that this is just the beginning of the means of finance discussion because the agencies would have to be included. Michael Murry asked if edits (or triggers) could be built-in to the system that would force the agencies to balance by means of finance however Jeff Mumphrey said that agencies would prorate outside the system and still balance if that was the case.

- There was discussion about the general functionality of the budget preparation module and ECC. JJ said that the gang of six in BRASS budget would be known as the gang of nine in BP-IP (SAP). JJ also said formulas to tie out forms can be used and the update of the information in the budget preparation module would be real time, any update from ECC would be nightly. Grants would not be just a source of revenue but will now have their own sponsor dimensions (start/dates, cost objects etc.) Will Kelly said that the data mart that currently exists; would be known as BI (Business Intelligence). Paul Fernandez added that more robust reporting will be done form BI. Mike Barbier asked if each budget year is contained in the budget cube and could you operate with more than one cube at a time, the answer was yes. JJ clarified by saying a separate cube is not required for each fiscal year.
- Katherine Granier asked if the BR9B information could remain static, i.e. not able to be changed by agencies and if changes would be allowed then would a trail of the changes be kept. Currently the agencies pull the BR9B report, make changes to it and submit it to OPB. The report is not consistent with any subsequent reports generated from ISIS HR. Janet Whyde pointed out that the agencies don't keep their BR9B (human resources) data clean (updated) and as a result need to change the BR9B reports. JJ said that a meeting with the agencies would have to be conducted to answer these questions.
- The topic of how NGO's (Non Governmental Organizations), SLP's (Special Legislative Projects) and Non OPB amendments (some of these were pass throughs) would be handled in budget preparation was brought up by the group. (F.R.I.C.E.- W) Paul Fernandez said these might be internal orders. Michael Murry asked if SLP's would be more like contracts, the answer was not known at this time.
- The decision by the CO (Cost Allocation) group to record revenue at the agency level and expenditures at the program level was discussed. JJ told everyone that if this decision was going to be the case then actual revenue would not be available by program, and thus a problem for budget prep because OPB would not know the break down of revenue by program. Everyone agreed that currently revenue and expenditures were recorded at the program level in BRASS.
- A question about how grant budgets were going to be brought into the budget prep module was asked by Michael Murry. Grants may not be fully appropriated for a given state fiscal year. How will the budget preparation module account for the differences in fiscal years (between state/federal)? JJ said that the differences in fiscal years would be handled in the Grants Management module.
- Budgeting levels were brought up by Mike Barbier and Paul Fernandez, specifically the rollups that could be used. JJ cited the example of Travel which is broken down into In/Out of State Travel, the actual expenditure maybe recorded at the In/Out of State Travel but the control would be at the Travel object category level. Mike Barbier said specific revenue has to be used for specific programs e.g. fees for hunting licenses can only be used on hunting enforcement. Michael Murray said that you may not want to tie certain revenue objects to certain programs. These are decisions made in the FM module sessions related to the Budget Address, and OPB and other participants must attend FM sessions to influence decisions made in this regard.
- An example of how web-based security would work was provided by JJ; 3 levels of security would exists:
 - Web Access
 - Layout (query)
 - Transactional Data (e.g. based on Cost Center)

Planning Personnel will have Layout tab and reporting tab, others will have only reporting tab (maybe other tabs but not Layout tab). End users, using Business Explorer (BEx), would typical access Layouts through a workbook. (Layout for end users) Global and local planning functions would be used

- Michael Murry asked if report access can be turned off/on this is because agencies have different levels, for example Department of Labor vs. Department of Insurance. JJ said that it could be done however it is anticipated that the reports will be standardized at appropriate levels for all agencies. The best practice would be obtained. Jeff Mumphrey said the same issue would exist for the Higher Ed. agencies because the agencies currently only enter only general revenue, stat ded. and federal but only draw general and stat. ded. Jeff Mumphrey added that potential solution would be to have the Higher Ed. agencies input their budget directly into SAP Budget Prep. Will Kelly said maybe the transparency initiative would be the way to bring Higher Ed. into the system (SAP). Paul Fernandez said a new BOR16 form would have to be defined. JJ said this would be a question of scope as far as the Higher Ed. agencies were concerned.
- The question of how many budget versions should be stored was asked by JJ. The reason for the question was to appropriately size the database in order to fit the required number of versions based on the response from OPB. JJ also pointed out that a version was the copy of the database objects (cubes, ancillary tables etc.); a snapshot at a desired point in time not to be changed. A version would include all agencies, all slices of data. Jeff Mumphrey, Katherine Grainer and others asked if forms (layouts) could have validations in order to ensure that agencies balanced before being submitted to the OPB. JJ said there would be validation steps that would be added. It was agreed for now that the final agency submission would be a version. Jeff Mumphrey said for the current year multiple versions will need to be available but don't need to be stored. Michael Murry asked if the naming convention of the versions could start with 'BR', JJ said the version key is three characters and that there would be agreement on a naming convention. The versions were noted by JJ on the version spreadsheet as a going-in position for the next Blueprint session with Agencies. Six main budget versions were identified. JJ asked who would make agency adjustments for BADPacks or other adjustments (Agency or OPB?). JJ also asked if there would be any agency involvement at the SIFO III level, the answer was no by the OPB. Jeff Mumphrey and others pointed out that this would be a budget level issue since the OPB would not know how to spread adjustments. JJ said everything has to be at the level of detail that is required by the funds management module.
- Legislative amendments were discussed; each amendment can be handled through the BSLT field and the use of a status flag. The flag would identify each status (accept, reject, modify, contingency) for the amendment. Paul Fernandez brought up the point that a version in BRASS was the original EOB plus or minus the delta (change) with any new changes added being a different version (changing the base vs. versioning). In BRASS a version is considered a column; columns are compared to obtain a new version. JJ asked if amendments that were rejected by the commissioner a year ago needed to be stored, the answer by the OPB was no, only for the current year. JJ asked if the legislature needed to have access to a version of the budget, the answer by the OPB was no. Jeff Mumphrey wanted to know if reports could be generated for amendments, such as a report by the amendment action taken by all (commissioner, legislature etc.) or a report on the various stages of the amendment process. JJ said that these reports would be generated based on BSLT codes. JJ asked how many versions would be required for the appropriations process. JJ said that the appropriation letter stage required its own version.
- It was also noted that budget forms were changing. Michael Murry said that forms change every year. This year form change will be finalized in January 2009. Ashley Peak pointed out that form changes affect the agencies, because agencies may need to go back and re-enter their numbers.
- Discussion about budget request forms was specific to each of the budget request forms. Each of the forms was identified as a detail form or a summary report form and noted by JJ in the forms spreadsheet. Mike Barbier asked if functions could be applied to certain objects JJ answered yes. Mike Barbier pointed that form CB8 was to request employees; employees are not requested from Human Resources. JJ said the topic of employees would be discussed with the agencies. Paul Fernandez also pointed out that a meeting with Civil Service and the OPB was to be scheduled to talk about these issues. JJ asked if all reports would be on the web, Will Kelly replied that it was too early to say. Mike Barbier asked if columns on forms could be re-arranged, the answer by JJ was yes. It was also noted that BRASS posted all entries, whereas SAP BP-IP entries made on the BEx/Web are stored in the Cube. Detail forms are entered and rolled up using a summary report.. Jeff Mumphrey asked if a redesign of all the back detail forms for means of financing was required. JJ replied that a meeting with the agencies would be required. JJ asked what the code next to the revenue object (code 1224) meant on BR6 form. Lucy Hidalgo answered that it was a revenue organization code in AFS and it was tied to the means of

financing. JJ said that planning functions may need to ~~could~~ be used for the BR12 form since this form is not always filled out correctly. The point was brought up that not everyone used the ISAS travel module, (about 10% not using) for the BR14 form. JJ said that on form BR17 contract information was required, and that there was to be follow up with the Logistics team regarding the contract data text to be input into contracts, especially to see if the data relevant for Budget is captured/converted from CFMS to MM. Paul Fernandez asked if supplemental documents could be attached and JJ replied that they could be attached at one-dimensional level (e.g. Program level, which is a Cost Center). JJ asked what the priority meant on form BR20a, Paul Fernandez said it was a ranking by the agency. Paul Fernandez also said that form BR20a was tied to an IT form (process) e.g. IT10. Form 20b (Fleet Maintenance) was discussed and Paul Fernandez said it may be a policy decision for everyone to get on fleet maintenance.

- The BR9 form was discussed; JJ asked what the hours meant on the form, Janet Whyde replied that it was they were paid hours. Janet Whyde will follow-up on wage type reports (BM65). Mike Barbier pointed out that this was only for current employees not FTE's. JJ said that the process issues are to be discussed with T.O. and Civil Service, as mentioned earlier.
- The BSLT field was discussed, Paul, Catherine and Mike asked if author, waves, chamber could be added to this field. JJ replied that he would conduct an exercise for both the DI and BSLT field in order to ensure the required attributes were added for the two fields.
- The subject of training was brought up by Michael Murry and Mike Barbier, their question was about the required amount of training on the budget prep module as well as who was to receive the training. JJ said that this would be a decision taken by the Change Management/Training in the Realization phase, which has a very elaborate process of identifying all Users in the State/Agencies, assigning User Roles, and then mapping User Roles to SAP transactions.
- Windows Vista and Microsoft Internet Explorer were discussed relative to the client installation of BEx the SAP Microsoft Excel layout tool; JJ pointed out the fact that they layouts from the tool may not look the same if different browsers are used. Will Kelly said that the state had a Microsoft Internet Explorer standard mainly because of Human Resources. Will also said that the statewide installation of Microsoft Window Vista may not happen. An action item has been captured to decide on this matter.