



MEETING MINUTES

State of Louisiana LaGov ERP Project

Blueprint Workshop / PS-Validation/ Project Systems

December 10 2008 - 08:30 to 4:00

Location: DOTD Conference Area 6W

Attendees:

No.	Name	Invited?	Attended 12/10/2008	Cancelled 12/11/2008	Email Address
1.	Hidalgo, Lucie	Y	N		Lucie.Hidalgo@LA.GOV
2.	Hodges, Beverly	Y	N		Beverly.Hodges@LA.GOV
3.	Hodnett, John	Y	Y		John.Hodnett@LA.GOV
4.	Hofstad, Larry	Y	Y		Larry.Hofstad@LA.GOV
5.	Jacob-John, Manoj	Y	N		Manoj.Jacob-John@LA.GOV
6.	Kelly, Will	Y	N		Will.Kelly@LA.GOV
7.	Lee, Christine	Y	Y		Christine.Lee@LA.GOV
8.	Lozano, Richard	Y	N		Richard.Lozano@LA.GOV
9.	Oglesby, John	Y	Y		John.Oglesby@LA.GOV
10.	Parker, Penny	Y	N		Penny.Parker@LA.GOV
11.	Ramsrud, Mary	Y	N		Mary.Ramsrud@LA.GOV
12.	Schoenfield, Dee Dee	Y	N		Diana.Schoenfield@LA.GOV
13.	Scott, Marlene	Y	N		Marlene.Scott@LA.GOV
14.	Speights, Rhoama	Y	N		Rhoama.Speights@LA.GOV
15.	Thigpen, Drew	Y	Y		Drew.Thigpen@LA.GOV
16.	Wheeler, Sue	Y	N		Sue.Wheeler@LA.GOV
17.	Wieczorek, Christine	Y	N		Christine.Wieczorek@LA.GOV
18.	Cusick, Charlie	Y	N		Charles.Cusick@LA.GOV
19.	Davis, John	Y	Y		John.Davis@LA.GOV
20.	Futch, Lynn	Y	N		Lynn.Futch@LA.GOV
21.	LeBlanc, Carolyn	Y	Y		Carolyn.LeBlanc@LA.GOV
22.	Milner, Marty	Y	Y		Marty.Milner@LA.GOV
23.	Morrison, Bill	Y	Y		Bill.Morrison@LA.GOV
24.	Oliver, Barbara	Y	N		Barbara.Oliver@LA.GOV
25.	Kimbrough, Inga	Y	Y		Inga.Kimbrough@LA.GOV
26.	Knighten, Crystéal	Y	N		Crystéal.Knighten@LA.GOV
27.	Mitchell, Jenepher	Y	N		Jenepher.Mitchell@LA.GOV
28.	Williams, Theresa	Y	N		Theresa.Williams@LA.GOV
29.	Williams, Chris	Y	N		Chris.Williams@LA.GOV
30.	McMenis, James	Y	N		JamesMcMenis@dotd.la.gov
31.	Buchanan, Marianne	Y	N		MarianneBuchanan@dotd.la.gov

No.	Name	Invited?	Attended 12/10/2008	Cancelled 12/11/2008	Email Address
32.	Schexnaydre, Debbie	Y	Y		DebbieSchexnaydre@dotd.la.gov
33.	Buckel, Brian	Y	Y		BrianBuckel@dotd.la.gov
34.	Lacy, Barry	Y	N		BarryLacy@dotd.la.gov
35.	Smith, Danny	Y	N		CharlesSmith@dotd.la.gov
36.	Leggett, Rita	Y	N		RitaLeggett@dotd.la.gov
37.	Rusch, Alan	Y	N		AlanRusch@dotd.la.gov
38.	Cali, Dom	Y	Y		DomCali@dotd.la.gov
39.	Duncan, Marsha	Y	Y		MarshaDuncan@dotd.la.gov
40.	Faldetta, Sal	Y	Y		SalFaldetta@dotd.la.gov
41.	Humm, Lori	Y	Y		LoriHumm@dotd.la.gov
42.	Felder, Deon	Y	N		DeonFelder@dotd.la.gov
43.	Kimmel, Linda	Y	Y		LindaKimmel@dotd.la.gov
44.	Meliet, Theresa	Y	N		TheresaMeliet@dotd.la.gov
45.	Samson, Lauren	Y	N		LaurenSamson@dotd.la.gov
46.	Collins, Sarah	Y	Y		SarahCollins@dotd.la.gov
47.	Devall, Kathy	Y	Y		KathyDevall@dotd.la.gov
48.	Zhang, Susan	Y	Y		SusanZhang@dotd.la.gov
49.	Elliott, Mary	Y	N		MaryElliott@dotd.la.gov
50.	Lee, James	Y	N		JamesLee@dotd.la.gov
51.	Parish, Jan	Y	Y		JanParish@dotd.la.gov
52.	Romeo, Robin	Y	N		RobinRomeo@dotd.la.gov
53.	Schiro, Mike	Y	N		MikeSchiro@dotd.la.gov
54.	Burges, Eric	Y	Y		EricBurges@dotd.la.gov
55.	Thompson, Margaret	Y	N		MargaretThompson@dotd.la.gov
56.	Ducote, Tony	Y	Y		TonyDucote@dotd.la.gov
57.	Milano, Tina	Y	Y		TinaMilano@dotd.la.gov
58.	Paine, Peggy Jo	Y	Y		PeggyPaine@dotd.la.gov
59.	Kurts, JoAnn	Y	N		JoAnnKurts@dotd.la.gov
60.	Sturges, Mona	Y	N		MonaSturges@dotd.la.gov
61.	Hafenstine, Dana	Y	N		Dana.Hafenstine@fhwa.dot.gov
62.	Bales, Jack	Y	Y		Jack.Bales@fhwa.dot.gov
63.	Stringfellow, Mary	Y	N		Mary.Stringfellow@fhwa.dot.gov
64.	Harper, Robert	Y	N		Bob.harper@la.gov
65.	Elliott, Jeanette	N	Y		Jeannette.Elliott@la.gov
66.	Woolie, Sandra	N	Y		SandraTWoolie@dotd.la.gov
67.	Scherich, Eileen	N	Y		Eileen.Scherich@la.gov
68.	Trahan, Sandy	N	Y		Sandy.Trahan@la.gov
69.	Meidhof, Jamie	N	Y		Jamie.Meidhof@la.gov
70.	Sanders, Trini	N	Y		Trini.Sanders@dotd.la.gov
71.	Donna Holiday	N	Y		Donna.Holliday@la.gov

<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	John Oglesby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
2. Workshop Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose • Work Session Recap • Supporting Master Data Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Key Design Elements and Decisions – Changes and Challenges – Open Issues – Benefits/Improvements – FRICE-W objects • To-Be Processes by Topic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Key Design Elements and Decisions – Changes and Challenges – Open Issues – Benefits/Improvements – FRICE-W objects • Organizational Impacts • Next Steps • Questions 	John Oglesby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See workshop objectives and items below. 	
3. Purpose of Today's Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the preliminary design of project structures and project creation. • Review the process surrounding the budgeting and control of projects. • Provide a high level overview of how various postings occur in the Project Systems module • Review of FHWA authorizations and accounting of FHWA projects • Determine the need for Project Systems Planning • Review reporting requirements and the need for network and activities for Project 	John Oglesby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See action items & assignments below. 	Flow charts for Project Structures, Project Accounting and Capital Projects Periodic Processing were provided.

Management

- Determine how costs are settled from projects to assets

4. Action Items

- Follow-up
 1. Follow up with the SRM Team – Can DOTD Control Sections be tracked in the P.O. text field? (Christine Lee)
 2. DOTD management needs to decide whether to establish project in Stage 1 or 2 or whether to set rules for different types of projects (Lori Humm)
 3. Follow-up to find out if a 90% fund depletion warning can be issued through Site Manager rather than SAP (Christine Lee)
 4. Determine if CMIA agreement between OSRAP & the feds needs to change for DOTD (PS & GM teams)
 5. Can RASPS electronic signatures be interfaced? (PS team)
 6. DOTD uses “Contract” employees (TIMED, Submerged Roads Program) who are not in the H.R. system. How can they get access to the SAP system? (Christine Lee)

5. Parking Lot

- DOTD – Project creation at Stage 1 or Stage 2? Are there options for different types of projects? (Asked by Tony Ducote)
- DOTD – “Pass through” fund projects (Urban, Enhancement, etc.) – How will these be handled?

6. Key Decisions

- DOTD – Add Utilities (and others?) to Milestones – Reference presentation slide 16
- DOTD – Will interface electronic signature to FMIS

7. Presentation Discussion:

John Oglesby kicked off the meeting at 8:40 with general information and introductions of attendees followed by an explanation of the purpose of blueprint validations in general and this session in particular.

Larry Hofstad presented the **Project Structures - DOTD, FPC and OCPR FI-PS-001, 002, & 3** sections, including the following topics:

- Project Structures – Design Considerations
- Project Structures – Key Decisions
- Naming Convention for DOTD Projects
- Update to the project structures for DOTD and FPC
- Naming Convention for FPC State Projects
- Naming Convention for FPC Non-State Projects
- Naming Convention for OCPR Projects
- Status Management
- Milestones
- User Defined Fields
- Networks and Activities
- Timing of Project Creation
- Project Structures DOTD – Flow Chart
- Project Structures FPC – Flow Chart
- Project Structures OCPR – Flow Chart
- Project Structures – Changes & Challenges
- Project Structures – Open Issues
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- Project Structures – Benefits & Improvements
- Project Structures – FRICE-W

Discussion during Naming Convention for DOTD Projects:

Dom Cali raised a question of whether DOTD needed to have a numbering convention similar to FPC in order to accommodate their needs which led to an extended discussion. Larry and Christine explained how the proposed numbering convention could work for DOTD under a variety of different types of projects with multiple contracts with different control sections. An issue came up about how it would work for ROW utilities and Christine worked through an example on the white board.

ROW example – Real Estate settles to Project Systems by control section. May have to allocate utility payments that cross parish lines.

Design example – Who makes allocations? Could have 15 or more design contracts for a single large project – would need to enter into a text field and then settle later. PS team was able to explain how the proposed solution would work. Christine asked for an example of a very large project to walk through and the group suggested using the LA-1 project.

LA-1 example – Feasibility - had 5 different phases with multiple contracts not broken down by multiple control sections (costs will need to be allocated). Environmental had 18 different segments. ROW had 2 different ROW projects and acquired more ROW than was required for this project. Had multiple RE contracts which would need to be allocated since control sections haven't been set up yet. Utilities currently paid from ROW and will need to split budget to relocate utilities separately from ROW. Have multiple contracts (30), but still no control sections. Engineering is under 1 contract in phase 1 with multiple subcontracts, but looking for new contract(s) for phase 2. Costs would need to be allocated since no control sections yet. TWO SCENARIOS - Either have to create a control section to drive postings to it or allocate to control sections after they are created.

Dom asked a follow-up question about multiple control sections for a single contract. Christine walked through the required posting. She mentioned that there was an option to put control section in PO text field for utilities, but needs to be confirmed with Logistics team that they aren't using this field for anything else. This item was captured as an action item for follow-up.

Discussion during Naming Convention for FPC State Projects:

Marty asked how this would relate to current schedule numbers. Christine said a user field will be created for the Schedule number. The schedule number from IP will need to be entered into the project to link the two. The BI team is investigating whether the master data can come over. Marty wanted to know if it was an alpha-numeric field for sub-projects and, if not, how the current numbers would be converted. Christine indicated the intent is for the field to be numeric with a cross-walk table to map the current numbers to the new numbers. Marty indicated that there would be multiple appropriations or MOF and Christine indicated that wouldn't be a problem.

Discussion during Status Management:

Marty had questions about differences between current statuses and new statuses. Christine discussed how FPC could see the same information with some of the detailed ones being reflected as milestones.

Discussion during Timing of Project Creation:

For DOTD, creation at State 1 would require follow-up. Prior decision was to go with Stage 2, but discussion in budget sessions recommended that it would be better to create at Stage 1.

John Oglesby indicated that there are pros and cons with either option. Need a standard process but could allow for exceptions on a "one-off" basis. Will capture costs under summary WBS elements or under the project depending on which option is selected. Tony Ducote suggested that it might be necessary to create rules for different scenarios in Stage 1 or Stage 2 depending on the type of project. This issue was identified as a parking lot item for DOTD management to decide.

There was discussion about a line item not becoming a project until the funding is assigned. There appeared to be agreement about this approach. Also discussed the timing of project creation for self-funded projects and agreed that it should not be created until funding is received by FPC. Would need to attach the schedule number from HB2 and request the number when the funding arrives.

Discussion during Project Structures FPC – Flow Chart:

Bill Morrison requested a modification to the Project Structures FPC – Flow Chart slide to reflect other MOF options that follow same flow as Bonds.

John Hodnett presented the **Project Budgeting and Control FI-PS-004** section, including the following topics:

- Project Budgeting and Control - Design Considerations
- Project Budgeting and Control – Key Decisions
- Project Budgeting and Control - Changes & Challenges
- Project Budgeting and Control - Open Issues
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- Project Budgeting and Control - Benefits & Improvements
- Project Budgeting and Control – FRICE-W

Discussion during Project Budgeting and Control – Key Decisions:

DOTD projects that cross multiple control sections (multiple construction phases for each control section) will be controlled together using FM Availability Control. Sal mentioned the need to be able to control spending at the contract level and it was confirmed that it would. After additional discussion, this approach was confirmed.

Warning at 90% has been eliminated by the Funds Management team to be consistent with the rest of the State. Dom mentioned that there should be a report to replace this warning and John confirmed that this was the intended approach.

Control at the high level commitment item equivalent to 2 digit AFS object category or DOTD ISIS Group, with the exception of Salary and Benefits. Art GL expense will be budget controlled separately for Facilities projects. Marty indicated a need to have expense objects to track these items and Christine confirmed that there is an action item to follow up with OSRAP to create these objects.

A question was raised about DOTD “pass through” fund projects (Urban, Enhancement, etc.) and how they would be handled. This issue was added to the parking lot.

Discussion during Project Budgeting and Control - Changes & Challenges:

Dom suggested making the budget check an integrated part of the screen rather than as a separate report through BI. Christine mentioned that there may be situations where a person may need to budget check real time rather than waiting on a BI report. There was discussion that contract changes impacting budget are made in Site Manager and an interface will be required to reflect these changes in SAP. When the change order is approved, this change in cost needs to be reflected in SAP. This represents a significant business process change for DOTD.

Dom pointed out that the FM team decision not to issue the 90% warning contradicts DOTD’s desire to have that control. A number of other attendees expressed similar concerns about the FM team deciding to over-ride the 90% warning without consulting the Project Systems team. There is still a desire to have this warning even if it goes to the clerk entering the payment rather than the project manager. Sal indicated that this approach isn’t much different than what the current system does and won’t help DOTD address this significant pain point. Christine suggested that it might be possible to see if Site Manager could issue a warning at 90% rather than SAP, which was identified as an action item.

Larry Hofstad presented the **Project Accounting Blueprint Session FI-PS-006** section, including the following topics:

- Project Accounting – Design Considerations
- Project Accounting – Key Decisions
 - Trns.port Integration with SAP
- Project Accounting DOTD – Flow Chart
- Project Accounting FPC – Flow Chart
- Project Accounting OCPR – Flow Chart
- Project Accounting – Changes & Challenges
- Project Accounting – Open Issues
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- Project Accounting – Benefits & Improvements
- Project Accounting – FRICE-W

Discussion during Project Accounting DOTD – Flow Chart:

There was a suggestion to add a step to the Project Accounting DOTD slide to reflect an audit function.

Discussion during Project Accounting – FRICE-W:

In addition to the “List of Projects Bid” Dom suggested adding a “List of Projects To Be Bid”

Under “Security – FPC- Person entering invoice same person entering contract” it was noted that a different person approves the payment.

Larry Hofstad presented the **FHWA Billing Blueprint Session FI-PS-007** section, including the following topics:

- FHWA Billing – Design Considerations
- FHWA Billing – Key Decisions
 - Example
- FHWA Billing – Changes & Challenges

- FHWA Billing – Open Issues
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- FHWA Billing – Benefits & Improvements
- FHWA Billing – FRICE-W

Discussion during FHWA Billing – Key Decisions:

A question was raised whether the DOTD project number would be the same as the federal number. This item is still to be determined.

Sal Faldetta raised a question about whether the CMIA agreement for the state would need to be amended for the billing cycles, which was captured as an action item.

Discussion during Project Accounting – Open Issues – Action Items:

A key decision was made to interface electronic signatures to FMIS and an action item was added to determine if RASPS electronic signatures could be interfaced.

John Hodnett presented the **Project Planning FI-PS-005** section, including the following topics:

- Project Planning – Design Considerations
- Project Planning, DOTD – Key Decisions
- Project Planning, FPC – Key Decisions
- Project Planning, OCPR – Key Decisions
- Project Planning – Changes & Challenges
- Project Planning – Open Issues
 - Action Items
- Project Planning – Benefits & Improvements
- Project Planning – Organizational Impacts
- Project Planning – FRICE-W

Discussion during Project Planning – Organizational Impacts:

PS Planning & PS functionality will replace FPC1 for FPC. Discussion indicated that SAP would capture similar information. Marty wanted to be sure he can manage his budget and cash as he is able to do now. Christine indicated the solution along with reporting should address the need.

John Hodnett presented the **Project Management FI-PS-008** section, including the following topics:

- Project Management - Design Considerations
- Project Management – Key Decisions
- Project Management – Changes & Challenges
- Project Management – Open Issues, DOTD
 - Action Items
- Project Management – Open Issues, FPC
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- Project Management – Open Issues, OCPR
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- Project Management – Benefits & Improvements
- Project Management – FRICE-W

There wasn't any significant discussion during this section other than clarifying the intent of the slides.

Larry Hofstad presented the **Capital Projects Periodic Processing Blueprint Session FI-PS-009** section, including the following topics:

- Capital Projects Periodic Processing – Design Considerations
- Capital Projects Periodic Processing – Key Decisions
- Capital Projects Periodic Processing – Flow Chart
- Capital Projects Periodic Processing– Changes & Challenges
- Capital Projects Periodic Processing – Open Issues
 - Action Items
 - Parking Lot
- Capital Projects Periodic Processing–Benefits & Improvements
- Capital Projects Periodic Processing – FRICE-W

There wasn't any significant discussion during this section other than clarifying the intent of the slides.

Larry Hofstad presented the **Overall Organizational Impact, Next Steps – General, DOA web-site for the ERP project, and Blueprint Validation Session Wrap-up.**

Overall Organizational Impact

- PS will bring project budget, financials, and milestones into one business system
- PS will provide budgetary control via “funded programs” to meet the State's needs
 - Allow multiple contracts against a project
- Streamline the FHWA project authorization and project billing processes
- Standard reporting features will provide
 - Budget vs. Actual
 - Purchase Orders by Project
 - Project Master Data by WBS element
- Custom reporting features will provide special sorting/grouping and filter capabilities for reporting on projects
- SAP will enhance the State's tracking of assets
 - PS will facilitate the settlement of the State's assets acquired through construction projects

Next Steps - General

- Current Blueprinting Phase (Nov '08 – Jan '09):
 - Validation sessions are currently being held for all modules
 - Process Design Documents are being developed
 - Other related Design Definition documents are being developed
- Realization Phase (February 2009+):
 - System Configuration
 - Unit and Confirmation Testing
 - Documenting of Business Process Procedures (BPP's)
 - Define and Develop FRICE objects
 - Integration Testing
 - User Acceptance Testing

DOA web-site for the ERP project

- Visit DOA website for Blueprint Presentations, Meeting Minutes and Project News
www.doa.louisiana.gov/ERP/index.htm

Blueprint Validation Session Wrap-up (session ended at 4:00 on 12/10/08 – no meeting required for 12/11/08)