



## Statewide Financial System Program Agenda/Minutes

<b>Date:</b>	April 4, 2014	<b>Time:</b>	1:00 pm
<b>Subject:</b>	KK Workflow	<b>Location:</b>	SFS, Training Room D
<b>Meeting Facilitator:</b>	Melinda Vasto	<b>Minutes Prepared by:</b>	Melinda Vasto
<b>Objective:</b>	Provide Stakeholders with the concept of Workflow for the re-architecture of Commitment Control (KK).		

<b>Attendees:</b>			
Melinda Vasto (SFS)	Bradley Stevens (DOB)	Kevin Lemin (DOCS)	
Moss Cail (SFS)	Mary Ryan (DOB)	Rachael Byron (OSC)	
Mary Alber (SFS)	Marilyn Bell (OMH)	Betty Jean Mihill (OSC)	
Ed Bourying	Shweta Gupta (OMH)	Andrew Howland (DOCS)	
Kristyn Blakley (OMH)	Peg Farrell (DOL)	Lisa Lipinski (DOL)	
Michelle Thomas (DSP)	Timothy Ciccone (OGS)	Adrian Swierczewski (DOB)	
Jeanne Waddington (DCJ)	Debbie Hilson (OSC)	Andrew Welcome (DOL)	
Brent Cozart (DOL)	Noreen Worley (DOL)	Chris Amado (DCJS)	
Bill H (OMH)	Bruce Foster (ITS)	Shiva Ganapatiras (ITS)	
Brian Fimple (SFS)	Pat Slavick (SFS)	Dennis Nelson (SFS)	

### Agenda:

What	Who	Time
Workflow Presentation 'KK Workflow Final'	Mary Alber (SFS)	

<b>OLD Action Items</b>				
Task Assigned	Staff Assigned (first and last name)	Due Date	To Do Added (PMO Use)	Requirement #
N/A				

<b>NEW Action Items</b>				
Task Assigned	Staff Assigned (first and last name)	Due Date	To Do Added (PMO Use)	Requirement #
For the routing rules slide, where the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) and Judiciary rules are noted for the end of the fiscal year; this slide needs to be corrected, it should read the beginning of the fiscal year (even though difference of one day).	Mary Alber (SFS)	4/25/14		
Update design to reflect the decision to reduce agency levels from 3 to 2.	Mary Alber (SFS)	4/25/14		
SFS to update slide 15 to show correct levels for cash ceiling routing.	Mary Alber (SFS)	4/25/14		

**The Following Decision(s) Have Been Made**

**Decision:** Agencies present (except for control agencies - Division of the Budget or DOB and OSC) agree with two levels of approval instead of three at the agency KK approval level of routing for budget entries.

**The Following Decision(s) Are Pending**

**Decision:** N/A  
 Staff Assigned (first and last name):  
 Due Date:

**Minutes:**

The Statewide Financial System (SFS) team presented the KK workflow conceptual design noting that most routing rules are similar, but there are some differences because the future budget journals will be loaded as segregations rather than appropriations. Generate parent will be turned on for project child and segregation budget definitions and the generate parent feature will create the related project parent and appropriation budgets respectively.

Q: Can funding be moved from one segregation to another?  
 A: Yes, the change is that we are moving from what could have been a three to five step process to a one step process.

Q: Apportionments - OSC will continue to determine the business process; they will not be done systematically. From a re-appropriation perspective you may start with fund one and then distribute from there to fund two and fund three. They will be driven from appropriation and as it works today, there may still be a need to move back and forth with a journal transaction. Today we have four multiple segregations determined by bill copy and bill copy level. Now segregation and appropriation can be maintained at the same level.

OSC will still do the upload of the initial budget and determine any policy or business process. The plan is that this will happen at the segregation level now. The segregation will be loaded at the start of the fiscal year equal to 100% of the appropriation. However, DOB will have the ability to set a portion of this budget into a reserve where it cannot be used by agencies. The final mechanics related to how DOB approves the load of segregations and the processing around the creation of the budget reserve entries still need to be developed.

Q: From an agency perspective, other than setting up agency KK what are the other steps required?  
 A: The new process should streamline the process and greatly reduce the number of entries with the segregation loaded. During the fiscal year agencies still may need to process entries to maintain their segregations/appropriations such as interchanges and apportionments.

In regards to interagency budget transfer - SFS noted that today agencies currently have three levels of approval at the agency and role mapping data demonstrated that agencies are not utilizing three levels of approvals.

SFS posed the following question to the stakeholders - do agencies feel that a third level is needed?

A: DOB stated that control agencies (which include DOB and OSC) need the three levels of approval. Other agencies present at this meeting, stated that two levels were sufficient. The SFS note taker recorded this stakeholder decision.

SFS stated that slide 15 shows the routing roles as envisioned today. Slide 16 shows all agency approvals and the move to DOB for approval.

Q: Is there a plan to have copy functionality in budget? Specifically we are concerned for those budget journals denied by OSC where copy could be utilized to resubmit. The group noted that the copy ability was available in general ledger.

A: SFS stated that this may be a defect as this should be available in existing functionality. In PeopleSoft 9.2, the ability to edit or copy a budget journal should exist. The copy functionality does not exist for budget transfers or interagency budget transfers.

The routing rules slide, where OSC and Judiciary rules are noted for the end of the fiscal year; this slide needs to be corrected, it should read the beginning of the fiscal Year (even though difference of one day).

Slide 14 regarding DOB Cash Ceiling - do not need three levels at agency, DOB is considered separately and 2 levels at DOB. SFS to update slide 14.

Q: DOB – does departmental for MSC01 and PBC01 provide additional ChartField routing. Department based routing is preferred over routed by Business Unit (BU) as it is today. The old way forced workflow approvals to many people who never needed to see them, which created confusion, delays and problems.

DOB, OSC, Courts and SFS have to have a conversation related to how their routing exceptions are handled.

DOB had asked do we really need to see (have workflow for each BU line), agencies answered yes (the Office of Mental Health or OMH and OGS). They noted it is nice to streamline but expressed interagency needed to remain the way it is now as there are specific situations where this is a benefit.

Interagency transfers – it is helpful to have the two agencies sign off as sometimes the originating agency may have restrictions that the other agency or agencies are not aware of. This could also be the case where the receiving agency upon reviewing the transfer in workflow may need to add comments for the sending agency to correct the ChartFields, on the entries and then deny back to the sending agency to correct.

Slide 18 - the Department of Health (DOH), City University of New York (CUNY) and State University of New York have specific customizations in workflow that will be further discussed to try to streamline exemptions. In current design there is a page in the SFS that captures which ChartField strings skip DOB and get routed upward. In the new model it can be set up to skip over DOB by fund. If we can establish the routing rules to address the needs while streamlining, this can simplify the configuration and reduce maintenance overhead.

Slide 19 - previously, when a budget journal went to workflow, no changes could be made to that journal and no corrections. The EE1 project officers reviewed that customization and recommended that it be retired and replaced by business procedures. Additional questions were asked surrounding when a budget journal is updated or deleted while in workflow what should happen and what notifications and tracking are needed. Agency feedback: the Office General Services (OGS), if an agency is doing something wrong, they should be notified. If fixing is required, the agency should be notified to train.

Slide 21 - during the discussion of the new ad hoc approver functionality it was confirmed that in order for an ad hoc approver to act on a budget entry, the ad hoc person must have an approver role.

Q: Can a journal include a new employee as an ad hoc approver?

A: Yes or re-routed to the new employee using workflow reassignment for those documents pending approval prior to the employee/approver onboard. Ad hoc provides more options to get new users in the workflow rather than going to Workflow Administrator (WFA). In the current implementation, if an approver level is not provisioned to users within an agency, then workflow fails and gets routed to the WFADM lost workflow users. In the new design, the approval framework skips the transaction forward in the workflow to the next approver, rather than routing to the workflow administrator. Only exception is if it has reached final approver. The current process of reassignment would carry forward where the WFA has to move work items parallel to a user who has a comparable role/security access. Ad hoc adds an additional approver to the chain on top of the pooled approval already required. Regarding the first bullet on slide 22 concerning MSC01 and PBC01, DOB requests that for every journal department routing applies, not just DOB KK. This request was noted by SFS

Slide 23 - Q: When you reference administrators, is that all or just Employee Data Administrators (EDA)?

A: All administrators will have impacts. There will be future sessions for administrators once we have more detailed designs and are closer to testing.

Q: Regarding the ad hoc approver role, there will be one for each module, even existing?

A: Yes, all, including Accounts Payable (AP).

Q: Ad hoc, is that a transactional level?

A: Yes. After submitting the document to workflow, any approver can add an ad hoc approver for those transactions. This is done transaction by transaction. This is similar to how the requisition process functions now.

Q: Now, there is a notification upon approval in work list. Would that be carried over?

A: Not decided yet.

Q: If this notification was provided, would it be for denied only?

A: Approved and denied.

Q: DOB asked when role mapping was originally done, the DOB team mapping approach was at level 1 you see all agencies and level 2 you would see maybe only the 20 agencies that you are responsible for. It will no longer take two weeks to make employee adds/moves – will this ad hoc make a day later a realistic example?

A: This really relates to how employee IDs are loaded into the SFS and not the DOB routing rules. Employees are loaded Fridays from PayServ. The lag in new accounts is for new state employees

where their employee ID is not yet imported into the SFS from PayServ. When users are already state employees, the delay relates to their old agency removing their account in the SFS and the new agency having their Agency Security Administrator (ASA) provision their new access.

Q: Are we speeding up getting new people in the system and roles attached?

A: If they have worked for the state already, it is easier and quicker. If an employee ID is needed and info needs to come from a PayServ feed, etc., that will take longer.

Q: OSC is responsible for loading original agency segregation budgets?

A: Yes, moving away from two- step process of loading all appropriations and then segregations. There are still details that need to be worked out in this process. OSC will load all segregations and then the agency determines where they go if further apportionments are required.

Q: What becomes of DOB's authorization and then secondly where 100% appropriation doesn't make sense, what options do we have to deal with this?

A: Instead of taking the segregation up, it may need to be taken down in certain situations through the use of a budgetary reserve. These are still under discussion as far as options.

Q: Will agencies at some point have the ability to discuss what is segregated?

A: There will be more discussions, but this may not be met by 2015.