



Statewide Financial System Program Agenda/Minutes

Date:	Tuesday, March 11, 2014	Time:	1:00pm
Subject:	eSettlements Fit-Gap	Location:	SFS, Training Room D
Meeting Facilitator:	Jim Beswick	Minutes Prepared by:	Jim Beswick
Objective:	Discuss eSettlements Fit-Gap		

Attendees:				
Suzanne Trzcinski (OSC)		Colin Brady (DOB)		Mike Mullin (SFS)
Susan Filburn (OGS)		Kiran Chalivendra (SFS)		Kim Martin (SFS)
Roz Yezzi (OGS)		Betsy Tweedie (SFS)		Erika Zaragoza (SFS)
Adam Brown (OGS)		Ed Bouryng (SFS)		Elliot Menchel (SFS)
Denise Davis (SFS)		Jim Beswick (SFS)		

Agenda:

What	Who	Time
Discuss eSettlements Fit-Gap	SFS	

NEW Action Items				
Task Assigned	Staff Assigned (first and last name)	Due Date	To Do Added (PMO Use)	Requirement #
ES-047: Work to test if pass-through transaction will work without supplier registration.	SFS			
ES-077: Rephrase in order to include all steps of the process.	SFS			
ES-051: Need to determine how to modify the template approach that would work effectively in eSettlements.	SFS			

The Following Decision(s) Have Been Made
Decision: N/A

The Following Decision(s) Are Pending
Decision: N/A

Minutes:

- ES-047: Business Services Center (BSC) - What is the registration process?
 Business Unit (BU)/supplier would enter into an agreement for the supplier to have access to eSettlements. Supplier must be in Vendor File first and email addresses verified. eSettlements uses existing supplier data but requires additional information. Not yet decided if suppliers must register by BU. Would need to expand this gap as a business process impact.
 Division of the Budget (DOB) - What's in it for the vendors to register?
 A larger view of transactions and the ability to enter invoices online.
 DOB - Do we have enough information to register in bulk?
 The supplier has to exist already in Vendor File. The Office of the State Comptroller's (OSC) Vendor Management Unit (VMU) would have to register each supplier separately.

DOB - Have there been cases in the past where VMU had to repeat the registration process?

OSC - I don't think they'd reregister. To change anything in the Vendor File, they just go in and update it. Anything we do to the Vendor File, we don't do in bulk.

BSC - If BSC can provide a list of all the vendors the Office of General Services (OGS) does business with, can it just go to OSC to enable?

We want all suppliers to get into this. It will require a business process change.

BSC - Some suppliers would enter the invoice. Do the ones that send files need to be able to do that?

The requirement would be more of a pass through. Because it's a pass through, they may not need access to the portal - a more manageable task.

Action Item: Work to test if pass-through transaction will work without registration.

2. ES-069: If an eInvoice submitted through FileNet, BSC assigns date received as Invoice Received Date. If submitted through other path, the system will assign the Invoice Received Date. OSC agrees the ability to revise is necessary.

SFS - Ability to change it stays in Accounts Payable (AP)?

Yes, unless you want additional people to change it.

DOB - What is the Invoice Received Date?

Either the electronic date when the eInvoice was created or the paper invoice received date depending upon how the eInvoice was received.

Recommendation that gap shouldn't be fulfilled. Would need to have the ability to change the date which is available in AP. Requirements was meant to restrict supplier's ability to change Invoice Received Date. Based on architecture, this will be a non-issue, as field is not available for edit.

3. ES-074: Functionality exists to copy a supplier/BU agreement into different BUs
4. ES-070: The XML file format from File Net would need to include Invoice Received Date. If directly input from the supplier, it doesn't. Voucher Build will require customization to accept Invoice Received Date field.

DOB - Out of the box, there's no Invoice Received Date?

There is an invoice date. The Invoice Received Date will be a custom field.

DOB - This date needs to be locked as the system date.

The State needs to define policies around the acceptance of electronic invoices and the business rules related to when an invoice is accepted by the state.

5. ES-068: No comment.
6. ES-080: Supplier would not be required to submit liability (obligation) date. It is an AP requirement. It would be added to the voucher by whoever is approving/editing the voucher in AP. The requirement doesn't sound legitimate for eSettlements. We need to capture through updates. Obligation date enhancements may have an impact on this. Would need to be worked out through the detailed design. Voucher Build should be looked at from an AP perspective. Financial accounting impact may require OSC BFR involvement.
7. ES-018: Contract ID not necessary to be inquired upon. Could be a partial fit as other fields still available for suitable inquiry purposes. BSC ok without contract ID. Revise as partial fit.
8. ES-019/ES-021: Issues based upon a PeopleSoft performance limitation. Could create a csv dump of all available files. Low priority for both business (ES-019) and supplier (ES-021).
9. ES-013: Only affects manual invoice entry. Once approved in AP, voucher would continue. If not, a notification message would be returned to the supplier to include a denial reason. Low priority.
10. ES-052: Notification/report of invoices that did not successfully Voucher Build. BSC feels ideal would be that someone gets an email showing why each voucher failed. OSC questions that this is important. We will look at both the reporting and notification standpoint, look at the design, and increase the priority to high for the notification option.
11. ES-053: Amount of detail requested an issue. Suggests one notification per invoice ad hoc. For manual entry invoices, there is a pre-check for valid invoice ID, date, BU. At the approval level, you'd look at possibility for them using a different BU. Delivered notification is very basic. Create an on-demand report as a work around. High priority.
12. ES-061: Customize the delivered notification to show number of invoices loaded with and without errors. SFS notes that, as design develops, need to ID points of failure within the process. This may change when/who needs notification. BSC would like to see just those invoices with errors.

BSC - BSC would sent to FileNet as they are created, not save them for a batch. Are you thinking of SFS running Voucher Build every night?

Can be run hourly if need be. EE1 will look at this in design.

13. ES-008: If the MarketPlace is going to do XML, BSC will need to talk to FileNet. Agreed to limit to XML.
14. ES-078: Accepting PDF may be important. BSC stated that Mom & Pop suppliers would have an easier time sending Excel. SFS noted that Mom & Pop suppliers may be better candidates for manual entry. Small vendors with large inventories would do better with XML or standard format. Agreed to limit to XML.
15. ES-015: For BSC, two most critical reports are what's in workflow that needs to be acted upon by a BSC employee and failed invoices. Need to ID process failure points and the reports necessary to ID what's caught there. Reports more important than notifications.
 - SFS - How is this different from an aging report?
 - BSC - It's a pipeline report. From an eSettlements perspective, BSC has the vision that it wouldn't do any work in eSettlements. Only things that should be aging in eSettlements are the manual entries direct from suppliers.
16. ES-077: Shows pre-Voucher Build process. Useful to those dealing with contracts as it shows all potential payment activity against a contract. SFS to take back to rephrase in order to include all steps of the process.
17. ES-020: Issues based upon a PeopleSoft performance limitation. Could create a csv dump of all available files. Low priority for business.
18. ES-022: Issues based upon a PeopleSoft performance limitation. Could create a csv dump of all available files. Low priority for supplier.
19. ES-033: No need to use separate communication method for eSettlements. Continue to use existing lines of supplier communications.
20. ES-081: Discussion included use of Help Desk incidents or conversation logging. Continue to use the same process as that used by OSC VMU.
21. ES-012: Business process change to have all "work" done in AP? If so, not necessary to add attachments in eSettlements. Ability to add attachments in AP may be sufficient. Low priority.
 - BSC - Would they both store in the same spot?
 - They can be referenced because everything goes into AP.
22. ES-079: Similar to ES-012. Currently, suppliers cannot see attachments in the Vendor Portal. All they can see are comments. Ability to add attachments in AP may be sufficient. Low priority.
23. ES-051: BSC - BSC uses AP-delivered template voucher which allows for supplier info, account number, address from where services are rendered. Approval process easy because the agency has already seen bulk of the information. eSettlements allows for use of Speedcharts to pre-fill some fields. Template approach provides a great opportunity to simplify work process. Action Item: Need to determine how to modify the template approach that would work effectively in eSettlements.
24. Brief discussion as to why use FileNet for archiving when this is delivered in eSettlements.