

Date	07/24/2026	Time	1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Location	First District Court of Appeal		
Objective	Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes		
Committee Members	Jason Adank (FDOT); Richard Evans (EOG); Rebecca Evers (DOR); Steven Fielder, Chair (DFS); Theresa Gagnon (EOG); Dennis Hollingsworth (DEP); Sally Huggins (DBPR); Charlotte Jerrett (FWC); Jesse Johnston (DMS) ; Matt Kirkland (DOE); Jon Manalo (AHCA); Jesse Marks (DMS) ; Angie Martin (DFS); Mark Merry (DFS); Jennifer Pelham (DFS); Warren Sponholtz (FL[DS]) ; Scott Stewart (DFS)		
Speakers	Michael Black (FL[DS]); Jimmy Cox (DFS); Sarah Crouch (PCG); Steven Fielder (DFS); Julian Gotreaux (DFS); Kimberly Kemp (DFS); Nikki Klein (DFS); Angie Robertson (DFS); Stacey Terry (DFS)		
Materials	Meeting Presentation		

Meeting Recording

An audio recording is located on the [Florida PALM website](#).

Opening Remarks and Roll Call

Steven Fielder, Chair

Mr. Steven Fielder called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. with a roll call of the Executive Steering Committee (Committee) members. Fourteen members were present for the meeting (*Names of members not in attendance appear with strikethroughs in the above table.*)

Presentation

Administrative; Julian Gotreaux

Mr. Julian Gotreaux gave an update on the Florida PALM Spend Plan for fiscal year (FY) 25-26 with a detailed breakdown of expense categories.

Mr. Gotreaux provided an update on Project Risks and Issues. Issue 38 related to Bank of America testing was closed. Performance improvements are being seen in processing the FRS Retiree Payroll file (Issue 39). Risk 6 reduced in probability which reduced its overall risk score to under six. Five Risks remain at a risk score of six or higher, one less than the previous month. The Florida PALM [Open Issues Log](#) and [Open Risk Log](#) details the above-mentioned Risks and Issues.

The Committee asked if the performance issues with the FRS Retiree Payroll file will have an impact on the go-live schedule. Mr. Jimmy Cox said, no.

The Project remains on schedule to be implemented in January of 2027. The Schedule Performance Index remains unchanged at .98. There are two Stage Gate Critical Path Items trending behind: I-WP110 – Training Build and D674 – Completion of Penetration Testing.

Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V); Sarah Crouch

Ms. Sarah Crouch shared their monthly IV&V assessment beginning with Readiness Certification #3. The IV&V team rated People, Processes, and Technology at a medium-risk rating, and Data at a low-risk rating.

People: Forty one percent of end users have not yet accessed Florida PALM. Weekly average testing rates have declined since April. The IV&V team recommends agencies use the downtime during the UAT Refresh to complete learning materials, communicate a training plan, finalize testing assignments, and strengthen change management strategies.

Processes: Eleven percent of agencies have fully tested all applicable Project-Recommended Standard Activities with less than 50 percent of User Stories having been tested at least once. The IV&V team recommends agencies track progress against Florida PALM recommended standard activities and identify outstanding testing/readiness tasks, expand testing participation, establish recovery plans for testing activities that fall behind schedule, and consider funding options for temporary resources to help accelerate testing.

Technology: There are nine remaining interfaces across six agencies that have not completed Interface Cycle 2 Testing. The IV&V team recommends agencies identify alternative business processes or manual workarounds to support operations after go-live if interfaces cannot complete by August 7.

The Committee asked for clarification on the interfaces that have not completed Cycle 2 testing. Mr. Cox said the Project team is working closely with those agencies and significant testing progress is being made.

Data: Twenty-nine agencies completed data cleansing activities before the start of Dry Run 2. The IV&V team recommends agencies continue updating as changes are identified and participate in future data cleansing activities.

Ms. Crouch then presented the IV&V team's assessment of testing and cutover planning. Performance Testing Segment I did not complete by the target completion date. The remaining scope after July 17 was deferred to Segment II. The performance of the FRS Payroll Retiree file is still exceeding acceptable processing thresholds during the budget checking process. The Project team continues to test solutions. The Committee asked for clarification on the presentation slide indicating insufficient volume to support testing. Ms. Crouch said the agencies are not submitting/testing high enough volume of transactions, in some cases, to test performance (volume) testing. The Committee asked for clarification on the presentation slide indicating the FRS Retiree Payroll file's 'current design may not support production scalability'. Ms. Crouch said the Project team is comparing the approved design with the delivered software functionality. Mr. Cox further clarified the Project team is testing the system's breaking point by testing multiple scenarios or variations of data through performance tuning.

The Committee referenced IV&V's reported open ticket metrics relating to system stability and asked for clarification on the term 'system stability defect'. Ms. Crouch said that term encapsulated anything that requires a resolution within code, configuration, or has a downstream impact and may need retesting. The term does not indicate a high or critical problem. A follow-up question was asked by the Committee on how the ESC can better assess agency versus software issues and if the solution is ready at go-live. Ms. Crouch added, the volume of system-related tickets are not reported by agencies as defects in SNow. Ms. Stacey Terry said through Project testing services, inclusive of all, and through agency testing, changes that need to be addressed are identified. The unknowns are the testing scenarios that were not expected/didn't know they existed by agencies. Generally, the system is working as expected. There are resolutions that are in progress and need finalization which will carry into Hypercare as the system stabilizes. Ticket triage helps uncover the trends and issues needing to be addressed. Mr. Cox reminded the Committee of the additional ESC meetings in December to accommodate a full and detailed discussion with the Project team and agency representatives. At that time, the Known Issues and

Enhancements list will be available, there will be zero high or critical tickets open, all testing services will be complete including a Dry Run 4 report, and the cutover checklist will be finalized. The Project cannot replicate agency testing, and Mr. Cox stressed the importance of agencies testing their business processes so unknowns are uncovered.

Concluding, Ms. Crouch shared extensive cutover planning continues by the Project team. Cutover dates and activities have been published to support agencies who are currently working on agency deployment plans.

Florida Digital Service Monthly Status Report; Michael Black

Per FY 2026-2027 Implementing Bill, Mr. Michael Black, in place of State CIO, Warren Sponholtz, shared a quarterly Florida Digital Service FL[DS] assessment of the Florida PALM Project. Their risk rating is high based on increasing number of delayed tasks and deliverables, being under budget for FY 2025-2026, and the risks relating to testing. They reported the current pace indicates critical work may be performed closer to go-live and that several critical activities remain incomplete. FL[DS]'s primary concern is that not all business processes will be validated before go-live.

Mr. Black confirmed that the FL[DS] analysis of the Project's budget is based on the progressive spend compared to the published July 2025 spend plan. Mr. Cox commented that several deliverables shifted fiscal years with the adoption of Amendment 13, which is largely why the Project is being viewed as so far under budget.

FL[DS] shared recommendations for agency testing, agency engagement, and agency readiness. The Committee confirmed FL[DS] experience in review and reporting on statewide IT projects and the cadence of review and reporting. FL[DS] indicated they have been assessing the Project for several years and that the monthly reviews are rolled into quarterly reports for publication.

Agency Readiness Certification #3; Nikki Klein

Agencies submitted the third update to the Readiness Certification on July 10. All agencies submitted, with two agencies submitting late. Responses from [Agency Readiness Certification #3](#) were published on the Florida PALM website, under Agency Reporting. The webpage was created to display reports and extracts of the Agency Criteria Met, Not Met, Mitigations Plans, and Confidence Levels across People, Processes, Technology, and Data.

Overall, 74 percent of agencies have a confidence level of Very Confident or Moderately Confident. The Technology category showed the lowest confidence levels. Seventy-nine percent of all readiness criteria were met or not applicable. Mitigation plans were required for criteria not met. Ms. Nikki Kline discussed the overall trends for each critical element: People, Processes, Technology, and Data, providing detail on each criteria.

The Committee asked why agencies report high Confidence Levels yet indicators for specific criteria are not met. Ms. Klein said the Confidence Levels are subjective while the criteria have defined minimums or objectives. Mr. Fielder said it may indicate how agencies feel they are progressing regardless of the criteria met or not met to date. The overall confidence did decline from Agency Readiness Certification #2, with less "green" and more "yellow" and "red". Ms. Crouch shared IV&V's perspective that the confidence in the People Critical Operational Element is because of the agency's believe that their "people" will be ready and will do what it takes to get the job done. This is a risk to the overall agency success if the people are not completing testing in the system to confirm agency business processes and business systems from end-to-end.

One Committee member shared their out-of-town users attended an agency meeting in Tallahassee where they received hands-on experience with Florida PALM and shared positive feedback. The variability in Confidence Levels is really driven by where the agency is on their readiness journey.

The Committee asked Ms. Klein if all criteria were weighted equally, to which she said, no, some are more impactful than others. She noted the most impactful criteria 'not met', as seen in the certifications, are with testing User Stories (2.1) and with executing Interface Testing (3.1). Ms. Angie Robertson clarified that there is no calculation of "scoring" or "grading" for the criteria. The colors on the dashboard are based on meeting or not meeting the criteria and the agency response to their confidence level.

Ms. Robertson shared that there is a new UAT statistics page on the Florida PALM website which includes information about agency activity in UAT from February to June. After the UAT Refresh, the page will include additional data and information about the individuals testing in UAT compared to those with access to test.

Testing Updates; Jimmy Cox, Angie Robertson, Stacey Terry

Ms. Robertson shared the importance of testing and visually showed the remaining time agencies have left in testing timeline. She announced a new section on website that reports user statistics for agencies in UAT environment. It shows a graphical comparison of agency tester logins from February through June, and it shows agency-specific data such as volume of activity for key transactions. Information will be updated on a monthly basis. After the UAT Refresh, the Project will provide trends by transaction across all agencies and report an analysis of total user population testing by agency.

April showed the most login ins and time testing in the UAT environment; however, testing began to drop in May and then again in June, likely due to in-person sessions concluding and competing year-end activities. Ms. Robertson said she is hopeful July testing will show more momentum.

Since the rate of independent testing by agencies is low, with testing having declined since in person sessions, a Committee member asked if returning to in-person testing sessions should be considered. Ms. Robertson stated that greatest impediment to agency testing is just not taking the time to do it. There are several ways that the Project supports agency testing through supporting SNow Tickets, ad hoc meetings, and Friday Office Hours. Mr. Cox confirmed that the Project staffing levels and timeline would not support diverting resources from the cutover, conversion, and training development activities planned for the remainder of the Project. Ms. Renee Hermeling mentioned the collaboration groups available to all agencies where agencies help agencies.

Mr. Cox provided a summary of the upcoming UAT Refresh activities. He noted a change for post UAT Refresh activities in that 'Track with Budget' agencies will be required to provide budget allotments for both FY 2025-2026 and FY 2026-2027.

Ms. Stacey Terry shared that Performance Testing is underway; Segment I is complete, and Segment II will be conducted after the UAT refresh in the updated PeopleTools environment. She covered the types of items being tested within each respective testing cycle within the Performance Testing Segments. She then reviewed the findings and mitigations from Segment I. The major findings include Load Balancer Capacity where the volume affects performance, Batch Testing where interferences were caused between multiple processing files, Infrastructure Stability, and Application Performance Tuning.

The Batch Schedule is being executed successfully during UAT but as testing continues, it uncovers areas that need refinement. Key challenges for the Batch Schedule have been inbound interfaces, the FRS Retiree Payroll file, timing of outbound files, and the communication of Batch Schedule failures. Based on the mitigations put in place, the outcomes from UAT testing and Performance testing, the schedule will be adjusted as appropriate. The final Batch Schedule will be posted after completion of UAT.

Year-End Testing; Deana Metcalf

Ms. Deana Metcalf shared that Year-End Testing is planned to occur August 24 through October 16. It will include Financial Reporting and Carry Forward activities. The months of June through September will be open for dual-year processing and the Agency Adjustment Period for financial reporting. The Project coordinated with MFMP, STMS, and LAS/PBS to plan for Carry Forward testing. The FY 2026-2027 testing can occur in tandem. Attention to accounting dates will matter; the system will default to current dates.

A new UAT Year-End Testing timeline was presented; detailing dates and key activities for Financial Reporting and Carry Forward.

Additional details were shared through a Carry Forward Testing timeline detailing key events and timing that will take place. The timeline previewed the types of activities that will occur within the AP/PO, IU, GL, AR, and KK modules.

The Project will host UAT in-person sessions for year-end topics August 26-27 and August 31-September 3. For in-person UAT sessions, the Financial Reporting topic will be covered in one day, and the Carry Forward topic will be covered over two days. Each topic will be presented twice to accommodate all agencies with space restrictions. Up to four participants per agency may attend. Ms. Metcalf noted many of the financial transactions (i.e., process a voucher) will not be demonstrated during the sessions because they were demonstrated during previous Project-hosted in-person sessions. Attendees should bring year-end work (including consolidations, adjustments) to UAT year-end sessions. Year-end account values will be published prior to UAT year-end testing.

Materials for the UAT year-end sessions will be shared prior to the session. Agencies can review business process models 10.1 and 10.4, and adjustment period in the Knowledge Center as a refresher.

Ms. Metcalf said attendees should be experienced with year-end transactions and have understanding in the following:

- (Financial Reporting) recording year-end accounting and accrual entries, IU transactions, recording adjustments within period 12 and 998, and journal functions to record and adjust.
- (Carry Forward) PO encumbrances, PO vouchers, IU transactions, GL journals, and the State's carry forward process.

All attendees are expected to take the information learned in the UAT year-end sessions back to their agency and share with other testers. Registration can be expected this week; Agency Liaisons and Enterprise Liaisons will be responsible for registering their agency or enterprise. The UAT Communication page on the Knowledge Center gives greater details on the topics being covered.

Training Updates: Kimberly Kemp

Ms. Kimberly Kemp shared that agencies are developing their agency-specific learning materials through a Readiness task. The Project team is working on web-based training and the end user manual. Web-based training will provide online courses for Topics outlined in the Topics and Activities List and will be published on the People First LMS. An end user manual will utilize Process Steps, adding content at the topic and business process grouping level. There will be 13 chapters (aligned with business process groupings) with multiple topic-level articles within the chapters. Chapters will be published as they are completed, on a rolling basis, by October 1.

There are 19 UAT process steps that remain in progress and will be published once finalized; of the 19 process steps, 11 are year-end focused and will be published prior to year-end UAT sessions in August.

The web-based training is being built off the end user manual content; therefore, the timing of the training development follow slightly behind the schedule for the manual. Momentum is expected to increase in August. A member of the public asked Ms. Kemp for the Project's confidence in meeting training timeline deadlines. Ms. Kemp said the end user manual is around 18 percent complete and is on schedule to meet the October 1 goal. The web-based training courses will likely be prioritized based upon the largest number of users, nature or frequency of the functions, etc.

Appendix

The ESC Presentation Appendix includes detailed information on the standard Testing Activities and Readiness Activities updates.

Next Meeting and Adjournment

Steven Fielder, Chair

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for August 26, 2026, at the Department of Environmental Protection.