Intragovernmental Transactions Working Group
Meeting Minutes
July 18th 2017

Thank you to all the ITWG participants who joined Tuesday's conference call. Nearly 200 lines joined the call and we are encouraged by everyone's involvement. We apologize for the technical issue we experienced during the May meeting that cut the call short; the issue has now been resolved.

Alex Abshire began the meeting by presenting a short overview covering the highlights for the meeting. He provided a brief description about the upcoming August 29th ITWG meeting, explaining that the meeting will be more of a catch up or refresher to bring everyone up to speed. Numerous new folks have joined the ITWG meetings recently, therefore we felt there is a need to have this type of presentation. Please feel free to invite your colleagues to attend, everyone is welcome to participate.

Brian Casto thanked everyone for taking the time to complete the surveys that have been distributed in the past. The feedback we have received has been a great asset in developing G-Invoicing.   He answered some of the questions that users requested be addressed during ITWG calls:

- IPAC will remain the final form of settlement.   Currently one Trading Partner has to enter or upload bulk file transactions and funds are transferred and posted in CARS on behalf of both Trading Partners. After implementation of G-Invoicing, IPAC will settle funds, but all transactions will be initiated within G-Invoicing and both partners will approve documents before funds are transferred and posted in CARS. IPAC will still be available for monthly transactions and historical reports to assist with Fund Balance with Treasury reconciliation.

- A few agencies suggested that we have a frequently asked questions page.   There is an existing Q & A section posted on the G-Invoicing website that covers system requirements, data elements, and other G-Invoicing items. Feel free to send any questions you may have that are not answered to the IGT mailbox at IGT@fiscal.treasury.gov.   We are continually updating the website.

- Adjustments and corrections will definitely be addressed in future meetings. Within the new G-Invoicing both trading partners will have more visibility of the Order and Invoice before either approving or rejecting, and before funds are even settled in CARS. We expect considerably fewer chargebacks.

- We are still working through accruals to support the exchange of accrual processing and will address in future meetings.

Slide 5 we received very positive feedback on business scenarios presented in May and we plan to spend more time creating scenarios in the future. They provide a useful exercise to help understand how G-Invoicing works as well as scenarios that G-Invoicing cannot handle today. A number of future business scenarios have been requested and we took note of all of them, some of the more common suggestions are listed on the slide and will be shown in future meetings. The bottom line is that we feel we see the value walking through transactions with this group and plan to present more of these in the future.

Question: Did you cover ERP vendor engagement? Brian answered that one of items noted on slide 4 notes that it will be a future topic and an update will be provided on vendor engagement a little later.

Question: Are you looking at agencies to develop interfaces for G-Invoicing? No, Matt Conrad explained that is our goal in working with ERP vendors. If you happen to have a home grown system then yes, it would be on your agency to work to build that interface. We are currently working with the larger vendors. Some organizations may have some work that needs to be done prior to implementation. Interface and agency system - coming next March will be the end state of G-Invoicing, it will support the transfer of information between systems.

There were concerns raised from US Courts there currently is not an interface built out from their ERP vendor Momentum. Keith Jarobe commented that we are currently in talks with Momentum and in the process of working towards a focus group with US Courts in the near future.

Slide 6, reviews the payment term days when an invoice must be approved, current change requests auto approve after "X" amount of days if the buyer does not approve it. We still need to work to come up with the number of days to review before an invoice will be approved. We have reviewed this with a couple of agencies and will continue to research and reach out until a resolution.

Keith Jarboe then updated everyone on the progress of the G-Invoicing Roadmap and Release schedule. We had a successful deployment of release 2.0 this past weekend and it was pretty significant for us. A lot of teamwork and effort has went in to making this release successful. Release 2.1 is scheduled for release in March of 2018.

Slide 8 Bill Schmidt noted issues have been raised by several agencies, with IPAC there is no incentive for early payment and no penalty for late payments. The buyer will submit an order and has the ability to change the default value for payment terms days. This can be greater than or less than the default value. Payment terms days determines the number of days before the invoice is automatically approved. Treasury will determine the default value set in G-Invoicing. When we get to the Order release R2.2, the seller will be able to negotiate the payment term days with the buyer. Once the order is approved by both trading partners, the payment terms days starts (business days). Trading partners can approve before the number selected in this field.

Questions:
What if there is an error on an invoice, and it auto approves? Will the auto approval initiate the IPAC? If there is an error on the invoice, you can either accept or reject the invoice. The invoice will just be accepted if an amount of time agreed upon lapses. If in fact the invoice was approved, it would have to be adjusted at a later date for the quick answer. Restricting ALCs who have access to collect money from your agency is a good business practice. G-Invoicing is treated like a push to the agency.

Question: Will this happen after receipt and acceptance? Yes, there needs to be an exchange of information before receipt and acceptance.

Question: When an agency makes a payment will there be some sort of indicator alerting that this is an advance payment? Yes there will be. Advances can be handled and will come across as invoices with advance payments. If you pay in advance the receipt and acceptance will be different. We will get more into this in the future. We will have a couple of scenarios that will help answer questions.

Mike Shannon noted on slide 8- for advance payments; where the invoice is approved on the day it is posted to G-Invoicing; we may want to consider for advance payments that the value cannot be zero. That way nothing on the buyer side except an invoice for advance, so we might want to think of a tolerance to put around that event to ensure advance payments cannot have a value of zero. Bill agreed a good point and we will revisit.

Question: If there is a rejection is there a time limit before an automatic payment, or will that stop the automatic payment? Once the buyer rejects the invoice back to seller, the invoice would have to be resubmitted or dropped. It will not be possible for automatic payments after an invoice is rejected.

Question: TFM Chapter 4700, Appendix 10 states that advances are prohibited by law unless permitted by statutory authority; How will advances be permitted in G-Invoicing? Brian stated that advances in intragovernmental activity are different from advance payments to commercial vendors. Advances are permitted for Intragovernmental Buy/Sell transactions under the Economy Act, because the risk of loss to the government is mitigated in intragovernmental activity as both trading partners are within the federal government. TFM Chapter 4700, Appendix 10, is in the process of being amended to reflect only intragovernmental advances and the update should be published shortly.

A couple of questions were raised on slide 9 about the system interface updates. We are working on the push/pull specifications and will present this to the vendors once completed. When completed, the data exchanges will allow the agencies to modify IGT orders and pull down what data partners changed. Each system can directly link to G-Invoicing and no human involvement will be required, if desired. We want to get the specifications out in front of the vendors as soon as we can and develop our side of the interface. We hope to meet the vendors in the middle around the same time to close the loop on the interface in Release 2.2 next year.

2.1 release next year
Question: Are dates FY 2018 or Jan 2018? Calendar dates.

Question: Is there a mandated date? Not at this time.

One of our biggest challenges has been defining the performance transaction. We are still defining requirements for system data exchanges and have upcoming meetings, but our focus is performance accounting changes and accounting entries.   G-Invoicing is not an accounting system. There is a distinct possibility that these data exchanges change over time as policy changes evolves.

Question: What are we doing for our non-federal customers in the private sector? Their agency enters into agreements with non-federal customers, one side is the seller and other is federal. Will they be able to upload to G-Invoicing? Keith stated we need to know more but sounds like an IPP platform. Invoices that are government agency to a state, city, or a private organization outside G-Invoicing. Matt

confirmed that these types of transactions would have to be processed outside of G-Invoicing. Bottom line, if it does not end up with an IPAC, it will not be going into the G-Invoicing system.

Brian closed the meeting by reiterating that most of the questions today were about automation. It's important for agencies to let us know if they plan to use the automated interfaces or if they plan on using manual entry in the user interface.

Please direct all inquiries to IGT@fiscal.treasury.gov.

Survey questions have been emailed to all ITWG participants. Please complete the survey.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/VDGS8DY