



Intragovernmental Transactions Working Group Meeting Minutes September 12th 2017

Alex Abshire began the meeting with a short overview of the agenda for the ITWG meeting. The meeting covered survey results from July, what's new with Federal Intragovernmental Data Standards, update on Data Exchanges, and the latest plans for Performance Transactions.

There will not be an October ITWG meeting while everyone is involved with year-end closing. Our next scheduled meeting is tentatively November 14th. An agenda will be provided prior to the meeting.

Brian Casto presented the July survey results on automation plans. There were 25 responses received, we appreciate the valuable feedback that was provided. The vendors we have been working with are SAP, Oracle, Momentum and Prism. In addition, a new vendor Workday has been added to the vendor list. Several responses mentioned some agencies have their own custom systems supporting IGT Buy/Sel. We are not sure if underlying software packages support the systems. In addition, a few agencies have plans to enter orders, receipts and invoices directly into G-Invoicing. We may need to know more about your situation and plans so that we can best support your agency going forward. When your agency reaches the point that G-Invoicing integration is on your radar, please feel free to contact us by sending an email to IGT@fiscal.treasury.gov.

Wes Vincent presented the new look for the Fiscal Service Data Registry (FIDS). Previously we mapped Form 7600 to G-Invoicing (originally called IPP/IGT). More recently we have been focusing on the data elements needed for IGT Buy/Sell. We are currently working on the Order standards, and have begun creating XML schemas to transport these data sets from system to system. GT&C standards have been stable for a while and can be viewed on our G-Invoicing Website. The XML Schema Definitions for GT&C's may be downloaded from the Fiscal Service Data Registry.

Wes continued stating that we have been asked to add a Ship To Agency Title to identify the specific agency location at the receiving end of the goods or services. Often this location title may appear as the first line of the mailing address. The Order standards today contains three address lines for Ship To Location. In addition we also carry a Description, City, State, Country and Zip Code, separately from the address lines. Wes asked if we add "Ship To Agency Title" and if anyone had any objections to adding this title. There were no objections presented. Wes added that the added fields would be an optional.

Wes continued on with the subject address information – the Prepared By Point-of-contact name, phone number and e-mail address: suggestion to add POC title and postal address. These additions would be optional data elements, possibly including the full mailing address, including city, state and zip. Wes asked if any thoughts or comments from the group. It was commented that agencies will need to

have their ALC addresses and Points of contacts up-to-date. Wes added that the added fields would also be optional.

Wes brought up the suggestion of renaming “Payment Term Days” to “Invoice Approval Days” to align better with the purpose of the data element. The purpose of the element is an agreed-upon timeframe during which the Buyer may approve or reject an invoice, prior to G-Invoicing automatic approval. There were no issues presented by renaming the field.

Bill Schmidt presented the Data Exchanges for Orders. He shared that we have been working on system interface specifications and related documents. Then he continued to present the Push and Pull Orders services. In actuality these four data exchanges will be serviced by two system interfaces: Push Order and Pull Orders.

- Push Order service covers opening new orders, approved orders (including changes to Servicing Agency data) rejecting orders, modifying orders and closing orders.
- Pull Orders service allows both Buyer and Seller to pull down new and updated Orders, shown as interfaces on slide. (Download by Seller and Buyer)

Bill continued explaining that feedback is currently being gathered from the development stakeholders and changes will be made as needed. Once the specifications have stabilized we will publish a public version on the G-Invoicing website along with updated Order data standards and other supporting documents.

- G-Invoicing team is scheduled to begin development of these interfaces early next year and implement these late in 2018. We will keep everyone updated as we move along.
- Also currently working with ERP Vendors to obtain commercial development plans that are in place. We will share the vendor plans as they become available.

Matt Conrad then presented the Delivery, Receipt, and Acceptance slides. In May we reviewed all the feedback and discussions and relooked at the attempts to agree on what to do for Delivery, Receipt, and Acceptance. We have not been able to come to an agreement across the Federal Government.

- TFM guidance will need to be tightened if we are to expect uniformity.

Earlier surveys showed:

- only 31% of agencies are interested in reporting a Delivery event separately from an invoice.
- only 39% of agencies were interested in reporting Receipt and/or Acceptance separately from the approval of an invoice.

However, some agencies have reported audit findings that have lead us to support the reporting of Receipt and Acceptance, and to a lesser extent Delivery.

One of the challenges facing Treasury is balancing accounting entries related to IGT Buy/Sell between agencies.

- G-Invoicing is providing a platform to share information.
- Although we are not yet in a position to establish a firm set of business rules to govern accounting triggers, agencies can share information through G-Invoicing.

On slide 9 Matt continued and discussed that we are proposing a Delivery Transaction, possibly modelled after the XML equivalent of a standard EDI-856 (or subset of the 856).

When the delivery of goods or services are known (or estimated) to be complete, the servicing agency will submit a Delivery Transaction to G-Invoicing.

- Detailed requirements need to be defined, for example- what data is involved, optionality of the transaction, etc.

The Delivery Transaction will hang off of an Order much like the Invoice does today.

- All or part of an Order-Line-Schedule may be delivered.
- A delivery transaction may involve more than one Order, Line or Schedule.
- Each Delivery will contain at least enough information to justify the accounting entry (or entries) which were triggered by the delivery of goods or services.

Again, we need to work out details, but we anticipate that a Delivery transaction could be reported before the Invoice or with the Invoice, and possibly after the Invoice is generated.

Matt continued to slide 10 to discuss proposing something similar for reporting Receipt and Acceptance to G-Invoicing.

When the requesting agency has received and/or accepted goods or services, they will submit an R&A Transaction to G-Invoicing.

- Detailed requirements need to be defined, for example what data is involved, optionality, whether Receipt can be reported separately from Acceptance, etc.

Like the Delivery Transaction, the Receipt & Acceptance will hang off of an Order.

- All or part of an Order-Line-Schedule may be received or accepted.
- A R&A transaction may involve more than one Order, Line or Schedule.
- Each R&A transaction will contain at least enough information to justify the accounting entry (or entries) which were triggered by the receipt or acceptance of goods or services.

The R&A transaction could be submitted at the same time as Invoice approval or at another time. At this point it doesn't have to agree with the value reported for Delivery or even align with a reported Delivery.

- We are simply collecting and routing information, not applying business rules or requiring additional review or approvals that could delay IPAC payments.

Matt continued to slide 11; explaining that both of the previous slides transactions are informational only at this point.

For example, if the receipt of goods or services triggers an Accounts Payable entry in your accounting system, send that information into G-Invoicing so your trading partner may have access to it.

- What date and amount? Your partner should have a reciprocating entry.

As proposed, neither the Delivery nor the Receipt & Acceptance transaction impacts the transfer of funds.

- Your partner doesn't have to agree with your Delivery or R&A transactions.

- Once the Invoice is approved by the Buyer (or the agreed upon time limit expires), IPAC will transfer funds, whether or not Delivery Receipt & Acceptance amounts and dates are in alignment with each other or even with the Invoice.

The net result is that both partners will have access to data that will help reconcile Buy/Sell activities. G-Invoicing will have the information necessary to report differences in Delivery date/amount versus Receipt date/amount.

Treasury will have access to new information which can be used to craft policy changes going forward. We still need more of these types of performance transactions brought out and we'd like to hear from you the agencies and the ERP vendors as we work through the details.

Brian Casto in closing noted there are several survey questions related to the discussions and presentations today.

Survey questions were emailed to all ITWG participants.

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

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