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Motorist Modernization Advisory Board Monthly Meeting

January 12, 2016

Kirkman Building, Training Room B130
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Invitees
Deb Roby
Ed Broyles
Steven Fielder
Carl Forney
April Edwards
Beth Allman
Linda Fugate

Representing
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
Florida Clerk Courts & Comptrollers
Florida Tax Collectors

Agenda Outline

- Roll Call
- Welcome
- Review and Approval of Last Meeting Minutes
- Policy and Decisions Review
- MM Phase I Program Update
  - Status Update and Financial Review
  - IV&V Update
  - Change Request Review
  - Requirements Validation Update
- Communications Update
  - Organizational Change Management
- Q&A
- Adjourn
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

- The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm. Terrence Samuel began the meeting with the Welcome and Introductions. He proceeded with roll call for the Board Members.

Advisory Board Members present included:
- Deb Roby (not present, on business trip)
- Ed Broyles
- Steven Fielder
- Carl Forney
- April Edwards
- Beth Allman
- Linda Fugate (via telephone)

- Other DHSMV members present included: Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Wendy Ling, Catherine Thomas, Jessica Espinoza, Judy Johnson, Laura Freeman, Samadhi Jones, Janis Timmons, Kathlene Crowe, RaeLynn DeParsqual, and Aundrea Andrades.

- Visitors included: Gary Didio (EY), Damaris Reynolds (Office of General Counsel), and Kim Koegel (Accenture).

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE LAST MEETING MINUTES

- Ms. Green reviewed the meeting minutes from November 10, 2015. A motion to approve was unanimously accepted by the members.

POLICY AND DECISIONS REVIEW

Ms. Espinoza provided an update on open items.

- CLD02 was closed in the last meeting.
  - The decision was not to charge money for CLP.
- CDL03 is closed but grayed out on the spreadsheet. The reason is because we are waiting to receive statistics on how many CDL Instructional Permits are re-issued.
  - Ms. Espinoza recommends to close this item.
• CDL04: Charge for the CLP replacements?
  - The decision was not to charge money.

• CDL05: Will the department stop issuing CLP's and CDL's to "Non-Domiciled" drivers? The recommendation was to continue to issue CLPs and CDLs to non-domicile drivers and produce unique cards.
  - The last update is that we are waiting to receive findings from FMCSA.

• CDL08: This item was closed in the last meeting. We added this to the legal opinion and statute analysis document from Peter Stoumbelis, the legal advisor for the Executive Steering Committee.
  - In the last update, we had the ESC agree to Rob’s recommendation of sending an electronic notification as well as mail notification.
  - If the customer has a MyDMV profile, we should send mail and electronic notices.

• CDL10: Should CLPS and CDLs for foreign drivers be printed with the verbiage “Non-Domiciled”? The last update is that we are still waiting to receive information from FMCSA.

• CIT02: How to handle out of state citation numbers. The last update is this may require us to build a composite key and we may be able to accomplish this in the system.
  - This topic was added to the test document for the Enterprise Architecture team.

• CIT03: Determine if Florida citation numbers will be expanded to 20 characters. We are adding this to the database redesign spreadsheet.
  - Robert Kynoch will follow up with Deborah Todd.

• POR02: Do we still need to account for the business rules for “R-Restricted” licenses? Our last update was we are going to check if “R-Restricted” licenses have been converted to “Learners Licenses”. As of 10/30/15, they have not been.
  - This item has been added to the Enterprise Architecture list. We are waiting to receive a response on whether if we can or cannot convert them.

• POR06: Determine if the Department of Defense (DOD) has a service to call and verify military status.
  - The last update was that the MOU was submitted to the DOD and we are waiting for a reply.
  - Per Ms. Johnson, the DOD is still evaluating if DHSMV qualifies to utilize this service.

• POR09: Currently an individual cannot go into a field office and request another Driver’s Record/Transcript, only their own. Verifying the Department wants to allow individual customers to purchase other driver’s redacted history records via the new online portal.
  - The recommendation was to move forward and allow it but will require a DL number and an option of adding the first, last name and date of birth.
- Action item was to provide examples of printed transcripts (protected/law enforcement, blocked not-protected, and regular transcripts).

- POR10: Are there requirements for the new portal as it relates to GovQA Public Records and if so, what are the requirements?
  - In our last update, two questions were added to the Legal Opinion document; 1) Can we legally record who is requesting another driver’s transcript? 2) If so, would we have to provide as a part of a public records request?
  - The outcome of the legal opinion will apply to DL and MyDMV.

- POR18: Should we provide an option for express shipping? If so, on which items and how will they be processed?
  - The last update is that we have not found a generic statute that limits us. We are seeking legislative authority to charge, collect and distribute.
  - This item has been added to the Legal Opinion document.

- DL01: Allow examiners to print Hazmat extensions letter locally. The update from the ESC was that the CDL Helpdesk will continue to be the only section to generate and issue hazmat endorsement extensions.
  - Ms. Espinoza will have a follow up meeting with Mr. Stoumbelis and Mr. Mechlin to discuss the legal authority to extend hazmat.
  - Ms. Fugate wanted to know if there was a way to reach departments directly rather than going through helpdesk. She waited on the phone to speak to someone for about 28 minutes. Ms. Espinoza said she would look into it with the CDL helpdesk.
  - Mr. Broyles explained the purpose of having the help desk support all of the common knowledge, but indicated there were only 4 people on staff at the CDL helpdesk.

- DL04 was closed at the prior meeting. The ESC recommended that this item be closed for now. The recommendation temporarily meets the requirement.
  - Mr. Hutchinson mentioned that the Security Token Service (STS) could possibly be extended to DAVID so that users do not have to sign in again.
  - This item was added to the tech list.
• DL05: The Motor Voter application should allow users to enter a partial address in the previous address field.
  - The action item was to add this topic to the Department of State open item list and have them sign off on it. OMM discussed this with DOS on 12/03/15.
  - The outcome is that they are ok with us only requiring the state, but also allowing the option to add the full address if the customer knows it.

• DL07: Record information of the person requesting transcript if it's not requested by the record holder.
  - The action item was to review the statute and see if it’s related to DL. If statute says it is ok, then we need to see if it is similar to what Maureen Johnson does.
  - This topic was added to the Legal Opinion document.

• DL10: Pre-fill Motor Voter information from information previously entered in FDLIS application.
  - This was added to the DOS Open Item list. They are ok with us copying the information over from a transaction.

• DL11: Move Motor Voter to the beginning of the application process.
  - When we met with the DOS, they didn’t have a preference on where we would have this in the application. It will be placed after the page where you select the motor voter options.

• DL12: Include an option for out-of-state voters in the Motor Voter form.
  - This has been approved by DOS for the customer to enter the state only.
  - Ms. Espinoza will combine items DL12 and DL05.

• DL14: It is a requirement for the Motor Voter form. We will add it to the Motor Voter form.

• DL15: Screening questions regarding convictions should not be retrieved by FDLIS from the online application. On 11/10, Deb Roby mentioned that Manatee County still uses the online application.
  - Ms. Fugate will follow up with Manatee County. Only a small number of Tax Collectors responded to the survey, but those who answered said they do not use the Online Application. In addition, one county also referenced the requirement to ask the questions again even if the customer completed the application. Per Ms. Fugate, she had not received a call back from Ken in Manatee County.

• REN01: Will we allow school bus drivers to renew CDL by convenience method? DHSMV receives a list from Department of Education verifying the school bus drivers.
- The Advisory Board agrees that the drivers should be allowed to renew by the convenience method. Per Mr. Fielder, they should be able to do any transaction as any other driver would be allowed to do.

- RENO2: The Statute was changed to allow a Customer Stop for Bad Check to prevent future transaction for the customer; however the Department’s policy has not been changed. Will there be a change to the Department’s policy to reflect the change to the statute?

- Per Mr. Fielder, The Advisory Board would like to make a recommendation to the ESC that the policy be fixed. The Department should fix its policy to match the statute (to be consistent).

**MM PHASE I PROGRAM UPDATE**

**Status Update and Financial Review**

- Ms. Timmons: Our budget is on track for the month of November. Our budget to actual was $1.6 million for contracted services and our expenses were $1.6 million for November YTD. We are on target with all of our deliverables. We have three deliverables due in December, but the next large set of deliverables will be due in February and March 2016. Currently, we are on track for month to date and year to date expenditures.

**IV&V Update**

- Mr. Didio: IV&V will be delivering the draft November monthly report next Monday, December 14th. We had a meeting last Friday to discuss the remaining recommendation, which was to develop a work breakdown structure and a high-level schedule for Organizational Change Management. It is the point of view that the IV&V team is satisfied with the recommendations and approach, so it is just a matter of getting it approved by the Executive Steering Committee. The Executive Steering Committee will review the associated change request on Thursday. If the ESC approves, the last recommendation will be cleared and the cube will be completely green by next week.

**Change Request Review**

Ms. Green: In the Advisory Board booklets, the previously reviewed and approved Change Requests that were discussed in the last meeting have been provided. Only one Change Request was ready at the time.

- Change Request 4 (p26) in the booklet includes an approved copy that deals with some of the scheduled tasks related to data synchronization.

- Change Request 5 (p29) addresses refining scheduled activities associated with Sprint Zero, which is the preparation for development work. As a part of Deliverable 24 that
Accenture recently submitted, they further delineated the activities that will be necessary for Sprint Zero.

- Change Request 6 (p32) this change request per our decision escalation matrix was within Terrence’s authority to approve and has to do with to adjusting Deliverable 23 release planning guiding principles and strategies deliverable dates.

- Change Request 7 (p34) as Mr. Didio mentioned, the last remaining deficiency recommendation deals with incorporating in our integrated master schedule tasks associated with Organizational Change Management. There are a few tasks in our schedule that are related to Organizational Change Management. There are also tasks in our schedule that have been associated with training, as well as some of the deliverables that the Accenture team is going to be delivering. The group had a meeting and here are some additional items that will be added to the schedule:
  
  - Ms. Ling: We met with Kim Koegel with Accenture, and we also met with Ms. Jones to go through the organizational change management tasks. The items listed in the change request have to do with the readiness assessment. This is not a formal deliverable per se, but internal checkpoints that we can use at specific times throughout the program. They’re timed specifically to ensure that we can assess the stakeholders at that time. The first checkpoint is 8.3 on page 2 of the change request. This will occur next year following the requirements. Once we finish all the requirements validation, there will be a checkpoint to assess readiness.
  - The second OCM readiness assessment will occur after the completion of development, which will happen on July 27, 2018.
  - The third checkpoint is at the end of testing. This is the framework of where the dates came from in understanding how we integrated that into the schedule.
  - The additional notes for the quarterly communications plan update. The intent is to make sure that we are tracking the details that are happening for OCM. Ms. Jones will be making an update to the plan with additional details. What we’ve done is try to capture when that will occur so that we can go back and check and when she’s doing the updates. We will be able to see a six-month projection of what’s going to be happening in the program for communications.

Requirements Validation Update

DL and Motorist Maintenance

- Ms. Espinoza provided an update on DL: The team is working on exams, license and ID details. For Motorist Maintenance, the team is on schedule. As we are grooming these stories, we find that there are some stories that get removed because they are already taken care of elsewhere, and it would make more sense for the developers to combine them. When stories that are too big to develop in one sprint, we have break them up. This is what we are currently going through.
MyDMV Portal and Renewal

- Ms. Johnson provided an update on MyDMV Portal: The team is working on the shopping cart functional area. There are a total of 15 stories in this area. We are currently on schedule. For Renewal, the team is working on the GHQ renewal validation portion. There is a total of 23 stories in this area. 15 stories are in progress and 4 are pending. We are on schedule.

Financial Responsibility and Citation Processing

- Ms. Thomas provided an update on Financial Responsibility: We have 24 functional areas in clearance, non-insurance, batch processing, releaser and field app. There are 6 field apps pending. We are currently ahead of schedule by 2 weeks. For Citation Processing, the team is working on miscellaneous suspensions, mandatory revocation, and learners license. The total functional areas are 11 and they are all in progress. We are ahead of schedule by 1 month.

COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

- Ms. Jones provided an update on communications. There was a General Headquarters ELT update of the Motorist Modernization program on December 7th, 2015 which included the unveiling of the Orion logo by Terry Rhodes. It officially presented the name of the software solution to the agency leadership. There were approximately 98 people invited and it was standing room only in the auditorium. Terry Rhodes, Diana Vaughn, Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Jessica Espinoza and Chad Hutchinson provided an update of the program.

- The Advisory Board web pages have been revised. Ms. Jones invited everyone to review the site to see the new layout.

- The PartnerNet webpages has been updated and streamlined. The MotoristModernization@flhsmv.gov email account has been established.

- There were minor modifications to the key messages. The original version of our key messages included the word “citizen”. This was corrected. The two places where the word “citizen” appears have been replaced with: “Expand online to let the customers access more services whenever and wherever they want.”, and “Continue improving driver license and vehicle data security to keep personal information safe.”

- The Department of State Focus Group met on December 4, 2015. The next meeting will be on January 11, 2016.

- The Bureau Administrative Review Workshop will be held on December 16, 2015 in Jacksonville, FL. The Sr. Business Analysts will be presenting to the group. Ms. Jones will provide a brief overview of the Organizational Change Management piece.

- The Tax Collector Focus Group is being planned for January, 2016 in Central Florida.
• Ms. Jones and Ms. Allman discussed scheduling the Clerk of Court Focus Group meeting in Tallahassee.

• An outreach to the Florida Sheriffs Association, the Florida Police Chiefs and the Florida Retail Federation is being planned.

• The priority that we have been working on with Accenture has been the organizational analysis which was submitted on December 3rd. This deliverable is currently in review. This organizational analysis will feed into the Training and Support Strategy. This is where we take a look at needs and objectives, the training curriculum, the training delivery strategy, and the performance support strategy.

• We will get into the details of how to affect all of the support staff to transition smoothly and seamlessly to the new system.

• Mr. Samuel requested Ms. Fugate to review the ParterNet site and to provide feedback. We plan to put the video on PartnerNet. Sharon Watson will send an email to the Tax Collectors to let them know that it’s available to view.

**ADJOINED**

• The meeting came to a close and was officially adjourned at approximately 1:54 pm.
• The next Advisory Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 12th from 1:00 – 3:00 pm.
Note: Handouts at this meeting included:

Consolidated in a booklet format:

- MM Advisory Board Agenda: 1 page
- MM Advisory Board Monthly Meeting Minutes 11-10-15: 6 pages
- MM Phase I Decisions: 12 pages
- IV&V Overall Risk State and Trending: 1 page
- IV&V Action Plan Summary: 1 page
- Change Request 04 Phase I: 3 pages
- Change Request 05 Phase I: 3 pages
- Change Request 06 Phase I: 2 pages
- Change Request 07 Phase I: 3 pages
- Communications Update: 5 pages
- Notes Section: 4 pages

Additional handouts include:

- Change Request 07 Phase I (updated): 3 pages
- 2015-2016 – MM Phase I Spend Plan: 1 page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Bureau Chief</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Advisory Board Status</th>
<th>Recommendation Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
<th>ESC Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDL01</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Print driver's photo on CLP or Static image?</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Advisory Recommendation: Static image, text indicating &quot;Not for Identification&quot; 7/14/15 Update - An issue was raised concerning the CLP being issued centrally and the customer leaving the office with no document or credential. It's an inconvenience for the customer per Linda Fugate.</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL02</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Ask for legislative change to charge for the CLP.</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/21/2015</td>
<td>Advisory Recommendation: Ask for legislative change to charge.</td>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td>ESC - Recommended No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL04</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Charge for CLP replacements?</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/23/2015</td>
<td>Advisory Recommendation: Charge after legislative approval (Set at $0 for now)</td>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td>Stats requested. Stats Update: FY 14-15 - Average time between issuance of Instructional Permit and CDL License is 48-days. Stats Request: How many CDL Instructional Permits are currently re-issued. 11/19 Update - ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL05</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Will the department stop issuing CLP's and CDL's to &quot;Non-Domiciled&quot; drivers?</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>6/20/2015</td>
<td>Advisory Board Recommendation: Continue to issue CLP's and CDL's to Non-Domicile drivers and produce unique cards</td>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td>Stats requested. Stats Update: FY14-15 - Of 39,853 Original CDLs, 9% were non-immigrants. 11/19 Update - Waiting for FMCSA findings Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL06</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>How to limit the maximum period for CDL’s license to 8 years?</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Issue CDL license up to 8 years and 364 days and limit early renewals to 1 year.</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL07</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Replace the 4 year Hazmat license with a Hazmat until date indicator on license?</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Approval to implement a Hazmat until date on the license</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL08</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>How should we implement the intrastate restriction for driver’s who are currently self-certified in an intrastate category and do not have the restriction on their license?</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>7/14/2015</td>
<td>Send out a letter asking drivers to reconsider their intrastate self-certification and change to intrastate-interstate via the web within the next 90 days. Drivers who continued to claim an intrastate self-certification after the 90 days will receive an intrastate restricted license at no cost. After the one-time free license, the driver will be charged a $25 replacement fee for any changes. 7/14/15 Update - Steven Fielder stated that &quot;intrastate via the web&quot; needs to be changed to &quot;intrastate via the web&quot;.</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation. Rob - Recommends sending electronically as well. (No final decision) 11/19 Update - ESC agrees with Rob’s recommendation. It was decided that if the customer has a MyDMV profile, we should send both (Mail and Electronic Notices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>Advisory Board Status</td>
<td>Recommendation Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>ESC Close Date</td>
<td>ESC Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL09</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Should the Department continue to issue no-cost Class E licenses to commercial drivers who downgrade due to disqualifications?</td>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Roby, David Helton, Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>No Change.</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL10</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Should CLPs and CDLs for foreign drivers be printed with the verbiage &quot;Non-Domiciled&quot;?</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Under Review from Requested Functionality Document. 4/8/15 Update - Deferred until 2017 per Deb Roby. 7/14/15 Update - Changed the status to &quot;Open&quot; per the Advisory Board.</td>
<td>11/19 Update - Waiting for FMCSA findings</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT01</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Citation Processing</td>
<td>Include all medical certification fields (physicians name, address, etc.) on transcripts.</td>
<td>Tod Browning</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>4/9-Tod advised this is in reference to transcripts and should be a planned functionality.</td>
<td>11/20/2015</td>
<td>AI - Add requirement in DL issuance to include this information in issued transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT02</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Citation Processing</td>
<td>Team to discuss how to handle out of state citation numbers. Currently use 0000. Consider using the reference ID.</td>
<td>Deborah Todd</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>8/16/15 - Dan provided a list of dedicated OOS fields for dispositions. Suzanne &amp; April are researching OOS ticket numbers. 9/3/15 - Suzanne to bring samples of OOS citations &amp; transcripts to grooming meeting. 9/3/15 Update - still no consistency in OOS citation numbers, leave as is until &quot;state to state&quot;.</td>
<td>11/19 Update - Note: This may require us to build a composite key. (We may be able to accomplish this in the current system) AI - Meet with Maureen</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT03</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Citation Processing</td>
<td>Determine if Florida citation numbers will be expanded to 20 characters</td>
<td>Deborah Todd</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>9/1 - waiting on a decision from the Director's office. Deborah Todd said the issue will not be discussed until at least the week of 9/8. 9/8/15 Update - not approved at this time.</td>
<td>11/19 Update - AI - Add this to the Database Redesign spreadsheet. AI - Robert Kynoch will follow up with Deborah Todd.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR01</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Core Rule for Eligibility for DL/ID Issuance</td>
<td>Customers that are males and under 26, must be flagged for Select Service. Age requirements for registering information with SS? Based on the &quot;selective service flag&quot; in the database, we have 2,081 males between 15 and 25 where the flag is false, but over 1.4 million with the flag true. These are active DL and ID holders. The majority with 'false' are license holders.</td>
<td>All Chiefs approved. 4/10/2015</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>See Selective Service table for details on &quot;Who Must Register&quot;) Alan Busenbark 4/8/2015 Correct and Current. Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR02</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Core Rule for Eligibility for DL/ID Issuance</td>
<td>Do we still need to account for the business rules for 'R- Restricted&quot; licenses?</td>
<td>All Chiefs approved. 4/10/2015</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Not needed as &quot;R&quot; license type is obsolete. Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015 11/30/15 Stat Update: Count License type 5349 R 2 C 1 N 2638 E **All are currently expired</td>
<td>12/22/2015</td>
<td>Stats requested. Stats Update - As of 8/28, there are 4,055 credentials with &quot;R- Restricted&quot; licenses. AI - Peter will check statute. (Added to Legal Opinion Document) AI - What year did we stop issuance? 2003 (Per Deb Roby) 11/19 Update - AI - Check if &quot;R- Restricted&quot; licenses have been converted to 'Learner's Licenses’. Answer: No. As of 11/30/15. See stats. AI - If the licenses are not converted, can we convert the license? / Add to tech list. 12/22 Update - Legal recommends conversion to Learner's Permits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item No. | Add Date | Function Area Requested Functionality | Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s) | Advisory Board Status | Recommendation Date | Comments | ESC Close Date | ESC Comments | ESC Status
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
POR03 | 6/10/2015 | Core Rule for Eligibility for DL/ID issuance | Customer cannot do an online issuance and have a restriction type code of ‘C’ and the following restrictions:  
*Note: Restriction code values will change pending approval - Question why is a driver not allowed to use Portal to replace or renewal license with the following restrictions?*  
*Note: Restriction code values will change pending approval - Question why is a driver not allowed to use Portal to replace or renewal license with the following restrictions?*  
“C” – Business Purposes  
“D” – Employment Purposes  
“F” – Probation Interlock Device  
“S” – Other Restrictions  
“Y” – Education Purposes  
“R” – Restricted | Chiefs’ Recommendation: The current and new CIPS print solution will need to handle the printing of the special Restrictions mentioned above. | Closed | I see no reason to disallow renewing as long as the dates and restrictions are brought forward on a renewed license.  
Ray Graves 03/31/2015  
See note 1 below table - Not sure why we cannot issue a DL if the restriction is already on the record. Please note that we no longer use the “Y” restriction.(BAR/Felicia Ford)  
See note 2 below - Should be able to issue with C, D, Y, or R restriction and if the time period is over it should automatically delete the restriction and issue.  
If restriction should be allowed unless they are not eligible for another R license. S would be ok as long as restrictions are clear as what the S stands for.  
Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015  
There may be valid reasons for not allowing portal renewals/replacements; however, from my point of view (field DL offices), when a customer with one of the listed restrictions come to our office and the restriction is still current and they are real ID, we don’t require other documents; therefore, they could renew online if they meet these requirements.  
Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015 | 8/20/2015 | | Closed

POR04 | 6/10/2015 | Eligibility for DL Renewal and Replacement issuance | Should checks for other Re-Exam Correspondences in addition to 3, be required in Portal to determine if an issuance is allowed? | | Open | Chiefs’ Recommendation:  
Looking to allow other correspondences currently not allowed to issue online due to the medical flag. Allow issuance if review/re-exam not required within 60 days. Bill Henderson is supplying the correspondences allowed a renewal or replacement issuance if medical flag set but follow-up in not due within 60 days or more. | 8/20/2015 | ESC agrees with recommendation. | As long as not within 60-days of follow-up. | Closed

POR05 | 6/10/2015 | Eligibility for DL Renewal and Replacement issuance | 90 Day Printed Temporary Permit fee of $77.00 - ‘??’ – new code – Can we charge for the issuance of the card and if so the fee amount? | | Closed | Chiefs’ Recommendation:  
A Temporary permit with a printed card doesn’t seem to be an option for online portal issuance of non-CDL drivers.5/28/2015  
Say it could be a printed document.  
Concern whether it would hold as authentic.  
Need statutory authority to charge. Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015  
We don’t have statutory authority to charge for a temporary driving permit. Alan Busenbark 4/8/2015  
Currently, our temporary permit can be easily duplicated and altered. Therefore, in our opinion, we should develop a more sophisticated and secure document before we consider charging for this service.  
Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015 | 8/20/2015 | | Closed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>Advisory Board Status</th>
<th>Recommendation Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
<th>ESC Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR06</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Eligibility for DL Renewal and Replacement issuance</td>
<td>Determine if the Dept. of Defense has a service to call to verify Military Status/Location and if DHSMV thinks this is viable option to eliminate Military customers from having to mail in packages for issuances? This would verify Military status and out of state. Then allow the renewal online even though they have already used their convenience renewal option and not have to submit by mail.</td>
<td>Chiefs' Recommendation: Reaching out to DOD (to see if our systems can talk?) We think this would be good to do verification of military status and not have to mail in renewal paper work – Casey Dobson 6/1/2015 6/1/2015 DOD stated that we must complete the form DD1144 in order for them to determine if a cost would be associated with our usage.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>No, the DOD does not have a service to call. Military personnel are verified by individual branch address, which can be found at website: <a href="http://www.defense.gov">www.defense.gov</a>. 08/20 Update - Team started MOU process to find out more information. 11/13 Update - MOU was submitted to DoD and waiting for a reply.</td>
<td>11/19 Update - Waiting for response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR07</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Eligibility for DL Renewal and Replacement issuance</td>
<td>If a customer have both an ID card and a terminated Driver License. Can the once terminated DL renew via the online system and terminate the ID?</td>
<td>Chiefs' Recommendation: Allow the issuance of the DL with the cancellation/termination the ID. The new Portal will also allow the issuance of an ID when the License is ineligible therefore cancelling/downgrading the license. 5/38/2015 Allow going from ID Card to a Renewal checking if eligible for convenience renewal.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Yes if no vision exam is required or if there is a way for vision report to be submitted and scanned for vision requirements showing they meet. Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015 5/17/2015 If a DL is terminated during an ID card issuance, the individual should not be allowed to renew the DL online. This is the current practice and keeps the department in line with the intent of REAL ID. Alan Busenbark 4/8/2015 8/20/2015 No. Termination of a DL/ID will create a cancellation on the record. Once terminated, the customer is required to go to an office to obtain a new credential so that a sanction clearance may be performed. Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MM Phase I Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>Advisory Board Status</th>
<th>Recommendation Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
<th>ESC Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR08</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>Eligibility for DL Renewal and Replacement Issuance</td>
<td>Will a customer be required to purchase an issuance if they update their residential address, which is what prints on the driver license or should we just put a question about the statute?</td>
<td>Chiefs’ Recommendation: We are deferring and requesting an answer from Executive Leadership on whether to require an issuance if residential address is update or just state the statute.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Yes, just put message about the statute. Better to have an updated address than none at all because they don’t want to pay the $25 Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015. There are pros and cons for both arguments; however, I lean to allowing customers to change their residential address in Portal without printing a new card. In this instance, a message on the statute requirement would be good to include. Alan Busenbark 4/8/2015. Yes, that is correct. The residential address is what prints on the driver license. Both mailing and residential address must be captured on the FOLIS application; however, the residential address must appear on the credential unless the customer qualifies for residential address exception. If we, just put a statute? It should be easily understood by the customer. Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015.</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Residential - Issuance required. Mailing - No issuance required. Ship to - Issuance required.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR09</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Currently an individual cannot go into a field office and request another driver’s record/transcript, only their own. Verifying the Department wants to allow individual customers to purchase other driver’s redacted history records via the new online portal. If so, should the search criteria be more precise? (Example: DL and DOB) And how many inquiries at one time?</td>
<td>Chiefs’ Recommendation: DLR will be required for purchasing another driver’s record/transcript. The name field will be optional; if supplied it will print on the transcript. There will be a limit of one other driver and your own per completed shopping cart transaction.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Search should be done by DLR or name, date of birth and sex to ensure the correct record is selected for transcript. I think credentialing and TC support should establish how many could be sold at once. This could create a wait for customers if we allow too many. Customers could also be referred to transcript portal for purchasing. Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015. Yes, the department should include online service and the search should be done by DLR, name, and date of birth and sex. DL EIN # also to ensure the correct record is selected for transcript. Customers could also be referred to transcript portal for purchasing. I don’t see a reason for limiting the amount. Oscar Tolmos 4/8/2015.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stats requested. Stats Update: In the last 6-months, 1,645 requests for other driver transcripts were processed (this type of request amounts to half of the public record requests processed monthly). Total transcripts issued (FY 14/15): Headquarters – 21,714 Field Offices – 73,996 Total HQ and Field – 95,710 Florida Clerk of Courts and Comptroller – 55,011 11/19 ESC Recommendation: DL Number [Required] First &amp; Last Name &amp; DOB [Optional].</td>
<td>11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR10</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>Transcripts/New Portal</td>
<td>Are there requirements for the new portal as it relates to GOVQA Public Records and if so what are the requirements?</td>
<td>Chiefs’ Recommendation: Defer need to discuss with legal – Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>GovQA tracks all public record requests with the inclusion of bulk data sales. We should be able to track what transcript have been sold through portal and to who if possible. Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research legal requirement. 11/19 Update - Added to Legal Opinion Document - 1. Can we legally record who is requesting another driver’s transcript? 2. If so, would we have to provide as a part of a public records request? The outcome of the legal opinion will apply to DL and MyDMV. 12/22 Update - AI - Send Peter Stoubelis more information about the current process (ie. questions on current form):</td>
<td>11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>Advisory Board Status</td>
<td>Recommendation Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>ESC Close Date</td>
<td>ESC Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR11</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Customers will have the option to update insurance information via the new online portal. There are concerns and so a suggestion has been to only allow updates when necessary to clear an open or pending FR sanction and when required to renew registration online. Otherwise, Could we please defer the option of simply updating their current insurance online? A few concerns are: We must allow insurance companies 10 days to provide us with new policy information – this would increase traffic back and forth to the insurance companies. A customer could enter wrong information or not the current effective date and cause a denial to come back in error. We cannot update the database unless the insurance company provides us the insurance policy – realizing we are going to verify the information being</td>
<td>Chiefs' Recommendation: Recommended portal allowing insurance updates only when required for FR Clearance and Vehicle Registration.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>The option of anyone simply updating the insurance should be deferred later down the road per Laura Freeman. Ray Graves. 3/30/2015 Need more information and understanding to have an opinion. Maureen Johnson 4/7/2015 We do not recommend at this time as FR cases have a verification date and customers may enter errors online which will increase the verification process. Therefore, coming into our facilities will decrease errors. Oscar Tolmos 4/9/2015</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Only allow sanction clearance. - Verify VIN first (VIN verification is done by the insurance company - XML should assist with this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR12</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>DL/CDL/ID</td>
<td>Issuance</td>
<td>PDPS/CDLIS Inquiry- When should this be done is the question? In the new suggestions the request is to do it Before Issuance of License in Portal CDL Renewal License Renewal Any issuance – replacements too Discontinue in Portal of doing the check in CIPS the backend process if doing it on front end?</td>
<td>Chiefs' Recommendation: It was stated PDPS is down on Sundays. We need more discussion on performing a PDPS Inquiry for Driver License renewals or all Driver License issuances Is it feasible for PDPS inquiries to take place during the back-end process and before printing of card? 5/28/2015 Class E only renewals check, but on CDL renewals and replacement. Mark so CPIS will know not whether to run the check. Still outstanding on Class E Replacements. 6/1/2015 ELT recommended performing checks on replacement as well as renewals. There is no additional cost for the inquiries, we are charged based on the number of pointer records.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>Chiefs' Recommendation: It was stated PDPS is down on Sundays. We need more discussion on performing a PDPS Inquiry for Driver License renewals or all Driver License issuances Is it feasible for PDPS inquiries to take place during the back-end process and before printing of card? 5/28/2015 Class E only renewals check, but on CDL renewals and replacement. Mark so CPIS will know not whether to run the check. Still outstanding on Class E Replacements. 6/01/15 ELT recommended performing checks on replacement as well as renewals. There is no additional cost for the inquiries, we are charged based on the number of pointer records.</td>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>ESC would like to know the current procedures for when the system is down statewide and current maintenance windows. ESC 09/18 - Based on maintenance windows, we will allow issuance of credentials even when the services are down. We will reconcile on the back end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>Advisory Board Status</td>
<td>Recommendation Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>ESC Close Date</td>
<td>ESC Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR13</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Minor’s Parental Consent Withdrawal</td>
<td>Do we want to allow a parent to withdraw their Parental Consent of their minor child via Portal?</td>
<td>05/28/2015 ELT - By Consenting Parent Only</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>05/28/2015 By Consenting Parent Only</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR14</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Subscription Monitoring Minor by Non Consenting Parent</td>
<td>Do we want to allow the non-consenting parent the option to subscribe for a minor monitoring subscription?</td>
<td>07/28/2015 ELT - Only the Consenting Parent</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR15</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Subscription Monitoring on Elderly Parent or Other Adult</td>
<td>Do we want to allow the option to subscribe Monitoring on Elderly or Adults?</td>
<td>07/28/2015 Executive Leadership to make determination</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>06/01/15 ELT suggested a change in legislation to charge for the Employee Monitoring</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Deferred to a later time. Recommendation: - Allow via online handshake - Initiated by parent.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR16</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Downgrades - Class E or ID</td>
<td>When downgrading from a CDL or a Class E license, why do we create the Class E or ID as an Original Issuance?</td>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Allow with the following conditions: 1. If the credential downgraded to has not expired, allow downgrade as replacement. 2. If the credential downgraded to is expired less than 12 months, allow renewal. 3. If the credential downgraded to is expired more than 12 months, allow original.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR17</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Downgrades – CDL to Class E</td>
<td>Should the replacement fee be charged when the customer is electing to downgrade (no disqualification on record)</td>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>Currently if there are sanctions on the license, the downgrade replacement is processed without charging a fee.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>The decision was made to only charge for downgrade when it is voluntary.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>Advisory Board Status</td>
<td>Recommendation Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>ESC Close Date</td>
<td>ESC Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR18</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td>Should we provide an option for express shipping, if so on which items and how will they be processed?</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESC Recommendation: Allow express shipping for Driver license and ID card issuances only. Boyd - We can recoup the costs. 08/24 Update: AI - Look for generic statutes on the state mail. Answer: No generic statute found. 10/15 Update - AI - Seek legislative authority to charge, collect and distribute.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR19</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>Portal Languages</td>
<td>Are we required to display the portal application in languages other than English and Spanish?</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Currently Virtual Office only provides Spanish and English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>We will focus on English and Spanish for now.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR20</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Rule for Fee Waiver for 100% Veteran</td>
<td>Should the Agency propose a Legislative change to exclude the waiver of DUI reinstatement fee even if 100% disabled?</td>
<td>Pat Porter/ Alan Busenbark</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Was that the intent to exclude Veterans from DUIs as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR21</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Mailing and Residential Addresses</td>
<td>Should out of country addresses be allowed for mailing, residential and ship to addresses in MyDMV or FDLIS?</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently out of country is not allowed for Residential and Mailing addresses in Virtual Office or FDLIS.</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation. See attachment: Motorist Modernization Phase I - Mailing and Residential Address</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR22</td>
<td>8/28/2015</td>
<td>Pending Sanctions</td>
<td>If a customer has a pending sanction, should we allow them to renew or replace their current license online? If so, should we establish a time frame to prevent them from purchasing a license right before the suspension goes into effect?</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boyd and Deb agreed to allow the issuance, but make the cut off point 10 days prior to the sanction effective date. We have to make certain the customer is made aware and it’s very clear they have the pending sanction. 10 days out should avoid us having to credit back money since the license should print within 10 days of the purchase. If within 10 days, we would provide a message “you must visit an office to renew or replace your license”. ***There is one exception: CDL Med Cert Disqualifications - No CDL issuance if pending. Their option would be to downgrade to Class E at no cost if applicable. Med Cert Disqualifications prevent the CDL driver from driving a CMV once placed on the record.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR23</td>
<td>8/26/2015</td>
<td>Minor ID Cards</td>
<td>Do we want a 5 to 14 yr. old to renew ID online or go in person? Currently we only allow 8 yr. ID card renewals online. Not 4 yr. ID cards for those under 15.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan B said DL Renewals will allow 5 to 14 yr. old ID cards to renew by convenience method. 10/13/15 Update - Linda Fugate was concerned about the photo of the child take at the time he/she is 5 and the changes that can occur in their appearance during this time period. Deb Roby stated that this is no different than a teenager who gets their license at 16 and would not be required to take another photo until they are 32 years old. It was also stated that this population is usually for kids with medical issues.</td>
<td>11/19 Update - ESC agrees with recommendation. Do not allow online renewal issuances for minors.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
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<td>Requested Functionality</td>
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<td>ESC Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL01</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Allow examiners to print Hazmat extension letter locally.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Advisory Recommendation: Planned - Extensions may be printed as replacements with “HazMat until MM/DD/YYYY” on the card. CDLIS Help Desk Recommendation: 1. Designate 2-3 Hazmat certified users per office (more hazmat specific training). 2. Add prompts to ensure successful submission/payment and a checkbox for Veterans who are entitled to a no-fee Hazmat endorsement. 12/08 Advisory Board Update: Linda Fugate mentioned that one of her recent calls to field support took 28 minutes to resolve. She would like to know if it would be possible to contact the CDL Helpdesk directly to cut down on call time.</td>
<td>Will there be a fee or no fee? AI - Do we have legal authority to extend Hazmat? (Added to Legal Opinion Document) 09/18 Update: 1. Issuance reason: a) Application/Examiner Error (inaccurate prints, veteran no fee issues, etc..) b) Delayed processing time at TSA 2. Process: CDL Help Desk generates letters manually on an as need basis. Staff uses the CDL driver’s data to draft letters that are specific to the driver’s case. 3. Average: 15-20 Hazmat extension letters are issued per week. 4. Other States: Pending more information 11/19 Update: ESC Recommendation - CDL Helpdesk will continue to be the only section to generate/issue hazmat endorsement extensions.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL02</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Show expiration date of FR cases on eligibility screen.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Planned - We will re-write and include more thorough information on the FR instruction sheets.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL03</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Change page name from CDL Information to CDL Medical Record in Add/Modify.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Planned - Going forward, we will use the proper name for this page and all related functionality (CDL Med Certification)</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL04</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>FDLIS should launch DAVID automatically, in order to allow QA to produce a report.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: A link to DAVID will be added in the system for easy access - Login and verification will still be required to access DAVID.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>AI - Boyd would like to know what &quot;scoring report&quot; is. Is this a QA function? Team will verify this. What is the DAVID access for? 9/15 Update - This is referencing the need to launch DAVID when performing QA through FDLIS. The QA staff is required to perform audits on individuals and each user is scored on percentage of transaction accuracy. *** A requirement to provide a quick link for HazMat fingerprints was previously identified and will satisfy the need for QA as well. 11/19 Update - ESC recommends that this item should be closed for now. The recommendation temporarily meets the requirement. Note: Chad mentioned that Security Token Service (STS) could possibly be extended to DAVID so that users do not have to sign in again. AI - Add to tech list</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL05</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>The Motor Voter application should allow users to enter a partial address in the previous address field. Original Request: The system should allow partial previous addresses to be entered. Even a previous city, state or county will help.</td>
<td>Deb Roby &amp; Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Planned - Street address will be optional but previous state will be required.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Diana/Terry will verify that DOS signs off on this. AI - Add to the DOS Open Item list and have DOS sign off on this. (Next meeting: 12/03) DOS Agrees with recommendation. A Department of State - Focus Group document has been produced to track decisions.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Recommendation Date</td>
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<td>ESC Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL06</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>The system should recognize third party payment types so that the reports can display actual payment type instead of &quot;TC Other&quot;. Original Request: System to recognize all tender types used in 3rd Party Systems so that fees don't report as TC Other on our FDLIS reports.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Not Planned - All TCs don't use the same 3rd party vendor but the department will look into a better solution. Advisory Board Recommendation: Create office setting that will save payment types for TCs with Third Party Cashiers as TC Cash, TC Credit Card, TC Check, etc...</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL07</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Record information of the person requesting transcript if it's not requested by the record holder. Original Request: List who wants the transcript (Individual or other).</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Not planned - Field personnel are only allowed to sell transcripts to the record holder.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL08</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>When it gets close to the end of the 60 day limit, could there be a proposed issuance date so we can extend their issuance date as needed?</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Not planned - issuance date is dependent on USOS approval and the information cannot currently be updated in real time.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL09</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>User I.D./Examiner I.D. needs to be addressed. Intent: Correct information in the reports to display the correct Examiner ID for the purpose of reporting productivity.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Planned - We will plan to display the information for both, the examiner/agent who owns the transaction and for the cashier.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL10</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Pre-fill Motor Voter information from information previously entered in FDLIS application.</td>
<td>Deb Roby</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Planned - The information saved will only be valid for the same day so that users do not have to type the information in again in the event that a transaction is voided.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL11</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Move Motor Voter to the beginning of the application process.</td>
<td>Deb Roby &amp; Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Page order has been adjusted to improve workflow for users. If the customer is not eligible, the Motor Voter page will not be displayed.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL12</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Include an option for out of state voters in the Motor Voter form.</td>
<td>Deb Roby, Maureen Johnson and Department of State Recommendation</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: The system should only require the previous state. Include an OOS section in the Motor Voter page for all Original transactions.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL13</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Motor Voter application receipt should print in multiple languages.</td>
<td>Deb Roby &amp; Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: We will offer any language offered by DOS/Sup of Election so that verbiage is consistent with approved application.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL14</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Questions regarding Sample Ballots should only be asked from the Motor Voter application form.</td>
<td>Deb Roby &amp; Maureen Johnson</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Add button to copy email address from the previous page, where the email address for receiving department information is provided. Add verbiage to inform customer that email addresses submitted for sample ballot are not protected.</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DL15
**Item No.:** DL15  
**Add Date:** 6/10/2015  
**Function Area:** DL Issuance  
**Requested Functionality:** Screening questions regarding convictions should not be retrieved by FDLS from the online application.  
**Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s):** Deb Roby & Maureen Johnson  
**Advisory Board Status:** Open  
**Recommendation Date:** 8/24/2015  
**Comments:** Needs further discussion. Waiting on TC Survey.  
**ESC Close Date:** 8/24/2015  
**ESC Comments:** ESC agrees with recommendation.  
**ESC Status:** Closed  
**AI -** Linda wanted to survey the tax collectors. She’s going back to ask them. She believes they are not using it. Members agreed to wait until we find out what Linda says.

### DL16
**Item No.:** DL16  
**Add Date:** 6/10/2015  
**Function Area:** DL Issuance  
**Requested Functionality:** Require the user to select a party on all New and Change/Update transactions.  
**Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s):** Deb Roby & Maureen Johnson  
**Advisory Board Status:** Closed  
**Recommendation Date:** 8/24/2015  
**Recommendation:** Customers will be required to select party for all transactions with motor voter changes or updates. We suggest the ability to display the party affiliation information on the sig pad  
**ESC Close Date:** 8/24/2015  
**ESC Comments:** ESC agrees with recommendation.  
**ESC Status:** Closed  
**AI -** Submit WRAP to fix this before MoMo.

### DL17
**Item No.:** DL17  
**Add Date:** 6/10/2015  
**Function Area:** DL Issuance  
**Requested Functionality:** Email address should be verified so that bad email addresses can’t be entered.  
**Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s):** Deb Roby & Maureen Johnson  
**Advisory Board Status:** Closed  
**Recommendation Date:** 8/24/2015  
**Recommendation:** The department will look into an automated method to validate email address.  
**ESC Close Date:** 8/24/2015  
**ESC Comments:** ESC agrees with recommendation.  
**ESC Status:** Closed  
**AI -** Submit WRAP to fix this before MoMo.

### DL18
**Item No.:** DL18  
**Add Date:** 9/15/2015  
**Function Area:** DL Issuance  
**Requested Functionality:** Transcripts should retain the true Original issuance date.  
**Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s):** Advisory Board/ Deb Roby, Maureen Johnson and Natasha White  
**Advisory Board Status:** Closed  
**Recommendation Date:** 10/15/2015  
**Recommendation:** Fix bug that replaces Original issuance date without creating a new issuance type.  
**ESC Close Date:** 10/15/2015  
**ESC Comments:** AI - Submit WRAP to fix this before MoMo.  
**ESC Status:** Closed  
**AI -** What will the impact be if we increase the load for AAMVA Checks?

### DL19
**Item No.:** DL19  
**Add Date:** 9/18/2015  
**Function Area:** DL Issuance  
**Requested Functionality:** Require CDLS check on Class E transactions (Org, Rnw & Rpl).  
**Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s):**  
**Advisory Board Status:** Closed  
**Recommendation Date:** 10/15/2015  
**Recommendation:**  
**ESC Close Date:** 10/15/2015  
**ESC Comments:**  
**ESC Status:** Closed  
**AI -** What will the impact be if we increase the load for AAMVA Checks?

### Notes
- **9/15 Update -** This is referring to the statutory question: “Have you ever been adjudged by a court of law to be mentally incapacitated, suffering from any mental disorder or disease?” Note: This question appears two times during a DL transaction (in respect to driving and in respect to voting). When a customer fills out the online application, the question is automatically answered for the customer in both places.
- **11/10 Update -** Deb Roby mentioned that Manatee County still uses the online application. Linda will follow up with Manatee County. Only a small number of Tax Collectors responded to the survey, but those who answered said they do not use the Online Application. In addition, one county also referenced the requirement to ask the questions again even if the customer completed the application.
- **9/30 Update -** If the user receives a “Not Eligible” response:
  - **Class E Original Issuance Service up:** No issuance allowed
  - **Class E Renewal Issuance Service up:** Only 90-Day permit can be issued
  - **Class E Replacement Issuance Service up:** Only 90-Day permit can be issued
  - **Class E Temporary Class E Permit Check not required**
- **10/09 Update -** If SSN does not verify, should the system disable the ability to issue Temporary Permits?
- **ESC -** Allow Rnw & Rpl Class E Only (No CDLs)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>Advisory Board Status</th>
<th>Recommendation Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
<th>ESC Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DL20</td>
<td>9/29/2015</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Can voided application info be reused on the same day? Will this be an auditing issue?</td>
<td>DL Issuance Team suggests getting a legal opinion.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>AI - Research legal requirement. (Add prompt for reason - similar to no fee replacements)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL21</td>
<td>10/9/2015</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Currently, customer’s must pay for ‘Exams - Not Paid’ in order to attain an FDE Letter. Should this requirement continue to be enforced?</td>
<td>The reason the customer is charged is because the “Exam Only” option is the only way to print the letter. Advisory Board Recommendation: Do not charge. Our priority is to make sure the customer has the most up-to-date address information submitted for safety purposes.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL22</td>
<td>10/9/2015</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Should a letter be sent out for confirmation when a customer adds emergency contact information?</td>
<td>Should the customer be allowed to use someone else’s information as their ECI without their consent? Advisory Board Recommendation: Do not send out a letter. This would increase cost for the department. Is there a legal requirement?</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>ESC agrees with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN01</td>
<td>9/11/2015</td>
<td>School Bus Renewals</td>
<td>Will we allow school bus drivers to renew CDL by convenience method? Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Deb Ruby</td>
<td>Boyd, Deb agreed we will allow CDL school bus convenience renewal options (online and mail). On line will be the electronic signature indicating they are school bus driver, may want to have a box they check indicating still employed as school bus driver. We will NOT renew CDL Hazmat by convenience method. Advisory Board Recommendation: Use the information provided by DOE to determine which CDL Bus Drivers are eligible for the discount.</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>9/17/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESC - There is a file sent to NW Reg. (DOE) AI - Meet with Maureen to find out who runs this file and do we ever get a response when we send it? 12/01 Update - Tim Wolff: The data from DOE for the bus driver transcripts runs every Monday starting at 8:05 PM through the following jobs: (Received from DOE) $DTR001J, $DTR010J, $DTR020J (Transmit to DOE) $DTR097</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN02</td>
<td>9/18/2015</td>
<td>Customer Stops</td>
<td>The Statute was changed to allow a Customer Stop for Bad Check to prevent future transaction for the customer; however the Department’s policy has not been changed. Will there be a change to the Department’s policy to reflect the change to the statute?</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>10/13/2015</td>
<td>10/13 Update - Linda Fugate stated that she would like to notify the customer of the stop on the renewal notice so that they would not have to issue a refund to customers who may not be eligible at the time of processing the renewal. 10/13 Update - Advisory Board Recommendation: Implement the policy to reflect the changes in the statutes. (This means the insufficient funds system needs to go into production) This also brought about the following requests: Allow clearance online and in the DL Field offices</td>
<td>AI - Check if the customer stop (bad check) is already in the renewal notice file that is sent to produce the notice. Answer: Yes Has the statute change been implemented in the process? Answer: Yes</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Advisory Board Status**:
  - New Item - New Item has been added to the decision log for recommendation
  - Update - Additional information has been updated for review
  - Require additional information - Advisory board requires additional stats or information to make a recommendation

- **Executive Steering Committee Status**:
  - New Item - New Item has been added to the decision log for review
  - Open - No decision has been made after initial review
  - Close - Decision has been made
  - Update - Additional information has been updated for review
  - Require additional information - ESC requires additional stats or information to make a decision
Overall risk state and trending

Risk state of the MM Program (Phase I)

Program governance
Benefit realization and sustainability

As of 14 December 2015

Program governance
Benefits design and realization

Risk state with trending

Project management
Processes, controls, and predictability

Technical solution
Requirements development, quality and transition

Indicates that the area being assessed has critical issues that will result in significant risk to the project most likely resulting in either the inability to achieve the outcomes, inability to meet the projected schedule, or a significant cost over-run. Requires immediate action.

Indicates that the area being assessed has issues that need to be resolved; inefficiencies exist. Current process/method can be used with refinement.

Indicates that the area being assessed did not have significant issues to report. Continued monitoring should be performed.

Indicates that the area being assessed has incomplete information available for a conclusive finding or is not applicable.
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