Motorist Modernization Advisory Board – Phase II Monthly Meeting  
February 12, 2019  
Neil Kirkman Building, Conference Room B-202  
2900 Apalachee Parkway, Tallahassee Florida 32399  
2:30 – 4:00 p.m., EST

Invitees        Representing
Stephen Boley       DHSMV
Lt. Jason Britt        DHSMV
Diane Buck       DHSMV
Jay Levenstein      DHSMV
Steve Burch        DHSMV
Lisa Cullen   Florida Tax Collectors
Sherri Smith  Florida Tax Collectors
Det. Sgt. Ivan Doobrow  Law Enforcement
TBD  Law Enforcement

Agenda

- Roll Call
- Welcome
- Review and Approval of Last Meeting Minutes
- IV&V Update
- Stakeholder Outreach Update
- Policy and Decisions Review
- MM Phase II Program Update
  - Financial Review
  - Project Updates
- Communications Update
- Q&A
- Adjourn
MOTORIST MODERNIZATION ADVISORY BOARD PHASE II
Monthly Meeting Minutes
Kirkman Building Conference Room B-202
January 8, 2019
2:30 to 4 p.m., EST

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
• The meeting was called to order at 2:27 p.m. Terrence Samuel began the meeting by welcoming members and visitors and proceeded with the roll call of board members.

Advisory Board Phase II members included:
- Stephen Boley DHSMV
- Steve Burch DHSMV
- Lt. Jason Britt DHSMV (via phone)
- Diane Buck DHSMV (via phone)
- Jay Levenstein DHSMV
- Lisa Cullen Florida Tax Collectors (via phone)
- Sherri Smith Florida Tax Collectors (via phone)
- Det. Sgt. Ivan Doobrow Law Enforcement (via phone)

- Additional DHSMV members present included – Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Koral Griggs, Cathy Thomas, Cheryln Dent, Laura Freeman, Jessica Espinoza, Chad Hutchinson, Craig Benner, Janis Timmons and Judy Johnson.
- Visitors present included – Alyene Calvo and Colin Stephens from Ernst & Young, and Nathan Johnson and Michelle McGinley from Accenture. Andrew Bell and Brandon Shelley from Florida Auto Tag Agencies, Bob Priselac from Title Tech, Joe De La Viesca and Somay Farias from FAMSP, Ian Yorty from Grant Street, Michael Samaan from Auto Data Direct and Carole Jean Jordan from Florida Tax Collectors also attended.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES
• Cheryln Dent reviewed the meeting minutes from December 11, 2018. There were no corrections identified. A motion to approve the minutes was accepted by the board members and the December 11, 2018, meeting minutes were approved.

IV&V UPDATE
• Alyene Calvo presented an IV&V update for Phase II. The overall risk state was green. There were no open deficiencies to report. The Schedule Performance Index (SPI) was .897 due to Uniface tasks. The program was within the established performance thresholds. 15 out of 1,430 tasks were late. The program completion date is projected to be 385.1 days late due to the low SPI. The Schedule Quality Score was 96.2.

- Mr. Samuel stated these Uniface tasks include documenting how the system is currently behaving, presenting this information in meetings and working with the business side.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
• Cathy Thomas stated meetings with the tax collector SMEs and the All-Hands Meeting will be held during the week of January 14, 2019.
Mr. Samuel stated Phase II Focus Group Meetings will be scheduled soon.

**POLICY & DECISION REVIEW**

- **POR02** – Defining Scope of Fleet Services – Judy Johnson stated this item was discussed at the ESC meeting on December 13. The ESC agreed to allow for bulk processing of titles. She stated this item would now be closed.

- **POR04** – Casual Title Transactions Through MyDMV Portal – Ms. Johnson stated the request for processing title transfers has been approved by the ESC. The ESC also approved the use of the eOdometer. The team will work with BIO and Julie Larsen to develop procedures. She stated this item would now be closed.

- **POR06** – Authentication and Transaction Services Offered in Phase II Kiosk Solution – Ms. Johnson stated the team is waiting for a meeting to be scheduled to discuss this item.

- **POR07** – Request to Allow Biennial Registrations on Tribal Registrations – Ms. Johnson stated this item was discussed with the ESC and legal is reviewing the statutes for this.

- **POR08** – Request to Allow the Issuance of Permanent Decals for Tribal Registrations – Ms. Johnson stated the team is waiting on feedback from the tribe managers to see if they are interested in permanent decals.

- **POR09** – Current Fleet Maintenance Process – Ms. Johnson stated the Fleet Maintenance process currently does not enforce the minimum number of vehicles required by statute. The team would like to enforce this requirement and not allow fleet companies who do not meet the requirements to renew their vehicles under the fleet program. The board suggested we educate and correct this issue before we start enforcing. They also suggested we send out compliance letters to inform the fleets and then re-address again later. She stated stats were run and out of 120 active fleets, 64 were compliant. This item was discussed with Robert Kynoch and is currently under review.

- **POR10** – Parking Permit Eligibility – Ms. Johnson stated the procedure states that a “valid” DL/ID card is required to issue a parking permit. The team would like to know if “valid” in this instance means not expired and no sanctions. The procedure also states that a business can have additional parking permits up to the number of vehicles owned. The current FRVIS system does not enforce the maximum requirement. The team would also like to know if we should enforce this in the new system.
  - Lisa Cullen stated the sanction would only be against their ability to drive. Since the person would need a parking permit due to a handicap situation, she believes we should allow the issuance of a parking permit while still requiring them to have their DL/ID card.
  - Sherri Smith agreed with allowing the issuance of a parking permit in these instances. She asked if the team had any stats for the amount of parking permits issued to businesses.
  - Ms. Johnson stated the team would obtain stats for the amount of parking permits issued to businesses and how many are out of compliance. She stated they would present these to the ESC.
  - Diane Buck suggested keeping an inventory list of vehicles the businesses are currently using.
  - Ms. Johnson stated the team would obtain the stats first, then reach out to the businesses who are not in compliance and see what their reasoning is for having numerous parking permits.

- **REG05** – Should the system perform an NMVTIS and NLETS check on registration-only transactions? – Ms. Thomas stated the team decided to just do a NMVTIS call for this. The team also decided on using the web service solution. She stated she will schedule a follow-up conference call with AAMVA. Boyd Dickerson-Walden recommended sending an official
correspondence document to AAMVA to review the new use cases we are requesting for the Title and Registration team. Robert Kynoch would take the lead on this. She stated this item would now be closed.
  - Ms. Cullen asked if NMVTIS is down, would that stop the registration?
  - Ms. Thomas stated it would not stop the registration.

- **REG06 – Specialty Plate Voucher Transactions** – Ms. Thomas stated the team would like to design a transfer specialty plate voucher transaction for the eligible person to redeem the voucher, transfer the voucher back to original purchaser, or provide refund, if eligible. She stated the ESC agreed with creating a transfer specialty plate voucher transaction. This item would now be closed.

- **REG07 – Decision on whether to make it easier for dealers to process more than one original dealer plate transaction at a time (ex. bulk issuance)** – Ms. Thomas stated the ESC had no issue with this if we have a way to keep track of how many plates the dealer has already received and make sure they follow their GLI plate limits. This item would now be closed.

- **REG08 – Decision on whether a scanned coversheet should be required to be printed for every registration correction** – Ms. Thomas stated the ESC agreed to print a scan coversheet only on the corrections that require backup documentation to be scanned. A prompt stating, "A scan cover sheet is required for this transaction," or, "Transaction requires scanned documents," would be used. This item would now be closed.

- **TLE05 – Decision on whether the tax collector offices will be able to create MVR reports for the customers to purchase in the office** – Ms. Thomas stated the ESC recommended to keep the MVR reports processed through the department, and not in tax collector offices. This item would now be closed.

- **TLE06 – Print Electronic Title for Dealer** – Ms. Thomas stated the procedure allows the dealership to take the title in their name and print the electronic title at the same time for a $10 fee. The team would like to make the dealership pay the title transfer fee if they want to change the ownership into their name. The department would receive the transfer title fees if we required them to do two separate transactions. The ESC recommended no change to the current procedure. This is not considered an actual title transfer due to the title being in an electronic status. The dealers can currently do this on Virtual Office for $2.50. This item would now be closed.

- **DS02 – Will we continue to send the supporting documents to Tallahassee or will the regional offices scan the documents in the offices?** – Ms. Thomas stated the ESC decided scanning will be performed in Tallahassee. This item will now be closed.

**LEGAL OPINION REVIEW**

- Ms. Thomas stated the Title team needed clarification on the procedure and statute for Surviving Spouse Transfer. The team would like to know if this statute exempts mobile homes, vessels and vehicles that run only upon a track, bicycle, swamp buggies or mopeds. They would also like to know if this statute is specifically for a motor vehicle solely. The team discussed the statute (S319.28) would be amended to include mobile homes and vessels and transfer of registration at no fee, but this has not occurred, yet, as far as the team is aware. The procedure that covers this is TL-18. Legal will review this item further.

**FINANCIAL REVIEW**

- Janis Timmons presented a Phase I and II financial review. The Phase I budget is $7.5 million with $4.3 million expended as of December 31. There was a 0 percent variance with $3.2 million in remaining funds. The budget for Phase II is $5 million with $2 million expended as of December 31. There was a 0 percent variance with $2.9 million in
remaining funds. The team is working on finalizing Phase I and Phase II legislative budget requests for 2019 – 2020.

PHASE II PROJECT UPDATE

• Nathan Johnson stated the Dealer License team is currently working on installer licensing and consumer complaints for Increment 2. This is due to be completed by February 20. The Portal/Fleet team was working on closing Increment 1 and beginning Increment 2. The IFTA/IRP team completed their draft requirements for ITN for Increment 1 and are transitioning into Increment 2. The Title team was working on remaining title transactions, stops and ELT provider maintenance for Increment 2. The Registrations team was working on additional transactions for Increment 2. The Globals/Batch/Inventory team was working on common reports and cashiering for Increment 2. The first increment of the release plan is complete. This would be presented at the All-Hands Meeting next week. Mr. Johnson stated there would be upcoming deliverables for Phase II as well.

COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

• Ms. Thomas stated the team had a conference call with the ELT vendors and to review the survey results. They received positive feedback overall.
• Mr. Samuel stated the team is in the process of scheduling an Industry Focus Group meeting. The list of various industries was previously presented to the ESC for review. He stated revisions were made to the list and would be presented at the next ESC meeting.

Q&A

• Bob Priselac requested clarification on Enterprise being able to perform a batch job versus an individual job. He asked if this would be available for Enterprise only or everyone?
• Ms. Johnson stated originally LPA used a screen scrape technology. The team wanted to create a webservice to process those transactions. She stated meetings still need to be held with Robert Kynoch to further discuss. She stated we received a request to do this from Enterprise as well, but it has not been defined who exactly would have access to the webservice, yet.
• Mr. Priselac stated he was not in favor of just one company gaining access to the webservice.
• Andrew Bell requested clarification on the differences between the webservice to be created and the current EFS system.
• Mr. Samuel stated he would discuss these questions and concerns with the ESC and during the Industry Focus Group meeting as well.
• Ms. Cullen asked if we will plan for delays if there is a statutory change in programming for Phase II.
• Mr. Samuel stated legislative changes made during the requirements phase do not impact as much as changes made after development is already completed. He stated the team intends to research and plan for these delays as much as possible.
• Ms. Cullen asked if we would handle changes to be made in EFS.
• Mr. Samuel stated changes to EFS are currently being worked on by the Operations team. He stated Terry Rhodes has stressed we keep Blueprint updated with these legislative changes. Then, the Operations team can refer to Blueprint when they begin implementing additional changes in the future.
ADJOURNMENT

- Mr. Samuel adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:15 p.m.
- The next Advisory Board Phase II Meeting is scheduled for February 12, 2019.

Note: Handouts at this meeting included:

Consolidated in a meeting packet and emailed to members:

- MM Advisory Board Phase II Agenda: 1 Page
- MM Advisory Board Phase II Meeting Minutes (12/11/18): 4 Pages
- MM Phase II IV&V Update: 31 Pages
- MM Phase II Decision Log: 7 Pages
- MM Phase II Legal Opinion Log: 6 pages
- MM Phase II Financials: 9 Pages
- Phase II Traffic Light Report: 1 Page
Motorist Modernization Program (Phase II)

State of Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV)

Independent verification and validation (IV&V)

Monthly Assessment Report Summary

December 2018

27 January 2019
Topics for discussion

- General IV&V overview
- Overall risk state and trending
- IV&V ratings summary
- Key indicators
- Status of key deficiency recommendations
- Overall performance
- Project complete date slippage
- Forecast milestone slippage
- Open deficiencies and actions
- Process improvement recommendations
- Upcoming IV&V activities

- Supporting information
  - Summary of changes
  - Open deficiencies
  - Project milestones
  - Late tasks
  - Project schedule quality
  - Project budget

Data contained in this MAR is as of 15 January 2019
General IV&V overview

- There are no open IV&V deficiencies
  - No additional facets evaluated
  - No new deficiencies identified since the last report
- The Program is within established schedule performance thresholds
  - The schedule performance index (SPI) is 0.890
  - 23 of 1,433 total tasks (1.61%) contained in the project schedule are late
  - 09 of 369 total tasks (2.44%) for the current period are late
- The Program is within established cost performance thresholds
  - The cost performance index (CPI) is 1.003
  - The Program is currently on budget based on provided budget and spending information
- The Program is behind schedule
  - The program completion date is forecast to be 06 June 2025, 688.4 days late
  - Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule
  - The amount of time the project is behind schedule is increasing

Overall IV&V risk state: Green
Overall risk state and trending

**Risk state of the MM Program (Phase II)**

- **Program governance**
  - Benefit realization and sustainability

- **Technical solution**
  - Requirements development, quality and transition

- **Project management**
  - Processes, controls, and predictability

**Risk state with trending**

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.

As of 15 January 2019
This chart shows a summary of the IV&V cube facet ratings (red, amber, green and gray), and open deficiencies.

Facet risk rating totals are as follows:
- Red (critical issues): 0
- Amber (issues): 0
- Green (no issues): 20
- Gray (not evaluated): 7
- Open deficiencies: 0

Conclusions:
- The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project approach sound?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The overall project approach is based on industry leading practices, methodologies and tools that have been used for other DHSMV projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project on time?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Program is currently behind schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► The schedule performance index (SPI) is 0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► 23 of 1,433 total tasks (1.61%) contained in the project schedule are late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► 09 of 369 total tasks (2.44%) for the current period are late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project on budget?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Program is within established cost performance thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► The cost performance index (CPI) is 1.003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► The Program is currently on budget based on provided budget and spending information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is scope being managed so there is no scope</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The work being completed as part of the MM Program (Phase II) is within the scope of the project as defined in the Schedule IV-B Feasibility Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creep?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the project’s future risks?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&amp;V Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the project’s risks increasing or</td>
<td>Steady</td>
<td>The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&amp;V Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreasing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there new or emerging technological</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>New and emerging technologies were considered in the Feasibility Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions that will affect the project’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>► None have an adverse effect on the project’s technological assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology assumptions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of key deficiency recommendations

**Recommendation status versus priority**

- **Low**: 0
- **Medium**: 12
- **High**: 0

**Overall status of recommendations**

- **Open**: 0
- **In Progress**: 0
- **Closed**: 12

**Recommendation status by deficiency**

- **P2D1**: 4 open, 0 in progress, 0 closed
- **P2D2**: 8 open, 0 in progress, 0 closed

**Recommendation priority by deficiency**

- **High**: 0
- **Medium**: 0
- **Low**: 12
Overall performance

- This chart shows the SPI and CPI plotted as points against the tolerance ranges set up for the project.
- **Summary:**
  - Schedule performance has reached the established threshold and is trending behind.
  - Cost performance is within the established threshold.
- **Conclusions:**
  - The Program is currently behind schedule.

- Green area indicates within tolerance of +/- 10% for both SPI and CPI.
- Amber area indicates review is required and corrective actions may be necessary.
- Red area indicates out-of-tolerance and corrective actions are necessary.

As of 04 January 2019
SPI = 0.890
CPI = 1.003
Overall performance (continued)

- This chart shows the cumulative planned value (PV) and earned value (EV) for the project.
- Summary:
  - Total EV is less than PV, indicating there is scheduled work that is not being completed.
  - The total amount of work not completed as scheduled is 2,661.9 hours.
- Conclusions:
  - The Program is behind schedule.

- Blue area indicates the cumulative PV as of the current reporting period.
- Grey area indicates the cumulative EV as of the current reporting period.
- PV is the work scheduled to be accomplished.
- EV is the value of the work actually performed.
This chart shows the percent complete for duration and work for the project.

Summary:
- Duration and work complete has been increasing since the beginning of the project.

Conclusions:
- None.

- Blue line is duration percent complete.
- Red line is work percent complete.
This chart shows the forecast slippage of the project complete milestone based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

Summary:
- The program is behind schedule.

Conclusions:
- The program completion date is forecast to be 06 June 2026 688.4 days late.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is increasing.
This chart shows the projected completion dates for future milestones based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

**Summary:**
- The program is behind schedule.

**Conclusions:**
- The program completion date is forecast to be 06 June 2025, 688.4 days late.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is increasing.
Open deficiencies and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Process improvement recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress update / resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► The program team should perform a level of effort analysis on the remaining Uniface task and update the MM Program Schedule to provide an accurate reflection of the remaining work, allocated resources, and adjusted timeline.</td>
<td>► DHSMV acknowledges this recommendation from IV&amp;V. We are in the process of drafting a change request to address the Uniface tasks currently in the schedule. The current tasks in the schedule were created with the available information at the time (CR03), but through additional progressive elaboration new tasks have been identified and refined that more accurately reflect the Uniface effort and resources. The change request will be presented to ESC for approval to update the Phase II schedule</td>
<td>► In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upcoming IV&V activities

- Participate in IV&V and Program meetings
- Review draft and final MM Program materials provided to the IV&V Team
- Conduct interviews as required
- Schedule of immediate IV&V deliverables is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Planned draft</th>
<th>Planned final</th>
<th>Actual final</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Jan 2018 (IVV-302AA)</td>
<td>02/14/2018</td>
<td>03/01/2018</td>
<td>02/26/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Feb 2018 (IVV-302AB)</td>
<td>03/14/2018</td>
<td>03/29/2018</td>
<td>03/21/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Mar 2018 (IVV-302AC)</td>
<td>04/13/2018</td>
<td>04/30/2018</td>
<td>04/20/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Apr 2018 (IVV-302AD)</td>
<td>05/14/2018</td>
<td>05/30/2018</td>
<td>05/21/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – May 2018 (IVV-302AE)</td>
<td>06/14/2018</td>
<td>06/29/2018</td>
<td>06/21/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Jul 2018 (IVV-302AG)</td>
<td>08/14/2018</td>
<td>08/29/2018</td>
<td>08/29/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Aug 2018 (IVV-302AH)</td>
<td>09/17/2018</td>
<td>10/02/2018</td>
<td>10/01/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Sep 2018 (IVV-302AI)</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>11/02/2018</td>
<td>11/02/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Nov 2018 (IVV-302AK)</td>
<td>12/14/2018</td>
<td>01/04/2018</td>
<td>01/04/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MAR – Dec 2018 (IVV-302AL) | 01/15/2019    | 01/30/2019    |              | In-Progress
Supporting information

► Summary of changes
► Open deficiencies
► Project milestones
► Late tasks
► Project schedule quality
► Project budget
## Summary of changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies addressed</td>
<td>▶ No deficiencies addressed since the last report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New deficiencies</td>
<td>▶ No new deficiencies identified since the last report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk ratings</td>
<td>▶ No risk ratings changed since the last report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity ratings</td>
<td>▶ No maturity ratings changed since the last report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews conducted</td>
<td>▶ No interviews conducted since last report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts received</td>
<td>▶ Numerous artifacts received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Open deficiencies

### Areas and implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas and implications</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2D1 – Incomplete program governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ No open deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting information**
# Project milestones

## Supporting information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBS</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.10</td>
<td>Obtain Validated Requirements Approval and Signoff</td>
<td>07/30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.14.5</td>
<td>Development Complete</td>
<td>12/03/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.15.5</td>
<td>Testing Complete</td>
<td>07/29/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.18.5</td>
<td>Decision Point - Ready to Pilot</td>
<td>08/19/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.18.7</td>
<td>Decision Point - Move to Production (Roll out)</td>
<td>11/07/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.18.12</td>
<td>Statewide Implementation Complete</td>
<td>06/05/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Execution and Monitoring &amp; Control Phase Complete</td>
<td>06/12/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Closeout Phase Complete</td>
<td>06/29/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project Complete</td>
<td>07/19/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Items highlighted are either currently late or projected to be late.
2. Original – Original contract completion date.
3. Scheduled – Scheduled completion date based on the latest schedule baseline.
4. Planned – Planned completion date (should be the same as scheduled).
5. Forecast – Based on ES calculations and the current SPI.
6. Actual – The actual completion date

Late: 688.4
### Late tasks

**Supporting information**

- This chart shows the number of tasks that are late for each of the IV&V reports for the following:
  - Total tasks late.
  - Tasks that are open (task completion percentage is greater than 0% and less than 100%).
- A task is automatically designated as “late” if it is not complete and the project status date is later than the baseline finish date for the task.
- **Summary:**
  - Total normal tasks: 1,433
  - Total tasks late: 23
  - Total open tasks late: 10
- **Conclusions:**
  - The total number of tasks designated as late is 1.61% of the total number of tasks.
Project schedule quality
Entire schedule: 9/19/2016 to 7/19/2023

Supporting information

- This chart shows the quality of the project schedule within each of the following areas:
  - Overall quality with trending
  - Key indicators
  - Schedule parameters

Summary:
- Overall quality: 96.1

Conclusions:
- Overall schedule quality is consistent and excellent

Key Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary tasks</th>
<th>Milestone tasks</th>
<th>Normal tasks</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Jan-19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Jan-19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Dec-18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Dec-18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule Parameters

- Dynamic schedule – Task dependencies and constraints
- Critical path – Task dependencies
- Resource allocation – Resource assignments
- Task durations – Task durations other that 8 to 80 hours
- Baseline – Full baseline defined for all tasks
- On time tasks – Tasks that are not late
Project schedule quality
Period: 02/01/2019 to 04/30/2019

Supporting information

- This chart shows the quality of the project schedule within each of the following areas:
  - Overall quality with trending
  - Key indicators
  - Schedule parameters
- Summary:
  - Overall quality: 96.1
- Conclusions:
  - Overall schedule quality is consistent and excellent

![Overall Quality Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Schedule Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic schedule</td>
<td>Summary tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical path</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>Milestone tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task durations</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule baseline</td>
<td>Normal tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time tasks</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dynamic schedule – Task dependencies and constraints
- Critical path – Task dependencies
- Resource allocation – Resource assignments
- Task durations – Task durations other than 8 to 80 hours
- Baseline – Full baseline defined for all tasks
- On time tasks – Tasks that are not late
Project budget
Total project funding

Total project budget versus actual expenditures

Supporting information
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Project budget
DHSMV staff funding

Supporting information

Total DHSMV staff budget versus actual expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total DHSMV staff - budget</th>
<th>Total DHSMV staff - actual</th>
<th>Cumulative total DHSMV staff - budget</th>
<th>Cumulative total DHSMV staff - actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project budget
Contract staff funding

Total contract staff budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands
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Total expense budget versus actual expenditures
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Project budget
OCO funding

Supporting information

Total OCO budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands
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Project budget
IV&V services funding

Total IV&V services budget versus actual expenditures
Project budget
Budget and actual distribution

Budget distribution
- DHSMV staff: $0, 0%
- Contracted staff: $8,110,262, 88%
- Expense: $304,230, 3%
- OCO: $29,258, 0%
- Other items: $0, 0%
- IV&V: $780,430, 9%

Actual distribution
- DHSMV staff: $0, 0%
- Contracted staff: $5,512,886, 89%
- Expense: $155,445, 2%
- OCO: $21,458, 0%
- Other items: $0, 0%
- IV&V: $533,540, 9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Decision Made After Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR 6</td>
<td>2/28/2019, will not be included in the 6/2019 deliverable.</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR 7</td>
<td>Request to allow biennial registrations on tribal registrations.</td>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>12/6/2019</td>
<td>Decisions made after the first iteration due date will result in a change request.</td>
<td>12/11/2013 Update</td>
<td>Board agrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/2013 Update</td>
<td>More information requested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR 8</td>
<td>Request to allow the issuance of permanent decals for tribal registrations.</td>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>12/6/2019</td>
<td>Decisions made after the first iteration due date will result in a change request.</td>
<td>12/11/2013 Update</td>
<td>Board suggested that we ask the tribes if they are interested in permanent decals.</td>
<td>12/13/2018 Update</td>
<td>More information requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR 9</td>
<td>The Fleet Maintenance process currently does not enforce the minimum number of vehicles required by statute. The team would like to enforce this requirement and not allow fleet companies who do not meet the requirements to renew their vehicles under the fleet program.</td>
<td>11/28/2018</td>
<td>12/6/2019</td>
<td>Decisions made after the first iteration due date will result in a change request.</td>
<td>12/11/2013 Update</td>
<td>Board suggested that we educate and correct before we start enforcing. They also suggested that we send out compliance letters to inform the fleets and then re-address again at a later time period.</td>
<td>12/13/2018 Update</td>
<td>Sent Robert Kynoch the Fleet detail stats report for review. 64 - Compliant 56 - Non-Compliant</td>
<td>More information requested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR 10</td>
<td>Parking Permit Eligibility - The procedure states that a &quot;Valid&quot; DL/ID card is required to issue a parking permit. Does &quot;Valid&quot; in this instance mean not expired and no sanctions? The procedures also state that a business can have additional parking permits up to the number of vehicles owned. The current FRVIS system does not enforce the maximum requirement. Should we enforce this in the new system?</td>
<td>1/8/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8/14/2018 Update: The list of transactions were reviewed during the August 1, 2018, ESC meeting. Mr. Samuel suggested we have a separate meeting to discuss kiosks with the IT Coalition the week of 9/10/2018.

12/13/2018 Update: A meeting will be scheduled to discuss with a smaller group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The team would like to see if we can get a legislative change on this statute (320.0841). I think if they would take out the wording of “each year,” we should be able to issue a permanent plate to the Indian tribes. It is costing the department money to renew the current plates and then we mail them to the tribes overnight at our cost. There is no cost to the tribal members to renew their plates.</td>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>2/7/2019 Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This item will be added to the legal opinion document.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title team is asking for confirmation that the department is not looking to modify the current statute for a Lost in Transit Title (Return Title Stop procedure).</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would impact the Motor Vehicle Procedures Manual (TL-05).</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title/Reg team is requesting input on if we can systematically auto-fill the MV Title and Registration forms and print them for the customer. The customer would fill out the required sections themselves (odometer, signature etc.)</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would be an issue due to them not being able to prosecute for uttering an instrument.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title/Reg team would like input on being able to use the signature pad for MV transactions, instead of only DL transactions.</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal will follow up with FHP regarding their concerns.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The team would like to see if we can get a legislative change on this statute (320.0841). I think if they would take out the wording of “each year,” we should be able to issue a permanent plate to the Indian tribes. It is costing the department money to renew the current plates and then we mail them to the tribes overnight at our cost. There is no cost to the tribal members to renew their plates.</td>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>2/7/2019 Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This item will be added to the legal opinion document.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title team is asking for confirmation that the department is not looking to modify the current statute for a Lost in Transit Title (Return Title Stop procedure).</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would impact the Motor Vehicle Procedures Manual (TL-05).</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title/Reg team is requesting input on if we can systematically auto-fill the MV Title and Registration forms and print them for the customer. The customer would fill out the required sections themselves (odometer, signature etc.)</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would be an issue due to them not being able to prosecute for uttering an instrument.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title/Reg team would like input on being able to use the signature pad for MV transactions, instead of only DL transactions.</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal will follow up with FHP regarding their concerns.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The team would like to see if we can get a legislative change on this statute (320.0841). I think if they would take out the wording of “each year,” we should be able to issue a permanent plate to the Indian tribes. It is costing the department money to renew the current plates and then we mail them to the tribes overnight at our cost. There is no cost to the tribal members to renew their plates.</td>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td>2/7/2019 Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This item will be added to the legal opinion document.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title team is asking for confirmation that the department is not looking to modify the current statute for a Lost in Transit Title (Return Title Stop procedure).</td>
<td>1/23/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would impact the Motor Vehicle Procedures Manual (TL-05).</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title/Reg team is requesting input on if we can systematically auto-fill the MV Title and Registration forms and print them for the customer. The customer would fill out the required sections themselves (odometer, signature etc.)</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would be an issue due to them not being able to prosecute for uttering an instrument.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Title/Reg team would like input on being able to use the signature pad for MV transactions, instead of only DL transactions.</td>
<td>2/5/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal will follow up with FHP regarding their concerns.</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></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>POR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow entities, such as UPS to issue Temp Tags on demand?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>Yes, statutory authority would be necessary. The question is whether UPS and leasing companies can issue and print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration. Section 320.131(8), F.S., only provides for licensed motor vehicle dealers to utilize this service. 320.131(8) The department shall administer an electronic system for licensed motor vehicle dealers to use for issuing temporary tags. If a dealer fails to comply with the department’s requirements for issuing temporary tags using the electronic system, the department may deny, suspend, or revoke a license under s. 320.27(9)(b)16. upon proof that the licensee has failed to comply with the department’s requirements. The department may adopt rules to administer this section.</td>
<td>9/5/2018</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>1 Cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the foregoing, legislation would be necessary for leasing companies and UPS to issue and print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></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>POR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow entities, such as Enterprise Holdings (Car Rental) to process title and registration transactions electronically?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>Yes, statutory authority would be necessary. Non-dealer commercial entities have expressed an interest in having the Department implement an electronic interface to perform title and registration transactions, similar to the process provided in s. 320.03(10), F.S. Section 320.03(10), F.S., limits use of the electronic system to entities that, in the normal course of its business, sell products that must be titled or registered, and provides title and registration services on behalf of its consumers (dealer licensees and entities that sell vessels). 320.03(10) Jurisdiction over the electronic filing system for use by authorized electronic filing system agents to electronically title or register motor vehicles, vessels, mobile homes, or off-highway vehicles; issue or transfer registration license plates or decals; electronically transfer fees due for the title and registration process; and perform inquiries for title, registration, and lienholder verification and certification of service providers is expressly preempted to the state, and the department shall have regulatory authority over the system.</td>
<td>9/5/2018</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></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>POR</td>
<td>2 Cont.</td>
<td>The electronic filing system shall be available for use statewide and applied uniformly throughout the state. An entity that, in the normal course of its business, sells products that must be titled or registered, provides title and registration services on behalf of its consumers and meets all established requirements may be an authorized electronic filing system agent and shall not be precluded from participating in the electronic filing system in any county. Upon request from a qualified entity, the tax collector shall appoint the entity as an authorized electronic filing system agent for that county. The department shall adopt rules in accordance with chapter 120 to replace the December 10, 2009, program standards and to administer the provisions of this section, including, but not limited to, establishing participation requirements, certification of service providers, electronic filing system requirements, and enforcement authority for noncompliance. The December 10, 2009, program standards, excluding any standards which conflict with this subsection, shall remain in effect until the rules are adopted. An authorized electronic filing agent may charge a fee to the customer for use of the electronic filing system. Further, Rules 15C-16.0015C-16.010, F.A.C., EFS Agent Participation Requirements, provides:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></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>POR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Entities requesting authorization to become an EFS agent must meet the following requirements: (a) Sell products that must be titled or registered. (b) Provide title and registration services on behalf of its consumers. (c) Enter into a contract with a Certified Service Provider. (d) Apply to the Department on Form HSMV 820835 (Rev. 08/11), Application to Become an Authorized Electronic Filing System Agent/Change of Certified Service Provider, which is incorporated herein by reference and available via the Department website <a href="http://www.flhsmv.gov/html/forms.html">www.flhsmv.gov/html/forms.html</a>, <a href="https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-00402">https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-00402</a>. Based upon the foregoing, legislation would be necessary to authorize non-leader commercial entities to process title and registration transactions electronically.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></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>POR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow LPAs, such as Sunshine State to process title and registration transactions electronically?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>A statutory change is not required, however, this would require a technology change. LPAs have expressed an interest in having a direct, electronic interface to FRVIS to perform title and registration transactions. Section 320.03(1), F.S., provides, in part, that: &quot;(1) The tax collectors in the several counties of the state, as authorized agents of the department, shall issue registration certificates, registration license plates, validation stickers, and mobile home stickers to applicants...&quot; Section 320.03(8), F.S., provides for tax collectors to utilize private tag agents (LPAs). Currently, LPAs use a software known as “Screen Scrape.” It enables them to intercept information being entered on their computer screens, and simulates keyboard activity being communicated to FRVIS. The LPAs want a direct interface to FRVIS to eliminate the need for their software. This would eliminate the need for them to make software updates to address any updates to FRVIS, and they argue that the interface would create a more efficient process. Based upon the foregoing, legislation would not be necessary for this change.</td>
<td>9/5/2108</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do we have the authority to offer biennial registration on Tribe license plates?</td>
<td>12/13/2018</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do we have the authority to issue permanent plate/decal registration(s) on Tribe license plates provided there was a change to statute (320.0841) to remove “each year”?</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The title team needs some clarification on the procedure and statute for Surviving Spouse Transfer. Does this statute exempt mobile homes, vessels and vehicles that run only upon a track, bicycle, swamp buggies or mopeds? Is this statute specifically for a Motor Vehicle solely? The team discussed the statute (§319.28) would be amended to include mobile homes and vessels and transfer of registration at no fee also; but this has not happened as far as we are aware. The procedure that covers this is TL-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Legal Recommendation</th>
<th>Legal Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The title team needs some clarification on the procedure and statute for Surviving Spouse Transfer. Does this statute exempt mobile homes, vessels and vehicles that run only upon a track, bicycle, swamp buggies or mopeds? Is this statute specifically for a Motor Vehicle solely? The team discussed the statute (§319.28) would be amended to include mobile homes and vessels and transfer of registration at no fee also; but this has not happened as far as we are aware. The procedure that covers this is TL-18.</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td>2/1/2019</td>
<td>We are currently working on the business rules for this transaction and want to make sure the team is following Florida Statutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Motorist Modernization Phase I Financial Review

### Phase I LBR Requests – Total Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Request</th>
<th>Contracted Services</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Services</th>
<th>Expense (Software, Travel, etc.)</th>
<th>OCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$2,500,000 *</td>
<td>$1,514,762</td>
<td>$619,186</td>
<td>$61,478</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>$6,362,609</td>
<td>$5,468,933</td>
<td>$479,280</td>
<td>$382,501</td>
<td>$31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>$9,857,775</td>
<td>$8,506,720</td>
<td>$479,280</td>
<td>$865,000</td>
<td>$6,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$7,536,000</td>
<td>$6,976,720</td>
<td>$479,280</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$1,823,620</td>
<td>$1,803,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $36,829,355 $32,178,267 $2,536,306 $1,745,667 $64,541
Motorist Modernization Phase I Financial Review

Budget and Actuals: Current Fiscal Year through January 31, 2018

BUDGET: $7,536,000

ACTUALS: $4,784,582

Contracted Services
- Actuals: $4,784,582
- Remaining: $280K

IV&V Services
- Actuals: $200K

Expense (Software, Travel)
- Actuals: $80K
Motorist Modernization Phase I Financial Review

## Budget and Actuals: Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Variance (Budget to Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Total Funding</td>
<td>$7,536,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$4,784,582</td>
<td>$4,784,582</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (January 2019)</td>
<td>$414,273</td>
<td>$414,273</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$2,751,419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Motorist Modernization Phase II Financial Review

### Phase II LBR Requests – Total Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Request</th>
<th>Contracted Services</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Services</th>
<th>Expense (Software, Travel, etc.)</th>
<th>OCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>$4,132,180</td>
<td>$3,575,240</td>
<td>$357,190</td>
<td>$179,850</td>
<td>$19,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$5,037,000</td>
<td>$4,379,200</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$8,426,200</td>
<td>$7,239,200</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$8,219,700</td>
<td>$7,239,200</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$476,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>$6,907,700</td>
<td>$5,939,200</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$464,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>$3,806,700</td>
<td>$2,871,200</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$431,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,529,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,243,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,857,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,372,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Phase II Financial Review

Budget and Actuals: Current Fiscal Year through January 31, 2018

BUDGET: $5,037,000

- Contracted Services: $423,240
- IV&V Services: $7,800
- Expense (Software, Travel): $150,000

ACTUALS: $2,549,347

- Contracted Services: $2.3M
- IV&V Services: $247K
- Expense (Software, Travel): $152K
- OCO: $21K

Remaining
## Budget and Actuals: Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Variance (Budget to Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Total Funding</td>
<td>$5,037,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$2,549,370</td>
<td>$2,549,347</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (January 2019)</td>
<td>$492,850</td>
<td>$492,850</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$2,487,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
## Motorist Modernization - Phase II Traffic Light Report
### Current Stage: Requirements Validation
#### As of February 1, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1 - Dealer License</th>
<th>Team 2 - Portal/Fleet</th>
<th>Team 3 - IFTA/IRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - Installer Licensing &amp; Consumer Complaints</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - Parking Permits, Titles, Dealer Services, Salvage, High Speed, eCommerce, Kiosk, mDL, Electronic Title &amp; Registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - COTS Integration Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date:</td>
<td>Due Date:</td>
<td>Due Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete:</td>
<td>% Complete:</td>
<td>% Complete:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items:</td>
<td>Action Items:</td>
<td>Action Items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Code:</td>
<td>Legacy Code:</td>
<td>Legacy Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation:</td>
<td>Estimation:</td>
<td>Estimation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 4 - Titles</th>
<th>Team 5 - Registrations</th>
<th>Team 6 - Globals/Batch/Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - Remaining Title Transactions, Stops, ELT Provider Maint.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - Additional Registration Transactions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - Common (Reports, Cashiering)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date:</td>
<td>Due Date:</td>
<td>Due Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete:</td>
<td>% Complete:</td>
<td>% Complete:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items:</td>
<td>Action Items:</td>
<td>Action Items:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Code:</td>
<td>Legacy Code:</td>
<td>Legacy Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation:</td>
<td>Estimation:</td>
<td>Estimation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % Complete: % complete of requirements validation for current Increment
- Green < 10% overdue
- Yellow 10%-20% overdue
- Red >= 20% overdue

### Action Items: % of overdue team action items
- Green < 10% overdue
- Yellow 10%-20% overdue
- Red >= 20% overdue

### Legacy Code: % of as-is processes scheduled to be documented for the Increment
- Green < 10% overdue
- Yellow 10%-20% overdue
- Red >= 20% overdue

### Estimation: % of completed user stories with overdue estimations
- Green < 10% overdue
- Yellow 10%-20% overdue
- Red >= 20% overdue