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

Invitees
Stephen Boley
Lt. Jason Britt
Diane Buck
Jay Levenstein
Steve Burch
Lisa Cullen
Sherri Smith
Sgt. Derek Joseph
TBD

Representing
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
Florida Tax Collectors
Florida Tax Collectors
Law Enforcement
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
  o Financial Review
  o Project Updates
• Communications Update
• Q&A
• Adjourn
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. Kristin Green 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
- 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 (absent)

- Additional DHSMV members present included – Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Koral Griggs, Cathy Thomas, Cheryln Dent, Jessica Espinoza, Felecia Ford, Chad Hutchinson, Craig Benner, Janis Timmons and Judy Johnson.
- Visitors present included – Alyene Calvo and Colin Stephens from Ernst & Young, and Nathan Johnson from Accenture. Andrew Bell from Florida Auto Tag Agencies, Brandon Shelley from OATA and Scott Lindsay and Carl Ford also attended.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

- Rachel Graham reviewed the meeting minutes from January 8, 2019. One correction was identified. A motion to approve the minutes with one correction was accepted by the board members and the January 8, 2019, 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 .890. Inefficiencies in Uniface tasks caused the SPI to be lower. The program was within the established performance thresholds. 23 out of 1,433 tasks were late. The program completion date is projected to be 688.4 days late due to the current SPI. The Schedule Quality Score was 96.1.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

- Koral Griggs stated Phase II Focus Group Meetings would be held in Titusville, Florida from March 4 – 6, 2019. MyDMV Portal, Title and Registration and Inventory processes would be discussed.
- She stated an Industry Focus Group Meeting is in the process of being scheduled.
- Andrew Bell asked if separate meetings would be held with the industries or just one.
Ms. Griggs stated there would be only one meeting scheduled at this time.

**POLICY & DECISION REVIEW**

- **POR06** – Authentication and Transaction Services Offered in Phase II Kiosk Solution – Judy Johnson stated there have been ongoing meetings to discuss this item.
- **POR07** – Request to Allow Biennial Registrations on Tribal Registrations – Ms. Johnson stated legal is reviewing statutes for this item.
- **POR08** – Request to Allow the Issuance of Permanent Decals for Tribal Registrations – Ms. Johnson stated legal is reviewing statutes for this item.
- **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 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 like to know if we should enforce this in the new system. It was determined that “valid” in this instance means a license that is not expired. A list of businesses with parking permits was provided to the ESC. She stated one entity had 290 parking permits issued to them, with only 140 registered vehicles. Robert Kynoch will have his team reach out to the business to understand the need for the additional permits in excess of the number of vehicles owned and/or registered.
- **POR11** – Permanent Plates for Tribes – Ms. Johnson stated the team would like to see if there could be a legislative change on this statute (320.0841). The team believes if the wording “each year” was removed, they should be able to issue a permanent plate to the tribes. It is currently costing the department to renew the current plates and mail them to the tribes overnight. There is no cost to the tribal members to renew their plates. This item would be added to the legal opinion document.
  - Lt. Jason Britt asked about the process of handling someone who was disqualified from being issued a permanent plate.
  - Ms. Johnson stated the tribal members would still need to register for permanent plates; however, if the tribe decides a member should no longer have a permanent plate, the member could then switch to a regular plate.
  - Lt. Britt asked if this was in statute.
  - Ms. Johnson stated she is unsure if the management of the plates is in statute, but the tribe is the only one who can request for a member to get one of their plates.
- **TLE** – Cathy Thomas stated the 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). She stated stats were run and approximately 1,500 – 2,000 titles are returned each month. The team suggested to notify the customer via email or through their MyDMV Portal account that their title was returned to the department. The ESC suggested to convert the Return Title to an "electronic" status. She stated legal would research this.
  - Lisa Cullen asked if a customer would still be able to do a Lost in Transit title with no fee.
Ms. Thomas confirmed; however, the return title stop stays on the customer’s record indefinitely. The team compared this to the Lost in Transit statute where after 180 days the customer would be forced to pay for the title. The team discussed putting in an indicator for this but wanted to check with legal on converting the Return Title to an "electronic" status first.

- **TLE** – Ms. Thomas stated the team is requesting input on if we can systematically auto-fill the Motor Vehicle Title and Registration forms and print them for the customer. The customer would fill out the required sections themselves (odometer, signature etc.) FHP thinks this is a fraud issue due to them not being able to prosecute for uttering an instrument. She stated legal would follow up with FHP regarding their concerns.
  - Ms. Cullen asked why we would not want to pre-populate these forms? She stated currently in the tax collector offices, they fill out these forms for the customers due to time-constraints.
  - Ms. Thomas stated the pre-populated forms may speed-up the customer service process.
  - Lt. Britt proposed adding a “prepared by” section to the form.
  - Ms. Cullen stated she could agree to this.

- **TLE** – Ms. Thomas stated the team would like input on being able to use the signature pad for motor vehicle transactions, instead of just DL transactions, to send motor vehicle forms to the signature pad, review the motor vehicle transaction and swipe the DL to pull up a customer's record. Deb Roby checked into this and it looks like it is a possibility, but she will follow up with Robert Kynoch. Mr. Kynoch will check into this also and report back to the ESC.
  - Andrew Bell asked if mileage would be considered acceptable if signed on the pad?
  - Ms. Thomas stated she would have to check with legal on this.
  - Steve Burch asked if this would be for financial transactions as well?
  - Jessica Espinoza stated not at this time.

**FINANCIAL REVIEW**

- Janis Timmons presented a Phase I and II financial review. The Phase I budget is $7.5 million with $4.7 million expended as of January 31. There was a 0 percent variance with $2.7 million in remaining funds. The budget for Phase II is $5 million with $2.5 million expended as of January 31. There was a 0 percent variance with $2.4 million in remaining funds.

**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 parking permits, titles, dealer services, salvage, high speed, eCommerce, kiosk, mDL, electronic title and registration in Increment 2. The IFTA/IRP team is working on the COTS integration design in Increment 2. The Title team was working on remaining title transactions, stops and ELT provider maintenance for Increment 2. This is currently under review. 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. Mr. Johnson stated the team would begin development estimations. He also stated the next All-Hands Meeting would be scheduled sometime in April 2019.

**COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE**

- There was no communications update at the meeting.
Q&A
• There were no questions or concerns from members present.

ADJOURNMENT
• Ms. Green adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:01 p.m.
• The next Advisory Board Phase II Meeting is scheduled for March 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 (1/8/19): 5 Pages
- MM Phase II IV&V Update: 31 Pages
- MM Phase II Decision Log: 2 Pages
- MM Phase II Legal Opinion Log: 6 pages
- MM Phase I/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

January 2019

14 February 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 14 February 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 0.897
  - 13 of 1,433 total tasks (0.91%) contained in the project schedule are late
  - 05 of 365 total tasks (1.37%) for the current period are late
- The Program is within established cost performance thresholds
  - The cost performance index (CPI) is 1.005
  - 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 19 May 2024, 305.7 days late
  - Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule
  - The amount of time the project is behind schedule is decreasing

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
  - Capability and maturity
  - Performance management
  - Organizational change management
  - Compliance and regulatory
  - Benefits design and realization
  - Technical infrastructure
  - Business continuity and disaster recovery

- **Project management**
  - Processes, controls, and predictability
  - Scope management
  - Time management
  - Human resource management
  - Procurement management
  - Quality management
  - Risk management
  - Communications management

- **Technical solution**
  - Requirements development, quality and transition
  - Requirements engineering and design
  - Data management
  - Security and controls
  - Cutover and support
  - Sustainability model

**Risk state with trending**

- Program governance
  - G1: Business case integrity
  - G2: Decision framework
  - G3: Complexity profile
  - G4: Business case management
  - G5: Governance effectiveness
  - G6: Performance management
  - G7: Organizational change management
  - G8: Compliance and regulatory
  - G9: Benefits design and realization

- Technical solution
  - G1: Business continuity and disaster recovery
  - G2: Business case integrity
  - G3: Decision framework
  - G4: Complexity profile
  - G5: Business case management
  - G6: Governance effectiveness
  - G7: Performance management
  - G8: Organizational change management
  - G9: Compliance and regulatory

*As of 14 February 2019*

- **Legend**
  - Red: 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.
  - Yellow: Indicates that the area being assessed has issues that need to be resolved; inefficiencies exist. Current process/method can be used with refinement.
  - Green: Indicates that the area being assessed did not have significant issues to report. Continued monitoring should be performed.
  - Light grey: Indicates that the area being assessed has incomplete information available for a conclusive finding or is not applicable.
IV&V ratings summary

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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Is the project on time?                            | No    | ► The Program is currently behind schedule.  
► The schedule performance index (SPI) is 0.897  
► 13 of 1,433 total tasks (.91%) contained in the project schedule are late.  
► 05 of 365 total tasks (1.37%) for the current period are late. |
| Is the project on budget?                          | Yes   | ► The Program is within established cost performance thresholds.  
► The cost performance index (CPI) is 1.005.  
► The Program is currently on budget based on provided budget and spending information. |
| Is scope being managed so there is no scope creep? | Yes   | ► 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. |
| What are the project’s future risks?               | Unknown | ► The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.                                                                                                                  |
| Are the project’s risks increasing or decreasing?  | Steady | ► The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.                                                                                                                  |
| Are there new or emerging technological solutions that will affect the project’s technology assumptions? | No    | ► New and emerging technologies were considered in the Feasibility Study.  
► None have an adverse effect on the project’s technological assumptions.                                                                                                                      |
Status of key deficiency recommendations

Recommendation status versus priority

- Low
- Medium: 12
- High

Overall status of recommendations

- Open
- In Progress
- Closed: 12

Recommendation status by deficiency

- P2D1: 4
- P2D2: 8

Recommendation priority by deficiency

- P2D1
- P2D2: 8

Summary:
- High priority: 12
- Medium priority: 12
- Low priority: 0
- Open: 0
- In Progress: 0
- Closed: 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 01 February 2019
SPI = 0.897
CPI = 1.005

0.70 0.80 0.90 1.00 1.10 1.20 1.30
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CPI

Behind schedule and underspent
Ahead of schedule and underspent
Behind schedule and overspent
Ahead of schedule and overspent
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 2,611.8 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 19 May 2024, 305.7 days late.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is decreasing.
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 19 May 2024, 305.7 days late.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is decreasing.
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>01/04/2019</td>
<td>01/04/2019</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Dec 2018 (IVV-302AL)</td>
<td>01/15/2019</td>
<td>01/30/2019</td>
<td>01/31/2019</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Jan 2019 (IVV-302AM)</td>
<td>02/14/2019</td>
<td>02/26/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting information

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

### Supporting information

<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

**Supporting information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas and implications</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2D1 – Incomplete program governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No open deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project milestones

<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>

### Supporting information

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 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: 13
  - Total open tasks late: 03
- Conclusions:
  - The total number of tasks designated as late is .91% 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

### Overall Quality – Entire Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-Feb-19</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-19</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Jan-19</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Jan-19</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic schedule</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical path</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task durations</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule baseline</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time tasks</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary tasks</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone tasks</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal tasks</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>99.0</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 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

<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>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 that 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

Thousands

- Total budget
- Total actual
- Cumulative total budget
- Cumulative total actual
Project budget
Contract staff funding

Supporting information

Total contract staff budget versus actual expenditures

- Thousands
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- Total contracted staff – budget
- Total contracted staff – actual
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Project budget
Expense funding

Supporting information

Total expense budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

Total expense - budget
Total expense - actual
Cumulative total expense - budget
Cumulative total expense - actual
Project budget
OCO funding

Total OCO budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

Total OCO - budget
Total OCO - actual
Cumulative total OCO - budget
Cumulative total OCO - actual

Month:
Jul-17
Aug-17
Sep-17
Oct-17
Nov-17
Dec-17
Jan-18
Feb-18
Mar-18
Apr-18
May-18
Jun-18
Jul-18
Aug-18
Sep-18
Oct-18
Nov-18
Dec-18
Jan-19
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Project budget
Other items funding

Supporting information

Total other items budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands


- Total other items - budget
- Total other items - actual
- Cumulative total other items - budget
- Cumulative total other items - actual
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Project budget
IV&V services funding

Total IV&V services budget versus actual expenditures

- Total IV&V services - budget
- Total IV&V services - actual
- Cumulative total IV&V services - budget
- Cumulative total IV&V services - actual
Project budget
Budget and actual distribution

Supporting information

# Project budget

## Budget and actual distribution

### Budget distribution
- **Other items**: $0, 0%
- **IV&V**: $780,430, 8%
- **DHSMV staff**: $0, 0%
- **OCO**: $29,258, 1%
- **Expense**: $304,230, 3%

### Actual distribution
- **Other items**: $0, 0%
- **IV&V**: $568,810, 9%
- **OCO**: $21,458, 0%
- **Expense**: $155,445, 2%
- **Contracted staff**: $5,970,466, 89%
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Decision 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>6</td>
<td>What transaction services will be offered in the Phase II Kiosk solution and what level of user authentication is required?</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Request to allow biennial registrations on tribal registrations.</td>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>12/6/2019</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>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>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Decision Made</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>AB Recommendation</td>
<td>AB Date</td>
<td>ESC Decision/Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</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>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>12/11/2018 Update</td>
<td>Decisions made after the first iteration due date will result in a change request.</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>12/11/2018 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>10</td>
<td>Parking Permit Eligibility - The procedure states that a “Valid” DL/ID card is required to issue a parking permit. Does “Valid” 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 Update</td>
<td>2/7/2019 Update</td>
<td>3/8/2019 Update</td>
<td>5/8/2019 Update</td>
<td>A “Valid” license in this instance will be a license that is not expired.</td>
<td>2/7/2019 Update</td>
<td>A list of businesses with parking permits was provided to ESC. Robert Kynoch will have his team reach out to the business to understand the need for the additional permits in excess of the number of vehicles owned/registered.</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>AB Recommendation</td>
<td>AB Date</td>
<td>ESC Decision/Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</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>11</td>
<td>The team would like to see if we can get a legislative change on this statute (330.0841). 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>This item will be added to the legal opinion document.</td>
<td>2/25/2019 Update</td>
<td>Paula talked to Jean with the Seminole Tribe, he stated that they will be alright with the government plates being permanent plates, but the tribal plates should still be renewed. I mentioned to him about the fleet plates and how they work, he said he would be alright with renewing the tribal plates like the fleet plates. He loves the idea of having the Portal to be able to renew the plates in.</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE 1**

1. 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). | 1/23/2019 | 2/28/2019 | This would impact the Motor Vehicle Procedures Manual (TL-05) Requested for the system to automatically calculate the 180 days and remove the stop or indicator when that time is expired. | 2/12/2019 | 2/7/2019 Update | Suggestion was made to convert the Return Title to an “Electronic” status. Legal will research this. Added to Legal document. | 3/7/2019 Update | Waiting on legal decision | |

**TITLE 2**

2. 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.) | 1/24/2019 | 2/28/2019 | FHP thinks this is a fraud issue due to them not being able to prosecute for uttering an instrument. | 2/12/2019 | 2/7/2019 Update | Tax Collectors would still like to fill out the forms for their customers, it saves time at the counter. Suggested that we include “Form prepared by...” statement. This would help Law Enforcement. | 3/7/2019 Update | Waiting on legal decision | |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3      | The Title/Reg team would like input on being able to use the signature pad for MV transactions, instead of only DL transactions.  
* Send MV forms to the signature pad  
* Review the MV Transaction  
* Search DL to pull up customers record | 2/5/2019 | 2/28/2019 | Agreed that this would be a good idea | 2/12/2019 Update | 3/7/2019 Update | No final answer yet | Under Review |
| 4      | The Title/Reg team is collecting the "Model" of the vehicle in modernization. The team would like guidance on where we are going to display this information. Should we add to the field to the Title, Form 82041 Title Application and Form 83300 Registration Form? | 3/7/2019 Update | 3/7/2019 Update | Suggested to check into what other states include on their documents/forms. Check AAMVA standards. Discussed using the VIN to decode model | Under Review |

2/12/2019 Update

Robert Kynoch will check into this and get back to the ESC.

3/7/2019 Update

No final answer yet

Under Review
Office of Motorist Modernization  
Phase II - Legal Opinion Log

<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>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, 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| POR  | 1 Cont. |  |  |  |  | (9)(a) The department shall implement a secure print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration, record retention, and issue system required for use by every department-authorized issuer of temporary tags by the end of the 2007-2008 fiscal year. Such system shall enable the department to issue, on demand, a temporary tag number in response to a request from the issuer by way of a secure electronic exchange of data and then enable the issuer to print the temporary tag that has all required information. A motor vehicle dealer licensed under this chapter may charge a fee to comply with this subsection. Based on the foregoing, legislation would be necessary for leasing companies and UPS to issue and print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration. |  | Close | |</p>
<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>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>9/5/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:
<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>POR</td>
<td>2 Cont.</td>
<td></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>
</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>
</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>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 &quot;Screen Scrape.&quot; 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>9/5/2018</td>
<td>Closed</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>
</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 &quot;each year&quot;?</td>
<td>2/7/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</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>
</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>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 (S319.28) 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>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>2</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>2/7/2019</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>FHP thinks this a fraud issue due to them not being able to prosecute for uttering an instrument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>3</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>2/7/2019</td>
<td>3/7/2019</td>
<td>Suggestion was made to convert the Return Title to an “Electronic” status. Legal will research this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Financials

MARCH 7, 2019
## Phase I
### Total Project
LBR Requests - Updated

<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>$2,323,620</td>
<td>$2,303,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$37,329,355</td>
<td>$32,678,267</td>
<td>$2,536,306</td>
<td>$1,745,667</td>
<td>$64,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget and Actuals: Current Fiscal Year through February 2019

BUDGET: $7,536,000

$6,976,720
$479,280
$80,000

ACTUALS: $5,198,855

Contracted Services
$2.0 M
$4.9 M

IV&V Services
$160K
$320K

Expense (Software, Travel)
$80K

Remaining

Contracted Services
IV&V Services
Expense (Software, Travel)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Variance</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>$5,198,855</td>
<td>$5,198,855</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (February 2019)</td>
<td>$414,273</td>
<td>$414,273</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$2,337,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Phase II  
### Total Project

LBR Requests Updated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Request</th>
<th>Contracted Services</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Services</th>
<th>Expense</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>$4,455,960</td>
<td>$423,240</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$13,742,200</td>
<td>$9,715,960</td>
<td>$423,240</td>
<td>$3,570,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$7,619,700*</td>
<td>$6,915,960</td>
<td>$423,240</td>
<td>$276,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>$6,036,700*</td>
<td>$5,580,460</td>
<td>$423,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>$2,906,700*</td>
<td>$2,479,460</td>
<td>$423,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$39,474,480*</td>
<td>$32,723,040</td>
<td>$2,473,390</td>
<td>$4,176,350</td>
<td>$101,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget and Actuals: Current Fiscal Year through February 2019

Budget: $5,037,000

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

Actuals: $2,748,317

- Contracted Services: $2.5M
- IV&V Services: $282K
- Expense (Software, Travel): Remaining
- OCO: Remaining
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Variance</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>$2,748,340</td>
<td>$3,748,317</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (February 2019)</td>
<td>$198,970</td>
<td>$198,970</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$2,288,683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Motorist Modernization - Phase II Traffic Light Report

**Current Stage: Requirements Validation**

*As of March 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>Increment 2 - Installer Licensing &amp; Consumer Complaints</td>
<td>Due Date: 2/20/2019 % Complete: 100%</td>
<td>Due Date: 5/3/2019 % Complete: 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Red Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Increment 2 - Parking Permits, Titles, Dealer Services, Salvage, High Speed, eCommerce, Kiosk, mDL, Electronic Title &amp; Registration</td>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Yellow Estimation: Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/4/2019 % Complete: 12%</td>
<td>Increment 2 - Additional Registration Transactions</td>
<td>Team 5 - Registrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Red Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Due Date: 2/15/2019 % Complete: 100%</td>
<td>Due Date: 2/20/2019 % Complete: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 4 - Titles</td>
<td>Team 6 -Globals/Batch/Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment 2 - Salvage, Batch (ELT, Batch Title Print, etc.), Title Imaging, Reporting, Admin</td>
<td>Increment 2 - Salvage, Batch (ELT, Batch Title Print, etc.), Title Imaging, Reporting, Admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/4/2019 % Complete: 10%</td>
<td>Due Date: 2/15/2019 % Complete: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Red Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Increment 2 - Common (Reports, Cashiering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 5 - Registrations</td>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Red Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment 2 - Additional Registration Transactions</td>
<td>Due Date: 2/20/2019 % Complete: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Red Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 6 -Globals/Batch/Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment 2 - Common (Reports, Cashiering)</td>
<td>Action Items: Green Legacy Code: Red Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/20/2019 % Complete: 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **% Complete:** % complete of requirements validation for current Increment
- **Action Items:** % of overdue team action items
- **Legacy Code:** % of as-is processes scheduled to be documented for the Increment
- **Estimation:** % of completed user stories with overdue estimations

Colors:
- Green: < 10% overdue
- Yellow: 10%-20% overdue
- Red: >= 20% overdue
- N/A: Not Applicable