Motorist Modernization Advisory Board – Phase I Monthly Meeting
June 12, 2018
Neil Kirkman Building, Conference Room B-202
2900 Apalachee Parkway, Tallahassee Florida 32399
1 to 2 p.m., EST

Invitees
Deb Roby
Ed Broyles
Kelley Scott
Pace Callaway
April Edwards
William Washington
Lisa Cullen

Representing
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
Florida Court Clerks & Comptrollers
Florida Tax Collectors

Agenda

- Roll Call
- Welcome
- Review and Approval of Last Meeting Minutes
- IV&V Update
- Stakeholder Outreach Update
- Policy and Decisions Review
- MM Phase I Program Update
  - Financial Review
  - Change Request Review
  - Project Updates
- Communications Update
- Q&A
- Adjourn
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
• The meeting was called to order at 1:01 p.m. Ms. Kristin Green began the meeting by welcoming the attendees, and proceeded with the roll call of board members.

Advisory Board members present included:
- Deb Roby
- Ed Broyles
- Pace Callaway
- April Edwards
- Lisa Cullen (via phone)
- Kelley Scott

• Additional DHSMV members present included Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Koral Griggs, Scott Tomaszewski, Chad Hutchinson, Laura Freeman, Sonia Nelson, Aundrea Andrades, Catherine Thomas, Felecia Ford, Janis Timmons, Cheryln Dent, Judy Johnson and Jessica Espinoza.

• Visitors included Aylene Calvo and Colin Stephens from Ernst & Young, Scott Morgan, Joseph Weldon from Accenture, Jonathan Sanford from Legal, Beth Frady from Communications, Beth Allman from FCCC and two media members from WFSU/The Florida Channel.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE LAST MEETING MINUTES
• Ms. Koral Griggs reviewed the meeting minutes from April 10, 2018. No corrections or comments were identified. A motion to approve the minutes was accepted by the board members and the April 10, 2018, meeting minutes were approved.

IV&V UPDATE
• Aylene Calvo presented the March 2018 report. The program is within the established performance thresholds and the overall risk state is green. The schedule performance index was at .987. There were 29 out of 3,036 late tasks, which was slightly higher than the 22 late tasks from last month. The cost performance index was at 1.003. The program completion date was forecasted to be 17.9 days late. The schedule quality score was at 94.5.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
• Mr. Terrence Samuel and other team members attended the IT Coalition Meeting on May 3, 2018, where Phase I and II were discussed. The team presented an overall update and answered any questions regarding the renewal notification project and structural testing. Mr. Samuel stated Mr. Chad Hutchinson presented an overview of the architectural testing at the meeting.
  - Mr. Hutchinson stated he also presented an update on changes and refinements made on test data management within the past year.

• Ms. Jessica Espinoza stated the team had a Phase I DL focus group meeting where a demo was performed and the renewal DL transaction was displayed. The team received positive feedback overall.
POLICY AND DECISION REVIEW

- POR31 – Express Shipping – Ms. Judy Johnson stated the team was waiting on a response from a current vendor to see if they could provide feedback on how other jurisdictions were handling the workflow with stuffing express shipping envelopes. The team requested to discuss with the ESC whether we can defer this to Phase II, since there will be a legislation change to be able to charge the fees for express shipping.
- FR02 – Rolling out the insurance companies XML onboarding as a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach – Ms. Catherine Thomas stated the team was continuing to schedule insurance companies for structural testing cycle periods. 179 insurance companies were signed up, while 158 were still not signed up. The Florida Office of Insurance Regulation has decided not to send out a blast memorandum to all insurance companies, but will send an email targeting the specific companies that have not responded and have not registered for structural testing. Ms. Thomas stated three OPS staff have started, with one still in the onboarding process.
  - Mr. Scott Tomaszewski added the team reached out to insurance companies to ensure they start developing ahead of signing up for structural testing. He stated testing will begin in June and July 2018.
- ENTP01 – Enterprise – Ms. Judy Johnson stated the team met with FDLE on April 13, 2018, to review proposed Phase I requirements that would impact their business. The team was waiting to hear back on who will provide the sign-off on this from FDLE.
- FR03 – FR – Ms. Thomas stated the team was looking for a decision on whether the insurance companies will need to do a full reload for the Go-Live or just use their Book of Business to clean up their records. The team recommended doing a full reload prior to Go-Live. Ms. Thomas stated if we use their Book of Business, we would lose history and possibly Financial Responsibility cases, which would cause a loss in revenue.

LEGAL OPINION REVIEW

- No legal opinion review was discussed.

FINANCIAL REVIEW

- Ms. Janis Timmons stated we received all funding for the 2017 – 2018 and 2018 – 2019 years. The budget is $9.8 million and the actuals are $6.7 million. We expended 80 percent on contracted services, 80 percent on IV&V and the OCO is fully expended for this fiscal year. The budget to actual variance for this fiscal year is approximately .01 percent. $975,067 was expended in April, compared to the $969,940, which was originally budgeted. This was primarily due to the amount of overtime worked. The remaining funds are $2.1 million.

CHANGE REQUEST REVIEWS

- Mr. Terrence Samuel updated the Board members after discussing with ESC, we will begin focusing and categorizing critical change requests to the functionality of the new system. Mr. Samuel announced ESC meets twice a month now.
- Ms. Kristin Green stated three of the Level III change requests were approved by the ESC, but due to time constraints they were not brought to Advisory Board prior to.
- CR111 – Supergroup User Guide Development Schedule Adjustment – Mr. Scott Tomaszewski stated this request was to align development and content collection one milestone behind the Application development and testing. This change request was approved by the ESC.
• CR112 – Informatica – Ms. Cheryln Dent stated this change request was to clarify additional Informatica portions of the schedule and align planned activities for the November Go-Live and MVRN Go-Live. This change request was approved by the ESC.

• CR113 – Enterprise Testing – Ms. Kristin Green stated this change request was to detail activities for Enterprise testing for Phase I Go-Live efforts. Various updates were made to the schedule and various testing tasks were incorporated. This change request was approved by the ESC.

• CR114 – Archive DL Batch Transcripts – Mr. Joe Weldon stated this change request is related to the DL Batch Transcript refinement to archive the original stories. The current batch transcript process was being changed to use the new webservice. There was no change in the hours and new stories and rules were created. There were no questions by the Board and the change request was motioned for approval.

• CR115 – Financial Responsibility – Clearance and Action Code Cleanup – Mr. Scott Tomaszewski stated the Financial Responsibility clearance changes performed earlier this year did not address all administrative clearances needs and action codes to maintain sanctions associated with records. This change request would include remaining work items involved with that process. The same schedule would remain. An additional 540 hours were identified. The team would identify any remaining stories that need to be lowered for this work to be completed. There was no known impact on LDO. There were no questions from the Board members and the change request was motioned for approval.

• Low Level Change Request PMCR-442 – Mr. Joe Weldon stated this change request was approved as an emergency request. Mr. Weldon stated the request changed the process for determining eligibility for clearing sanctions. The team collapsed three stories into one. There were no further questions on this change request.

PROJECT UPDATES

• DL Issuance – Mr. Joe Weldon stated the team was in Milestone H, which ends on May 30, 2018. The team was working on sanction clearance and clearance-only transactions, as well as six change requests previously approved by the Board members. According to the Traffic Report, the team was red for business actions and yellow for development and testing in the milestone. Mr. Weldon stated the Policy and Procedure team will be on site from May 15 – 17, 2018. That team completed their Milestone F functionality. The DL Issuance team will continue to perform several demos for the Policy and Procedure Team.
  o Risk 17 – Mr. Weldon stated this risk involved Idemia making updates to their process for card design to handle the new changes and restrictions. The work would be completed sometime in June.
  o Issue 39 – The team was short two developers. Mr. Weldon stated one position had been filled and they are working to fill the other position.
  o Change request pending – Mr. Weldon stated this change request was related to upgrading VLS 3.0 to a new version.

• Renewal Notification – Ms. Sonia Nelson stated the team was working to complete the HIP Sprint, which ended in February. The team was continuing to work on the Spanish translations and changes to the DL renewal notices. The team was still performing renewal vendor structural testing scheduled to complete by June 22. Palm Beach County, Manatee County and Grant Street finished testing. Southwest Direct, Marion County and Pasco County were still testing. Lee County, Pinellas County, Direct Mail, Point and Pay, Cathedral Corporation and TC Delivers were scheduled to start soon. The team was also working on performance testing in the STAGE environment, which should be completed at the end of the week. The team had no new risks or issues to report.

• CDLIS/CP – Ms. Sonia Nelson stated the team was working in Milestone E, Sprints 23 and 24. The team was behind for this sprint. The team was working on an interlock device for installation, court ordered non-DUI interlock device and printing for Florida citations for out-of-state drivers. The Traffic
Light Report indicated business actions were green, development for Citation Processing was red and green for CDLIS, testing was red for Citation Processing and green for CDLIS and technical debt was green for both. For the milestone, the team was green for business actions, yellow for development and testing and green for technical debt.

- Informatica — Ms. Cheryln Dent stated the team had completed development for eight modules related to data mappings. Ms. Dent stated that development of the modules was completed by April 30, however, the current sprint was red because testing had not been completed. Due to environmental issues, testing had been delayed; therefore, not completed yet. There were no more sprints left for the team. The team was waiting on the CONV environment to be set up with the Motorist Maintenance Applications to complete testing. The team had one change request to realign tasks on the schedule.

- MM/FR – Mr. Scott Tomaszewski stated the team was working in Milestone G, Sprint 24 and the HIP Sprint. The team was working on change stories related to handling system bypass, special features, quick adds, inventory and AAMVA features. Financial Responsibility was on hiatus for the current sprint. The Traffic Report for Motorist Maintenance on Sprint 24 indicated business actions were red, technical debt was green, developers were red and testers were red. The Traffic Report for the HIP Sprint indicated business actions were red, developers were red and testers were red. The Ascendant Commercial Insurance Incorporated Company was scheduled to start structural testing on April 30, but did not occur. The team had a meeting on May 4, to ensure these companies develop prior to scheduling structural testing.

  o Closed Risk 19 – Verification to reload file code and how it would handle multiple submissions – Mr. Tomaszewski stated at the last Advisory Board meeting, it was discussed to take the reload file, which was already modernized and bring it over into our code base; however, the team found issues with production. Mr. Tomaszewski stated there was still a question on how often companies would be able to run the reload.

  o Issue 10 – Delays in conducting backlog refinement meetings impacting sprint commitment – Mr. Tomaszewski stated this issue was more aligned with the quality of requirements versus the number of meetings. Mr. Tomaszewski stated the key is to engage the right subject matter experts who know the role of Motorist Maintenance and contributed to the requirements, and obtain their input prior to development and testing. This issue will be closed and a special issue will be opened for the requirement quality.

- MyDMV Portal – Ms. Aundrea Andrades stated the team was in Milestone F. The team closed Sprint 26 this week and Sprint 27 ended today. The team was working on BAR ORION stories, sanctions and change request 82. The developers were red on the Traffic Light Report due to them being over capacity for Sprint 27. The team’s committed and approved stories will be moved over into the HIP Sprint. Testers were also red due to the development being behind. The project was green overall for the milestone. The team performed a demo for Ms. Diana Vaughn resulting in some change requests. The team discussed automating and certifying the print of driver license records requests via the Portal, a guest log-in and minor verbiage changes to the screens after the demo was performed.

- Mr. Terrence Samuel discussed staying on task with various structural testing, AAMVA testing, etc. Mr. Samuel discussed deploying the code out to Tax Collector offices soon, so they can start using the system as soon as possible and report any feedback. Mr. Samuel stated the teams are still working with insurance companies and renewal vendors, and would continue to invite new vendors to come meet with us.

  o Ms. Lisa Cullen stressed we should not let a Go-Live go into November for the Tax Collectors.

  o Mr. Terrence Samuel agreed we would not want the Go-Live to go into November.

  o Ms. Cullen stated meetings could be arranged with the various counties to discuss using the new system if needed.

  o Mr. Samuel stated we would keep those meetings in mind.
COMMUNICATION UPDATE
• There was no communication update to present.

Q&A
• There were no questions or concerns from members present.

ADJOURNMENT
• Ms. Kristin Green adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:48 p.m.
• The next Advisory Board Meeting for Phase I is scheduled for June 12, 2018.

Note: Handouts at this meeting included:

Consolidated in a meeting packet and emailed to members:

- MM Advisory Board Agenda 1 Page
- MM Advisory Board Monthly Meeting Minutes dated 4/10/18 5 Pages
- MM Phase I IV&V Status 32 Pages
- MM Phase I Decision Document 12 Pages
- MM Phase I Legal Document 1 Page
- MM Phase I FY 17-18 Spend Plan 5 Page
- MM Phase I Change Requests (111, 112, 113, 114 and 115) 27 Pages
- MM Phase I Change Request Log 1 Pages
- MM Phase I Traffic Light Reports 2 Pages
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
- Forecast milestone completion
- Open deficiencies and actions
- Performance 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 May 2018
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 0.988
  - 62 of 3,062 total tasks (2.0%) contained in the project schedule are late
  - 5 of 684 total tasks (0.7%) for the current period are late
- The Program is within established cost performance thresholds
  - The cost performance index (CPI) is 1.000
  - 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 09/13/2019, 15.9 days late
  - The Program is within established schedule performance thresholds.
  - Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
  - The amount of time the project is behind schedule is increasing
Overall risk state and trending

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

- **Program governance**: Benefit realization and sustainability
  - Complexity profile (G2)
  - Business case integrity (G1)
  - Change management (G5)
  - Performance management (G6)
  - Benefits design and realization (G9)

- **Technical solution**: Requirements development, quality, and predictability
  - Integration management (P5)
  - Design management (P6)
  - Testing and validation (T7)

- **Project management**: Processes, controls, and predictability
  - Human resource management (P4)
  - Quality management (P7)
  - Risk management (P8)
  - Communications management (P9)

**Risk state with trending**

- As of 14 May 2018

Indicators:
- Red: Significant risk with negative outcomes, inability to meet projected schedule, or significant cost over-run. Requires immediate action.
- Yellow: Issues need to be resolved; inefficiencies exist. Current process/method can be used with refinement.
- Green: No significant issues to report. Continued monitoring should be performed.
- Grey: Incomplete information available for a conclusive finding or is not applicable.

**Program governance**

- Technical infrastructure
- Methodology and development
- Business continuity and disaster recovery

- **Technical solution**
  - Sustainability model
  - Cutover and support
  - Security and controls

**Project management**

- Time management (P2)
- Cost management (P3)
- Requirements engineering and design (T1)
- Compliance and regulatory (G7)

- **Governance**
  - Business case integrity (G1)
  - Decision framework (G4)
  - Governance effectiveness (G7)

- **Risk management**
  - Requirements development, quality, and predictability
  - Integration management (P5)
  - Testing and validation (T7)

- **Communications management**
  - Human resource management (P4)
  - Quality management (P7)
  - Risk management (P8)
  - Integration management (P5)

- **Technical infrastructure**
  - Business continuity and disaster recovery
  - Methodology and development
  - Technical solution

- **Performance management**
  - Business case integrity (G1)
  - Decision framework (G4)
  - Governance effectiveness (G7)

- **Governance**
  - Business case integrity (G1)
  - Decision framework (G4)
  - Governance effectiveness (G7)

- **Risk management**
  - Requirements development, quality, and predictability
  - Integration management (P5)
  - Testing and validation (T7)

- **Communications management**
  - Human resource management (P4)
  - Quality management (P7)
  - Risk management (P8)
  - Integration management (P5)
Overall 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): 25
  - Gray (not evaluated): 2
  - Open deficiencies: 0

- Conclusions:
  - The MM Program Team has satisfactorily addressed all deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.
### Key indicators

<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? | Yes | ▶ The Program is within established schedule performance thresholds.  
▶ The schedule performance index (SPI) is 0.988.  
▶ 62 of 3,062 total tasks (2.0%) contained in the project schedule are late.  
▶ 5 of 684 total tasks (0.7%) 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 1.000.  
▶ 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 I) 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 satisfactorily addressed all deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team. |
| Are the project’s risks increasing or decreasing? | Steady | ▶ The MM Program Team has satisfactorily addressed all 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: 0 (Open), 4 (In Progress), 0 (Closed)
- Medium: 0 (Open), 55 (In Progress), 0 (Closed)
- High: 0 (Open), 17 (In Progress), 0 (Closed)

**Overall Status of Recommendations**

- Open: 0
- In Progress: 76
- Closed: 0

**Recommendation Status by Deficiency**

- D9: Open - 3, In Progress - 11, Closed - 0
- D8: Open - 3, In Progress - 8, Closed - 0
- D7: Open - 8, In Progress - 10, Closed - 0
- D6: Open - 5, In Progress - 8, Closed - 0
- D5: Open - 10, In Progress - 7, Closed - 0
- D4: Open - 8, In Progress - 10, Closed - 0
- D3: Open - 7, In Progress - 14, Closed - 0
- D2: Open - 10, In Progress - 13, Closed - 0
- D1: Open - 10, In Progress - 11, Closed - 0

**Recommendation Priority by Deficiency**

- High: D9 - 0, D8 - 3, D7 - 0, D6 - 1, D5 - 2, D4 - 2, D3 - 0, D2 - 2, D1 - 2
- Medium: D9 - 0, D8 - 8, D7 - 0, D6 - 4, D5 - 8, D4 - 7, D3 - 5, D2 - 11, D1 - 7
- Low: D9 - 0, D8 - 0, D7 - 0, D6 - 0, D5 - 0, D4 - 0, D3 - 0, D2 - 0, D1 - 0
Overall performance

- This chart shows the SPI and CPI plotted as points against the tolerance ranges set up for the project.
  - Summary:
    - Schedule and cost performance are within established thresholds.
  - Conclusions:
    - The Program is currently on schedule and on budget.

- 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 7 May 2018:
SPI = 0.988
CPI = 1.000

0.70 0.80 0.90 1.00 1.10 1.20 1.30
SPI

0.70 0.80 0.90 1.00 1.10 1.20 1.30
CPI

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.
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 as scheduled.
- The total amount of work not completed as scheduled is 3,960.4 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.
Overall performance (continued)

- This chart shows the percent complete for duration and work for the project.

- **Summary:**
  - Duration and work complete has been consistent since the beginning of the project.
  - The modification of the schedule due to CR 68 (Informatica) introduced a large number of long duration activities with little work, greatly impacting percent duration complete.
  - The modification of the schedule due to CR 79 (detailed Informatica tasks) reduced the number of long duration activities.

- **Conclusions:**
  - None.

- Blue line is duration percent complete.
- Red line is work percent complete.
Forecast milestone completion

This chart shows the projected completion dates for future milestones based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

Summary:
- The Program is within established schedule performance thresholds.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is decreasing.

Conclusions:
- The project is behind schedule.
Open deficiencies and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DHSMV MM Program Team has satisfactorily addressed all deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.
Performance improvement recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress update / resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The DHSMV MM Program Team has satisfactorily addressed all performance improvement recommendations identified by the IV&V Team.
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 – Jul 2017 (IVV-302BD)</td>
<td>08/14/2017</td>
<td>08/29/2017</td>
<td>08/21/2017</td>
<td>▶ Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Aug 2017 (IVV-302BE)</td>
<td>09/14/2017</td>
<td>09/29/2017</td>
<td>09/22/2017</td>
<td>▶ Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Sep 2017 (IVV-302BF)</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>10/30/2017</td>
<td>10/20/2017</td>
<td>▶ Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Oct 2017 (IVV-302BG)</td>
<td>11/14/2017</td>
<td>11/30/2017</td>
<td>11/21/2017</td>
<td>▶ Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Nov 2017 (IVV-302BH)</td>
<td>12/14/2017</td>
<td>01/01/2018</td>
<td>12/21/2017</td>
<td>▶ Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Dec 2017 (IVV-302BI)</td>
<td>01/15/2018</td>
<td>01/30/2018</td>
<td>01/22/2017</td>
<td>▶ Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Jan 2018 (IVV-302BJ)</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-302BK)</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-302BL)</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-302BM)</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-302BN)</td>
<td>06/14/2018</td>
<td>06/29/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Jun 2018 (IVV-302BO)</td>
<td>07/16/2018</td>
<td>07/31/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting information

- Summary of changes
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- Project budget
## Summary of changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies addressed</td>
<td>There are no open IV&amp;V deficiencies.</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 rating changes since the last report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity ratings</td>
<td>No maturity rating changes 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>

### Supporting information

- No interviews conducted since last report.
The DHSMV MM Program Team has satisfactorily addressed all deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.
## Project milestones

### Supporting information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBS</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.12</td>
<td>Project Monitoring and Control Phase COMPLETE</td>
<td>06/28/2019</td>
<td>06/28/2019</td>
<td>06/28/2019</td>
<td>07/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.8</td>
<td>Project Closeout Phase COMPLETE</td>
<td>06/28/2019</td>
<td>08/29/2019</td>
<td>08/29/2019</td>
<td>09/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Database Redesign / Synchronization COMPLETE</td>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
<td>09/07/2018</td>
<td>09/07/2018</td>
<td>09/18/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>PHASE GATE REVIEW - Database Redesign / Synchronization COMPLETE</td>
<td>06/20/2018</td>
<td>09/07/2018</td>
<td>09/07/2018</td>
<td>09/18/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5.10</td>
<td>Development COMPLETE</td>
<td>05/25/2018</td>
<td>09/13/2018</td>
<td>09/13/2018</td>
<td>09/25/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>PHASE GATE REVIEW - Development</td>
<td>07/27/2018</td>
<td>09/13/2018</td>
<td>09/13/2018</td>
<td>09/25/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.5</td>
<td>Testing COMPLETE</td>
<td>02/20/2019</td>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>05/06/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.7</td>
<td>PHASE GATE REVIEW – Testing</td>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>05/06/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8.4</td>
<td>Operations Planning COMPLETE</td>
<td>03/02/2018</td>
<td>12/28/2018</td>
<td>07/19/2019</td>
<td>08/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

► Additional milestones will be added as the project progresses

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
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: 3,062
  - Total tasks late: 62
  - Total open tasks late: 29
- Conclusions:
  - The total number of tasks designated as late is 2.0% of the total number of tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Period</th>
<th>All tasks</th>
<th>Total late</th>
<th>Open late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0117</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0217</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0317</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0417</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0517</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0617</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0717</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0817</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0917</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 1017</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 1117</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 1217</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0118</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0218</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR 0318</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of late tasks per reporting period
## Project schedule quality

**Entire schedule: 11/01/2013 to 08/29/2019**

### 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:** 94.5

### Conclusions:
- Overall schedule quality is consistent and excellent

### Key Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic schedule</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical path</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task durations</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule baseline</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time tasks</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary tasks</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone tasks</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal tasks</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **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: 06/01/2018 to 08/31/2018

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: 94.2

Conclusions:
- Overall schedule quality is consistent and excellent

- 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

Supporting information

Total project budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

Total budget
Total actual
Cumulative total budget
Cumulative total actual
Total DHSMV staff budget versus actual expenditures

- **Total DHSMV staff - budget**
- **Total DHSMV staff - actual**
- **Cumulative total DHSMV staff - budget**
- **Cumulative total DHSMV staff - actual**
Total contract staff budget versus actual expenditures

- Total contracted staff - budget
- Total contracted staff - actual
- Cumulative total contracted staff - budget
- Cumulative total contracted staff - actual
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

Supporting information

Total OCO budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

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

Total IV&V services budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

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

**Budget distribution**

- **DHSMV staff**
  - $0
  - 0%
- **Contracted staff**
  - $23,403,744
  - 86%
- **Expense**
  - $1,591,078
  - 6%
- **OCO**
  - $69,211
  - 0%
- **Other items**
  - $62,101
  - 0%
- **IV&V**
  - $2,057,026
  - 8%

**Actual distribution**

- **DHSMV staff**
  - $0
  - 0%
- **Contracted staff**
  - $21,870,613
  - 88%
- **Expense**
  - $1,021,351
  - 4%
- **OCO**
  - $69,210
  - 0%
- **Other items**
  - $62,101
  - 0%
- **IV&V**
  - $1,977,146
  - 8%
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Recommendation/Advisory Board (AB) Comments</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Recommendation/Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>AB Status</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR31</td>
<td>01/13/17</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td>Currently the department allows customers to request express shipping of their driver license/ID card by supplying P&amp;I with their personal express shipping account number for various providers (FedEx, UPS, DHL). It was decided previously by the ESC that the new Portal application will allow expedited shipping for Driver License/ID card issuances. Should we require the customer provide an account number or should we set a fee amount and bill the department’s account for shipping?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR31 Cont.</td>
<td>01/13/17</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR31 Cont.</td>
<td>01/13/17</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**03/03/17 Update**
Sent a request for pricing to Alissa Hoban who reached out to Trey Collins. Alissa Hoban provided the current price sheet for the various options.

**03/16/17 Update**
Aundrea Andrades presented the current pricing for Priority Overnight, FedEx Standard Overnight and FedEx two day overnight to the ESC. Aundrea suggested creating a table indicating the correct amounts for each service based on the zones and the board members agreed that it would be beneficial to use the pricing method moving forward. ESC requested information on how quickly we can process the issuance and what is the normal speed.

**04/25/17 Update**
All mail received by 3:30 p.m. in the mail room will be delivered as follows:
- Priority Overnight will arrive by 10:30 a.m. next day
- FedEx Standard Overnight - Commercial will arrive by 3:00 p.m. next day
- FedEx Standard Overnight - Residential will arrive by 8:00 a.m. next day
- FedEx 2-Day will arrive by 10:30 a.m. 2nd day

**04/27/17 Update**
The ESC decided that we will give the customer 3 options for express shipping. The system will calculate the fee based on the shipping option and zone. The system will display the expected delivery date for each option.

**05/17/17 Update**
As of the last update, the legislative bill did not pass. The team would like directions for the next steps.

**05/18/17 Decision**
The department will continue with previous plan.

**05/23/17 Update**
Deb Rotty emailed a copy of the Card Print Solution contract and the following notes:
1. I have attached a few pages with language from the card print solution contract regarding expedited printing. The contract only addresses two types of printing and mailing for credentials:
   - Standard processing with first class mailing
   - Expedited processing with next business day delivery
   The contractor is required to produce separate invoice details for the expedited credentials with the shipment tracking information, in addition to the regular invoices. There are specific prices identified for each type of credential processing and mailing (regular and expedited/overnight) during the term of the contract and the extension periods.

Require additional information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Recommendation/Advisory Board (AB) Comments</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Recommendation/Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>All Status</th>
<th>All Date</th>
<th>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR31</td>
<td>01/13/17</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR31</td>
<td>01/13/17</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR31</td>
<td>01/13/17</td>
<td>Express Shipping</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Running:*
*POR31* Cont....

**01/13/17**
Express Shipping

- Request to use customer number in addition to Driver License number in the data exchange.
- Request clarification on the label, such as what type and what will be printed on the label.
- What type of tracking information will be provided?
- The team indicated that they were focusing on the print solution only because that was their number one priority. The team also stated that since the bill did not pass no further work would be done pertaining to this issue.

**07/27/17 Update**
The MYDMV Portal team will resume discussion with the Print Card Solution team after the UAT date for the new cards.

**03/26/18 Update**
Portal team members met with developers to review the express shipping requirements. Team members created flow diagrams and another meeting will be scheduled to review with the business partners.

**04/10/2018 Update**
Team members met with representatives from Motorist Services, Purchasing and Idemia. The team reviewed the proposed workflow and the following concerns were raised:

- Legislative Approval
  - Currently, there is a three-day hold for CIPS transactions; however, the MYDMV Portal will be performing real-time AAMVA verifications. Who will be responsible for packaging the credentials and updating the tracking information? (P&I and the mailroom stated they currently do not have the resources to package the express mail envelopes).
  - Idemia is going to research express shipping model they have with other clients and give us a demo.

**5/29/2018 Update**
The leadership is currently researching if rule 69C-4.0045 would authorize the fee for express shipping.

**5/14/2018 Update**
Shawn Laweisqe stated he will get back with the team by the end of the week with same ideas on times we can meet to discuss this issue.

**5/30/2018**
The team would like to move this request to Phase II.
The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
-文本未完成
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
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- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
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- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
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- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.

The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
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The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
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The FR team is looking for a decision as to whether we should roll out the insurance companies XML, embarking on a "Big Bang" approach or a "Staggered" approach. We have more than 500 insurance companies that need to be moved to the new system. They will have more than a year for structured testing and preparing for the conversion, as FR development is complete in January 2018. We groomed our requirements to go with the "Big Bang" approach.

### Option 1: Big Bang Approach
- New and old FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
- Option 2: Staggered roll-out
- Old and new FR systems run concurrently.
- Text not completed.
**Motorist Modernization Phase I**

**Decision Document**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Recommendation/Advisory Board (AB) Comments</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Recommendation/Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>AB Status</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR02</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>12/10/17 Update Continued...</td>
<td>We are following up with the pilot companies as to where they are with modifying their systems. United Auto Insurance stated they are in the process of getting their software up to speed, and hoping to convert to XPL after the new year. AIG has sent and processed files successfully and will start structural testing hopefully this week. Venis has not started anything as of yet, they are experiencing production issues. They have verified they can see the folders, but no further update at this time. The Stage Environment is being set up for January 2018 for all companies to use to structural test.</td>
<td>03/04/2018 Update</td>
<td>The Stage Environment is due to be ready by January 8, 2018. Pat Porter has completed the letter to the insurance companies and it is in the review process at this time. This letter includes important dates as well as a January 31, 2018, deadline to have a contact person identified and an email address for structural testing.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR02 Cont.</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>03/04/2018 Update Continued...</td>
<td>We are still holding the weekly pilot company testing progression call. AIG is moving quickly with their structural testing and hasn’t run into any major issues. Venis has been struggling with production issues. One issue was related to AST, as their rebuild file was too large. We were told there were no limitations. Also, there was an anti-virus issue with files timing out. Venis still has not started any pilot structural testing. United Automobile is having a problem related to the dummy NAIC codes we provided and getting them programmed in their system. The FR team is setting up a conference call with them and our technical team to help solve their issues. At this time, they have not started any pilot structural testing.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR02 Cont.</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>03/12/2018 Update</td>
<td>The Stage Environment is ready to begin structural testing with the insurance companies. The team’s continuing the weekly pilot company progression calls, but last week no companies were on the call. This week all three companies participated. The team is continuing the weekly pilot company testing with the insurance companies. The business has a conference call with Allstate and USA regarding participating in same pre-structural testing. Allstate requested a letter with the directive that DHSMV’s converting to total XPL. USA is talking to upper management as they have funding needs for the development of XML.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Recommendation/Advisory Board (AB) Comments</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Recommendation/Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>AB Status</td>
<td>AB Date</td>
<td>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
<td>ESC 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>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR02 Cont....</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</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>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

01/25/2018 Update Continued...
The team's continuing the weekly pilot company progression calls. This week all three companies participated.

The insurance letter was approved and mailed out to the companies on January 18. The team is getting responses from the companies with their contact person and phone numbers.

We will have approximately 159 accounts to bring over to XML throughout this year; 592 companies.

The final XML manual edits have been completed and posted to the Department’s FR website.

02/12/2018 Update
The business is moving forward to establish points of contact to coordinate final structural testing for all insurance companies by December 2018.

Out of the Pilot Testing, it was discovered a production issue impacting RELOAD would impact OHRM. Coordinating resolution with OA Production staff.
The team sent a letter on Friday, March 2, 2018, to the insurance industry for additional communication regarding structural testing notification and signing up for the testing cycles. The letter states the companies have until COB on Monday, March 19, 2018, to select their testing cycle. If they fail to reply, a structural testing period will be assigned to them. The first testing cycle will begin on March 26, 2018, and the last testing cycle will be completed on December 14, 2018.

ISA is currently working on a Reload Wrap and are planning on this being completed by March 16, 2018. The Purge Wrap has about one and a half weeks left of testing.

Interviews are being conducted for OPS staff to assist with the XML conversion process.

The Business is continuing to schedule the insurance companies structural testing cycle period. Testing cycles 30-15 are no longer available.

Total Insurance Companies - 336 (not including 4 vendors)
Signed Up Companies - 117 (including 2 vendors)
Not signed up Companies - 221

The OIR meeting was held on Thursday, March 22, 2018, to discuss the XML onboarding process. The team requested assistance with contacting the insurance companies that have not responded. OIR will look at communication methods (email blast/newsletter) to reach out to the companies and “CEOs.”

The Florida Office of Insurance Regulation is sending out a memorandum to all property and casualty insurers authorized to do business in Florida, strongly encouraging the insurance companies who have not responded to the department's attempt to get everyone scheduled for their testing cycles to contact the department immediately.

Interviews are complete for the OPS staff to assist with the XML conversion process. The plan is to hire five people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Recommendation/Advisory Board (ABI) Comments</th>
<th>Bureau Chief/Recommendation/Approval By Name(s)</th>
<th>All Status</th>
<th>All Date</th>
<th>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR02</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Require additional information</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The business is continuing to schedule the insurance companies' structural testing cycle periods. Testing cycles 3 and 4 are still open.

Total Insurance Companies - 337
Signed Up Companies - 179
Not Signed Up Companies - 158

The Florida Office of Insurance Regulation has decided NOT to send out a blast memorandum to all insurance companies, as I reported last meeting. Instead, they are going to send an email targeting the specific companies that have not responded.

We have four OPS staff going through the onboarding process at this time. The team is looking forward to them starting.

Three OPS staff have started and one is still going through the onboarding process. The remaining testing cycles are now full, although, the team is still scheduling and making adjustments. Five companies are scheduled for cycle 5 (May 21 - June 1):
- Auto Club South
- Farmers Insurance Exchange
- Infinity Insurance Company
- Pennsylvania Manufacturers Assoc. Insurance Co
- Ascendent Commercial Insurance

The business is holding a four-hour conference call on June 26 from 1 to 5 p.m. with the insurance companies to review the process again, and show a PowerPoint presentation of what is expected and the steps to follow. Hopefully this will help with the confusion and questions the insurance companies are having.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Recommendation/Advisory Board (AB) Comments</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Recommendation/Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>AB Status</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTP01</td>
<td>06/12/17</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>As part of the Modernization effort, we are merging our DL and MV databases, which involves combining our customer records to a single record, which reflects both DL and MV. This process also means that we must define a clear set of business rules as it pertains to the customer and their addresses, both mailing and residential. The address rules also have an impact on our business customers. Mailing Address Residential Address</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>If DHSMV does not receive sign off from FDLE, or the requirements change, multiple teams may experience rework. Sex offenders/sex predator/career offenders being allowed to update mailing address only on MyDMV Portal and not allowing issuance? Can they renew their Motor Vehicle online without being allowed to update their address? Tax Collectors talked about the amount of returned mail. Ability to have an out-of-country address for ODL drivers of 5's dealers</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP01</td>
<td>Cont....</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP01</td>
<td>06/12/17</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP01</td>
<td>06/12/17</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP01</td>
<td>Cont....</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>5/30/2018 Application will be developed without signoff from FDLE.</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>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Recommendation/ Advisory Board (AB) Comments</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Recommendation/ Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>AB Status</td>
<td>AB Date</td>
<td>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
<td>ESC 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>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR03</td>
<td>4/27/2018</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>The FR team is looking for a decision whether the insurance companies will need to do a full reload for go-live or just use their Book of Business to clean up their records. The team recommends doing a full reload prior to go-live. If we use their Book of Business, we will lose history and possibly FR cases, which will cause a loss in revenue.</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>If DHSMV uses the insurance companies' Book of Business, we risk the chance of losing history and possibly FR cases, which will cause a loss in revenue.</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>If DHSMV uses the insurance companies' Book of Business, we risk the chance of losing history and possibly FR cases, which will cause a loss in revenue.</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>If DHSMV uses the insurance companies' Book of Business, we risk the chance of losing history and possibly FR cases, which will cause a loss in revenue.</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>If DHSMV uses the insurance companies' Book of Business, we risk the chance of losing history and possibly FR cases, which will cause a loss in revenue.</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Financials

June 12, 2018
### 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$36,829,355</td>
<td>$32,178,267</td>
<td>$2,536,306</td>
<td>$1,745,667</td>
<td>$64,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Phase I Financial Review

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

BUDGET: $9,857,775

ACTUALS: $8,864,595

- Contracted Services
- IV&V Services
- Expense (Software, Travel)
- OCO

Remaining
# 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 2017-2018 Total Funding</td>
<td>$9,857,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$8,865,720</td>
<td>$8,864,595</td>
<td>(.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (May 2018)</td>
<td>$1,112,523</td>
<td>$1,112,133</td>
<td>(.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$1,011,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
THANK YOU
## General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agile Project Name</th>
<th>Motorist Modernization Phase I – DL Issuance &amp; Motorist Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Request Title</td>
<td>Archive Duplicative Capture Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Requested By</td>
<td>Joe Weldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Owner</td>
<td>Barbara Peacock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Requested</td>
<td>5/15/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Request #</th>
<th>(To be assigned by CCB Chair)</th>
<th>125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒ New Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Resubmitted / Amended Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Change Request Information (completed by the requestor)

**Description of Change:**

The following DL Issuance user stories were determined to be duplicative of other Capture stories.

1. **FR33320**  
   Display "Print Preview/Re-print" screen – this is handled by the Transaction Review Screen FR9130 - Create "Transaction Review" Screen and the individual Generate Card Print Preview by transaction stories.

2. **FR33318**  
   Complete Capture Transaction – This story was replaced by the following 2 stories that are the final updates after card printing:  
   - FR37849 Update Adjusted EIN Number  
   - FR37850 Update Print Job Status

3. **FR33308**  
   Capture Print Service – This story was replaced by separate stories to perform card print by credential type:  
   - FR37724 Perform Card Print - Original ID  
   - FR37729 Perform Card Print - Renew ID  
   - FR37730 Perform Card Print - Replace ID  
   - FR37735 Perform Card Print - Original DL  
   - FR37736 Perform Card Print - Renew DL  
   - FR37739 Perform Card Print - Replace DL  
   - FR37740 Perform Card Print - Original CDL  
   - FR37741 Perform Card Print - Renew CDL  
   - FR37744 Perform Card Print - Replace CDL  
   - FR37745 Perform Card Print - Original CLP  
   - FR37749 Perform Card Print - Replace CLP  
   - FR37804 Generate Card Print Preview - Original ID  
   - FR37805 Generate Card Print Preview - Original CDL  
   - FR37806 Generate Card Print Preview - Original DL  
   - FR37808 Generate Card Print Preview - Replace ID  
   - FR37809 Generate Card Print Preview - Renew ID  
   - FR37810 Generate Card Print Preview - Renew DL  
   - FR37811 Generate Card Print Preview - Replace DL  
   - FR37814 Generate Card Print Preview - Renew CDL  
   - FR37815 Generate Card Print Preview - Replace CDL  
   - FR37816 Generate Card Print Preview - Replace CLP  
   - FR37817 Generate Card Print Preview - Original CLP

4. **FR33317**  
   Update/Save "Print Preview/Re-print" screen – A CR (FR37546 - PMCR-41) Create Reprint Screen for DL changed the way reprints of credentials are handled and this screen/story is no longer needed in the DL Issuance module in Orion.

This change request will remove these stories from the DL Issuance backlog.

**Classification:** Critical  ☒ Critical CR, as per 5/4/18 CCB criteria revision.
Due to the level of classification (Level III) and potential impact to the scope, schedule (on the critical path, milestone impact, and/or >10 business days/81 hours), and/or budget (> $500, increase to overall program budget), this change request must be reviewed by the Change Control Board and approved by the Executive Steering Committee in accordance with the MM Phase I Program Management Plan.

**Change Request Type:**
- □ New (Unplanned/Missed) Work Effort
- □ New (Expanded) Work Effort
- X Re-work
- ☑ Removal/Archival

**Business Need / Justification** (completed by the requestor)
These stories are duplicative and not needed. This request removes the duplicative work from scope.

**Impact Analysis**

**Requirements Change Description:**
Below is the list of stories that will be REMOVED from the backlog:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blueprint ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR33320</td>
<td>Display &quot;Print Preview/Re-print&quot; screen</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR33318</td>
<td>Complete Capture Transaction</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR33308</td>
<td>Capture Print Service</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR33317</td>
<td>Update/Save &quot;Print Preview/Re-print&quot; screen</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Change Description:** N/A

**Associated Wrap Number?** N/A

**Impact on Backlog:** Above stories were assigned to Milestone J, but would be removed from the backlog because of this change.

**Impact on Schedule:**
- ☑ No Project / Program schedule change
- □ Project / Program schedule change

No schedule change required.

**Schedule Change Description:** This request will not impact the current development schedule (September 2018).

**Change may be addressed within:**
- □ New Milestone
- X Existing Milestone
- □ New Sprint
- X Existing Sprint

**Provide detail for when this change will be implemented:**
Once approved, this change will be implemented immediately.
Current Schedule: There is no change to the current schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3225%</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILESTONE GROUP J</td>
<td>53 days</td>
<td>Thu 6/28/18</td>
<td>Wed 9/12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3226%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sprint 27</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Thu 6/28/18</td>
<td>Wed 7/18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3227%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sprint 28</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Thu 7/19/18</td>
<td>Wed 8/8/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3228%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sprint 29</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Thu 8/9/18</td>
<td>Wed 8/29/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3229%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dt HIP Sprint - Milestone Group J</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>Thu 8/30/18</td>
<td>Tue 9/11/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3230%</td>
<td></td>
<td>DL Milestone Retrospective - Milestone J</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Wed 9/12/18</td>
<td>Wed 9/12/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Schedule: No change to existing schedule. Team will remove the stories.

Impact on Cost: N/A

Resources Needed to Support this Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (P) or Operational (O)</th>
<th>Work Effort (Hours)</th>
<th>% Allocation to Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal BA hours to remove the stories from TFS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work Effort:
This CR will remove 116 hours of effort from the DL Issuance backlog.

Alternatives to the Requested Change: None identified. If this CR is NOT approved, the team will have duplicative work in the backlog.

Impact on Training: No known impact to training.

Impact on Policies and/or Procedures: No known impact to policies or procedures.

The project/program manager attests that all impacts and alternatives have been vetted by the following members:

- Product Owner: Barbara Peacock
- Scrum Master: Pavel Machado
- Program Manager: Cheryln Dent
- Project Manager: Joe Weldon
- Sr. Business Analyst: Jessica Espinoza
- Lead Developer / Software Architect: Thomas Culbertson
- Enterprise Technical Team Representative: Scott Bean
- Testing Manager: Lacey Lowers
- LDO Representative: Sarah Pope
- Financial Representative (DAS/OFM): Steve Burch
- Other Operational / Business Manager(s):

List Individual Name(s) & Review Notes
### Change Control Board Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Defer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Recommended for approval by CCB members on 5/24/18.

### Advisory Board Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Defer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Due to timing constraints, this request was not reviewed by the Advisory Board.

### Executive Steering Committee Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Defer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### Approver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approver</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry Rhodes, Executive Director, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/7/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Vaughn, Deputy Executive Director, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kynoch, Director of Motorist Services, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden, Chief Information Officer, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Dobson, Program Manager – FLOW, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/17/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office of Motorist Modernization  
Change Request Form – Agile Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agile Project Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Request Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Requested By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Request # (To be assigned by CCB Chair)</th>
<th>126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ New Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Resubmitted / Amended Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Request Information (completed by the requestor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Change: The purpose of this change request is to combine both (1.) Milestone G Sprint 29 + HIP Sprint and (2.) Milestone H Sprint 30 + HIP Sprint into single sprints. Due to the short duration of the HIP Sprints and the overhead of conducting Sprint ceremonies, the team believes it will be more productive to consolidate these time periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification: Medium ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the level of classification (Level III) and isolated impact to the schedule/sprint (not on the critical path), total work effort between 6 business days (48 hours) and 10 business days (80 hours), no impact to the milestone schedule, minor scope change(s) and/or minimal impact to budget (&lt;$500, no increase to overall program budget), this change request may be approved by the Program Director¹ in accordance with the MM Phase I Program Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Request Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ New (Unplanned/Missed) Work Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ New (Expanded) Work Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Re-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Removal/Archival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Need / Justification (completed by the requestor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typically, a day and a half are consumed in ceremonies for each sprint. Because Milestone G and H each currently include a 4-day HIP Sprint, the team believes it would be more efficient to consolidate the HIP Sprints into Sprints 29 and Sprint 30, respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Change Description: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Change Description: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Wrap Number? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Backlog: None. The MyDMV Portal team will address all remaining Milestone G and H development and testing in the combined Sprint 29/HIP and Sprint 30/HIP time periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All non-critical CRs must be approved by the ESC, per revised process effective on 5/4/18.
**Impact on Schedule:**
- ☑ No Project / Program schedule change
- ☒ Project / Program schedule change

**Schedule Change Description:** Removing the Milestone G and H HIP Sprint and combining scheduled time as Sprint 29/HIP sprint and Sprint 30/HIP sprint.

**Change may be addressed within:**
- ☑ New Milestone
- ☑ Existing Milestone
- ☒ New Sprint
- ☒ Existing Sprint

**Provide detail for when this change will be implemented:** Once approved, change will be implemented in IMS. Work will be performed June 6 – July 3 for G and July 11 – Aug 6 for H.

**Current Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE GROUP G</td>
<td>34 days</td>
<td>Wed 5/16/18</td>
<td>Tue 7/3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprint 28</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Wed 5/16/18</td>
<td>Tue 6/5/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprint 29</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Wed 6/6/18</td>
<td>Tue 6/26/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyDMV HIP Sprint - Milestone Group G</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Wed 6/27/18</td>
<td>Mon 7/2/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyDMV Milestone Retrospective - Milestone Group G</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Tue 7/3/18</td>
<td>Tue 7/3/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MILESTONE GROUP H                         | 20 days  | Wed 7/11/18| Tue 8/7/18 |
| Sprint 30                                 | 15 days  | Wed 7/11/18| Tue 7/31/18|
| MyDMV HIP Sprint - Milestone Group H      | 4 days   | Wed 8/1/18 | Mon 8/6/18 |
| MyDMV Milestone Retrospective - Milestone Group H | 1 day    | Tue 8/7/18 | Tue 8/7/18 |

**Proposed Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE GROUP G</td>
<td>34 days</td>
<td>Wed 5/16/18</td>
<td>Tue 7/3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprint 28</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Wed 5/16/18</td>
<td>Tue 6/5/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sprint 29/ MyDMV Portal HIP</strong></td>
<td>19 days</td>
<td>Wed 6/6/18</td>
<td>Mon 7/2/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyDMV Milestone Retrospective - Milestone Group G</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Tue 7/3/18</td>
<td>Tue 7/3/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MILESTONE GROUP H                         | 20 days  | Wed 7/11/18| Tue 8/7/18 |
| **Sprint 30/ MyDMV Portal HIP**           | 19 days  | Wed 7/11/18| Mon 8/6/18 |
| MyDMV Milestone Retrospective - Milestone Group H | 1 day    | Tue 8/7/18 | Tue 8/7/18 |

**Impact on Cost:** No impact to current costs.

**Resources Needed to Support this Request**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (P) or Operational (O)</th>
<th>Work Effort (Hours)</th>
<th>% Allocation to Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Effort:** N/A

**Alternatives to the Requested Change:** Keep schedule as-is, and risk losing development/testing time due to sprint ceremonies.
**Impact on Training:** No known impact to training.

**Impact on Policies and/or Procedures:** No known impact to policies and procedures.

The project/program manager attests that all impacts and alternatives have been vetted by the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Owner</td>
<td>Deepa Vasudevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrum Master</td>
<td>Catherine Alvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Cheryl Dent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Aundrea Andrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Business Analyst</td>
<td>Judy Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Developer / Software Architect</td>
<td>Derek Valdejuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Technical Team Representative</td>
<td>Joe Weldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Manager</td>
<td>Kelsey Parten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDO Representative</td>
<td>Sarah Pope/Mallory Lastinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Representative (DAS/OFM)</td>
<td>Steve Burch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operational / Business Manager(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change Control Board Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision:</th>
<th>☒ Approve</th>
<th>☐ Reject</th>
<th>☐ Defer</th>
<th>☒ N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Due to timing constraints, this request was not reviewed by the CCB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advisory Board Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision:</th>
<th>☐ Approve</th>
<th>☐ Reject</th>
<th>☐ Defer</th>
<th>☒ N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Due to timing constraints, this request was not reviewed by the Advisory Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executive Steering Committee Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision:</th>
<th>☑ Approve</th>
<th>☐ Reject</th>
<th>☐ Defer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approver</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry Rhodes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Vaughn</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kynoch</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Motorist Services, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Dickerson-Walden</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer, DHSMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Dobson</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
467 MyDMV PMCR-468 Transaction Activity

Adding rules to determine what should show on the Transaction Activity tab and determining period of time for displaying various transactions. Remove the columns columns from displaying, improve display performance.

- Refinement - Scope Change - Milestone H - Modify - High - Approved

5/8/2018

4 Hours - Refinement

45 CP PMCR-446 8D Violations Process

8D Violations report is currently for 3rd or Subsequent Violations. Business has requested the report to show all violations including the 1st and 2nd in the Report.

- Development - Re-Eval - Milestone I - Modify - Non-Critical - Approved

5/15/2018

1 Hours Development

447 MM PMCR-448 Technical work needed to incorporate WRAP released last couple of months to complete R24409 - Development Stories - Changes - Special Functions - Bulk Transcripts Screen

Implement the release to incorporate the new changes into the system.

- Development - Missed - Milestone H - Modify - Critical - Currently incorporated into production - Approved

5/19/2018

1 Hour Development

452 Renewal PMCR-454 Update RQ24329 to indicate records that cannot be selected for the Audit

If this work is not completed the Renewal Audit will require manual intervention to select proper records for the audit process and the fee discrepancies would appear to be numerous.

- Change Request - Modify - Emergency - Approved

5/15/2018

5 Hours - Refinement

453 Renewal PMCR-454 Decal Number, Decal Year, and Vessel Registration Number elements are not being sent in the data file or referenced in the Renewal Data Specification file document

Add the Decal Number, Decal Year and Vessel Registration elements to the Renewals Vendor Data File and update the Specification document.

- Change Request - Modify - Emergency - Approved

5/15/2018

5 Hours - Refinement

455 Renewal PMCR-456 Update Renewal System to set the ReducedFeeFlag for discounted plates

The purpose of this CR is to address Issue #15 on the Five Discrepancy Tracking spreadsheet

- Change Request - Modify - Emergency - Approved

5/15/2018

5 Hours - Refinement

456 DL PMCR-457 Update to Common Rule on FR Sanction Fees

There was an update to the common rule on FR Fee calculation that occurred during functional testing for DL issuance. This CR is to account for the updates to R24776 to account for when to charge the FR fee based upon Refee data and offense count.

- Functional Testing - Report

5/5/2018

4 Hours - Refinement

459 MyDMV PMCR-460 CIP Address Update

Don’t allow a residential address update for CIP only issuance. If the address is updated and a CIP option is selected pop-up model displays “No residential address is allowed you must select another issuance option.”

- Development - Re-Eval - Milestone G - Modify - Critical - Blocked Current Story - Approved

5/5/2018

4 Hours - Refinement

1.5 Hours Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Team</th>
<th>CR #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Milestone/Sprint to Implement</th>
<th>Story Impact</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Priority Notes</th>
<th>Internal Review Status</th>
<th>Internal Review Date</th>
<th>Estimated Effort by Work Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MMCR-470</td>
<td>Required data field missing from OOS</td>
<td>Required field omitted from mockup developers picked up that is required as part of the federal mandate to track and communicate 10-Year History Checks. CDLIS 5.3 procedures manual. To stay compliant with Federal mandate to provide dates showing attempts to contact other states/entities for specific driver record information. In addition it is a requirement to complete RQ28466 Development Stories - Changes - Inventory - Display OOS CDL Tracking Queue Details.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Missed</td>
<td>MS/ Sprint 26</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>5/31/2018</td>
<td>0.5 Hour - Blueprint correction</td>
<td>7 Hours - Build</td>
<td>5 Hours - Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>MyDMV</td>
<td>MMCR-473</td>
<td>Modify Issuance Service Common Rules</td>
<td>Modify the common rules for DL issuance service to not require a vision exam within 30 days of issuance. This rule only applies to field office and not MyDMV Portal, so this needs to be removed from common rules. We also need to call this common rule for the issuance service. Impacts DL and MyDMV Portal.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Rework</td>
<td>RQ16376 RQ16450 and RQ21889 (Common)</td>
<td>Milestone G</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>6/5/2018</td>
<td>1 Hour - Refinement</td>
<td>4 Hours - Build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Traffic Light Report
Sprint Update
As of Thursday, June 7, 2018 at 12 p.m.

**DL Issuance**

- **Business Actions** – Dependencies on the business (requirements clarification, decisions, etc.)
- **Development** – Application Development
- **Testing** – Application Testing
- **Technical Debt** – Dependencies on infrastructure and associated processes (data model, enterprise code, operational changes, etc.)

**Business Actions**
- Development
- Testing
- Technical Debt

**Development**
- Application Development

**Testing**
- Application Testing

**Technical Debt**
- Dependencies on infrastructure and associated processes (data model, enterprise code, operational changes, etc.)
Motorist Modernization Traffic Light Report

Milestone Update

As of Thursday, June 7, 2018 at 12 p.m.

**DL Issuance**

- **Milestone H**
  - Apr 5 - May 30
- **Milestone G**
  - May 16 - July 3
- **Milestone F**
  - Dec 20 - Feb 6('18)
- **Milestone G**
  - Mar 8 - May 2
- **On Hiatus**
  - N/A
- **Milestone E**
  - Mar 21 - Jun 19

**Motorist Modernization**

- **MyDMV Portal**
- **Renewal Notifications**
- **Motorist Maintenance**
- **Financial Responsibility**
- **CDLIS**
- **Citation Processing**

**KEY**

- **Green** means the team is within capacity for the Sprint and there are no outstanding issues. The team is on schedule for completing Sprint by the target date (based on % complete).
- **Yellow** means the team is slightly over capacity for the Sprint (within 5%). The team is trending behind schedule for completing the Sprint by the target date and has established a plan to catch up (based on % complete).
- **Red** means the team is significantly over capacity for the Sprint (greater than 5%). The team is blocked by a major issue or impediment. Team is behind schedule (or late) for completing the Sprint by the target date (based on % complete).

**Business Actions** – Dependencies on the business (requirements clarification, decisions, etc.)

**Development** – Application Development

**Testing** – Application Testing

**Technical Debt** – Dependencies on infrastructure and associated processes (data model, enterprise code, operational changes, etc.)