Motorist Modernization Advisory Board – Phase II Monthly Meeting
July 10, 2018
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WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. Mr. Terrence Samuel began the meeting by welcoming members and visitors and proceeded with the roll call of board members.

Advisory Board Phase II members included:

  o Stephen Boley       DHSMV
  o Lt. Jason Britt    DHSMV (via phone)
  o Diane Buck         DHSMV (via phone)
  o Jay Levenstein     DHSMV
  o Trisha Williams    DHSMV
  o Lisa Cullen        Florida Tax Collectors
  o Leticia Torres     Florida Tax Collectors
  o Det. Sgt. Ivan Doobrow  Law Enforcement (via phone)
  o Christie Utt      Legal (absent)

- Additional DHSMV members present included – Terrence Samuel, Cheryln Dent, Koral Griggs, Janis Timmons, Felecia Ford, Laura Freeman, Judy Johnson, Catherine Thomas and Jessica Espinoza.

- Visitors present included – Alyene Calvo from Ernst & Young, and Nathan Johnson from Accenture. Brandon Shelley from OATA and Andrew Bell from Florida Auto Tag Agencies were present. Aaron Frisbee, Adria Espich and Carole Jordan from the Florida Tax Collectors were also present.

OVERVIEW OF THE SUNSHINE LAW

- The Sunshine Law was not reviewed at the meeting.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

- Ms. Koral Griggs reviewed the meeting minutes from May 8, 2018. No corrections were identified. A motion to approve the minutes was accepted by the board members and the May 8, 2018, meeting minutes were approved.

IV&V UPDATE

- Ms. Alyene Calvo presented an overview of the April 2018 report. The risk state was amber due to two open deficiencies. 24 out of 1,411 tasks were late. The schedule performance index was .928. The program was within the established performance thresholds. There were not enough EVM data points to accurately calculate future milestone completion dates. The Schedule Quality Score was 96.1.
STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
- Mr. Terrence Samuel asked the Board members if there were any industry groups that Motorist Modernization needed to reach out to for input on Phase II.
- Ms. Lisa Cullen mentioned reaching out to the expressway authorities.
- Mr. Jay Levenstein stated the IFTA/IRP team had previously identified external stakeholders.

POLICY & DECISION REVIEW
- POR02 – Fleet Services – Ms. Judy Johnson stated the ESC decided the banks and credit unions would not be allowed to issue temporary tags. The team was continuing to research Sunshine State and leasing companies gaining access to temporary tags. Legal was still reviewing statutory authority for this as well.
- POR03 – Motor Vehicle Record Sales (MVRN Report) – Ms. Judy Johnson stated she spoke with Deepa Vasudevan from Bureau of Records Division to determine how many of these MVRN Report requests were made. Ms. Vasudevan reported that approximately 1,500 requests were manually processed per month resulting in 10,000 – 15,000 documents total. Due to the number of MVRN Report requests currently being processed manually, the MyDMV Portal team decided to move forward with incorporating this feature into the MyDMV Portal.
- POR04/POR05 – Ms. Judy Johnson stated both of these items involved providing casual title sales services through the MyDMV Portal. Ms. Diana Vaughn asked the team to reach out to Department of Revenue for requirements gathering. The team also researched and outlined how to provide casual title sales services through the MyDMV Portal with the guidance of Mr. Robert Kynoch. The conditions that where outlined included:
  - Vehicle must have an electronic title
  - Vehicle must be clear of any liens and stops
  - Vehicle must be verified through NMVTIS and NLETS
  - The title status must be eligible for transfer
  - All sellers and purchasers must be a natural person
  - All sellers and purchasers must have a MyDMV Portal account
- Ms. Lisa Cullen was concerned that the team had not addressed handling the odometer disclosure.
- Ms. Johnson discussed Florida obtaining a waiver through AAMVA. She stated the E-odometer Committee is working with AAMVA on guidelines for this. Ms. Johnson stated once these guidelines are established, the team would incorporate them into their policies and procedures.
- Ms. Cullen asked if the concern of a title being transferred to an incorrect person would be addressed.
- Ms. Johnson stated the individual who is transferring the vehicle would logon to the Portal and identify who they are selling the vehicle to. Once that information is received, emails would be sent to the seller and purchaser, and both parties would have to log into MyDMV Portal and confirm the transaction.
- Ms. Cullen asked if the seller’s title would be suspended after the seller initiates the transfer process.
- Ms. Johnson stated a hold status would be placed on the seller’s vehicle to prohibit any other transactions.
- Ms. Cullen asked if there will be a specific time period where the purchaser would need to respond to the transaction in the MyDMV Portal.
- Ms. Johnson stated if the purchaser does not respond within a certain timeframe, a reminder email would be sent. If the purchaser still does not respond, the pending transaction would be voided.
- Ms. Cullen asked if the vehicle would remain in the owner’s name.
- Ms. Johnson confirmed.
- Ms. Cullen asked about the registration.
- Ms. Johnson stated once the title transaction is complete and a registration also needed to be completed, a registration transaction could be processed through MyDMV Portal.
- Ms. Cullen asked if this would be part of the commerce download that is sent to the tax collector.
- Ms. Johnson confirmed. She stated that the only piece that would be downloaded would be the pulling and printing of the plate.
- Ms. Diane Buck asked what would be done if the customer needed to void the title transaction for any reason.
- Ms. Johnson stated the customer would have to go into an office to void the title transaction.
- Ms. Leticia Torres asked if a customer would be able to put a lien on the vehicle.
- Ms. Johnson stated she was unsure.
- POR06 – What transaction services will be offered in the Phase II Kiosk solution, and what level of user authentication is required? – Ms. Johnson stated there was discussion on incorporating different transactions into the kiosk solution. This list of transactions was presented to the ESC and is currently under review.
- REG01 – For a residential address change on a motor vehicle transaction, are we going to force the customer to get a replacement driver’s license? – Ms. Catherine Thomas stated after further discussion with the ESC, a request was made to get stats from Natasha White as to how many people change their address on their motor vehicle transaction, and not their address on their driver license at the same time. After obtaining stats, 1.4 million people change one address but not the other, and 1 million were being updated by EFS when the addresses were the same. Ms. Thomas stated WRAP 3978 will stop EFS from doing this. Ms. Thomas stated this item would be taken back to the ESC.
  - Mr. Jay Levenstein asked if the 1.4 million statistic above were people who have renewed their motor vehicle and changed their address, but did not change their address on their driver license.
  - Ms. Thomas confirmed.
- REG04 – Should the system do an NMVTIS check prior to approval of a renewal? – Ms. Catherine Thomas stated the team met with Shibu Abraham and Desi Tatilian to discuss the impact on the system with running a NMVTIS check on all renewals. This could potentially triple the load on NMVTIS. Ms. Thomas stated the team is waiting on a response from AAMVA to see if they can proceed.
  - Ms. Lisa Cullen asked if registrations would be stopped if NMVITS is down.
  - Ms. Thomas stated if NMVTIS is down, we would collect the registrations through a batch process and review them.
  - Mr. Terrence Samuel asked how long it had been since the team reached out to AAMVA.
  - Mr. Thomas stated the team reached out to AAMVA recently.
- TLE01 – Should the Motor Vehicle Issuance system pre-populate the vehicle information based on data retrieved from VINtelligence? – Ms. Catherine Thomas stated the Motor
Vehicle Fraud Mitigation team presented the WRAPs to the ESC. The ESC decided the team should wait and see the value of manually keying in the VIN for the next twelve months, and then determine if they should plan to pre-populate the vehicle information in Phase II. Ms. Thomas stated she will discuss with the ESC on closing this item.

- **REG05** – Should the system do a NLETS check prior to registration renewal? – Ms. Thomas stated this would help with fraud issues on the registration side and help with Quality Assessment review processes.
  - Ms. Lisa Cullen asked if law enforcement would handle these fraud issues with the customer or if they would be addressed at the counters.
  - Ms. Thomas stated the team was still working out the details, but the registration would process as normal, and the customer's record would be flagged on the backend.
  - Lt. Jason Britt asked for clarification on this issue.
  - Ms. Thomas stated if something was flagged in the record on the NLETS side, we would not want the clerk to get involved for security reasons. She stated the registration would go through as normal, but would be flagged on the backend for law enforcement to check into.
  - Lt. Britt stated this would need to be discussed further.
  - Mr. Terrence Samuel asked if the team would discuss this issue with law enforcement and obtain their feedback prior to the next meeting.
  - Ms. Thomas stated the team would discuss with Beth Brinkley and Sgt. Teslo and provide any feedback at the next meeting.

**FINANCIAL REVIEW**

- Ms. Janis Timmons provided a Phase I and Phase II financials update. The budget for Phase I for the 2017-2018 fiscal year is $9.8 million, and $7.5 million for the 2018-2019 fiscal year. A legislative budget request for $1.8 million is being processed for Phase I for the 2019-2020 fiscal year. The actual expenditures for Phase I is $9 million. 90 percent was expended on contracted services and IV&V. The OCO was fully expended. The budget to actual variance for the fiscal year to date is (.01) percent. The month to date is at (.04) percent variance. For Phase II, the budget for the 2017-18 fiscal year is $4.1 million, and $5 million for the 2018-2019 fiscal year. A legislative budget request for $8.4 million is being processed for Phase II for the 2019-2020 fiscal year. The actual expenditures were $2.4 million. 50 percent was expended on contracted services, and 80 percent was expended on IV&V. The OCO was fully expended. The budget to actual variance for the fiscal year to date is (.06) percent. The month to date variance is (.14) percent.

**PROJECT UPDATES**

- Mr. Nathan Johnson stated the teams have been working on the initial requirements report deliverable, which is being reviewed by the business team currently. The team is currently working on the detailed requirements validation schedule, and the test plan was closed out as well.
- Dealer Services – Ms. Felecia Ford stated she is working with the SCRUM master to ensure the functional requirement numbers are listed on the GAP analysis. They also met with the Portal/Fleet Services team to discuss requirement dependencies.
- Portal/Fleet Services – Ms. Judy Johnson stated the MyDMV Portal team is reviewing Deliverable 7. She stated the team has a touchpoint meeting today.
• IFTA/IRP – Ms. Laura Freeman stated four demos have occurred. She stated 25-30 people attended each demo. The next step for the team is to work on RFP or RFQ. The team submitted Deliverable 7 and will provide comments. Ms. Freeman stated the team is lacking in gathering the Uniface requirements.
• Titles & Registrations – Ms. Catherine Thomas stated the team was working on Deliverable 7.
  o Mr. Terrence Samuel asked when will the next time the Tax Collector SMEs will visit.
  o Ms. Thomas stated possibly in July or August. She suggested they should visit every three months. She stated she would like the Tax Collector SMEs to be involved in writing the team’s business rules.
  o Ms. Lisa Cullen proposed the week of July 16, and have them return on August 13 or the 20.
  o Mr. Samuel stated the team would check this timeframe and get back with them. He asked if all tax collectors have access to Blueprint.
  o Ms. Thomas stated five tax collector SME’s currently have access, and a call is scheduled with the others today. She stated Silverlight is installed, but Curt Chester will need to contact their IT departments due to Manatee County, Hillsborough County and Lee County still experiencing issues with Blueprint.
•Globals/Batch – Ms. Jessica Espinoza stated the team was reviewing Deliverable 7. She stated PRIDE reached out to the team recently. The team is waiting for PRIDE to provide a demo before another meeting is scheduled.

COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE
• There was no communications update at the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT
• Mr. Samuel adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:16 p.m.
• The next Advisory Board Phase II Meeting is scheduled for July 10, 2018.

Note: Handouts at this meeting included:
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► Project budget

Data contained in this MAR is as of 14 June 2018
General IV&V overview

► There is one (1) open IV&V deficiency.
  ► P2D1 – Incomplete program governance
  ► 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 0.983
  ► 11 of 1,411 total tasks (0.78%) contained in the project schedule are late
  ► 0 of 65 total tasks (0.00%) 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
► Current milestone status is unknown.
  ► There are not enough EVM data points to accurately calculate future milestone completion dates.

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

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

**Program governance**
- Benefit realization and sustainability
  - G3: Capacity and maturity
  - G6: Performance management
  - G9: Benefits design and realization

**Decisive framework**
- G4: Governance effectiveness

**Capability and maturity**
- G1: Business case integrity
- G2: Organizational change management
- G5: Compliance and regulatory

**Time management**
- G7: Data management
- G8: Security and controls

**Cost management**
- G7: Data management
- G8: Security and controls

**Requirements engineering and design**
- G7: Data management
- G8: Security and controls

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

**Risk state with trending**

As of 14 June 2018

- Program governance
  - G4: Governance integration
  - G7: Data management

- Technical solution
  - Testing and validation
  - Cutover and support

**Indicators**
- Indicates the area being assessed has critical issues that will result in significant risk to the project most likely resulting in either the inability to achieve the outcomes, inability to meet the projected schedule, or a significant cost over-run. Requires immediate action.
- Indicates that the area being assessed has issues that need to be resolved; inefficiencies exist. Current process/method can be used with refinement.
- Indicates that the area being assessed did not have significant issues to report. Continued monitoring should be performed.
- Indicates that the area being assessed has incomplete information available for a conclusive finding or is not applicable.
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): 2
  - Green (no issues): 18
  - Gray (not evaluated): 7
- Open deficiencies: 1
- Conclusions:
  - The MM Program Team is currently working to resolve the 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>
<tr>
<td>Is the project on time?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Program is currently behind schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► The schedule performance index (SPI) is 0.983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► 11 of 1,411 total tasks (0.78%) contained in the project schedule are late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► 0 of 65 total tasks (0.00%) for the current period are late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project on budget?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Program is within established cost performance thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► The cost performance index (CPI) is 1.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► The Program is currently on budget based on provided budget and spending information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is scope being managed so there is no scope creep?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The work being completed as part of the MM Program (Phase II) is within the scope of the project as defined in the Schedule IV-B Feasibility Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the project’s future risks?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>The MM Program Team is currently working to resolve the deficiencies identified by the IV&amp;V Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the project’s risks increasing or decreasing?</td>
<td>Steady</td>
<td>The MM Program Team is currently working to resolve the deficiencies identified by the IV&amp;V Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there new or emerging technological solutions that will affect the project’s technology assumptions?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>New and emerging technologies were considered in the Feasibility Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► None have an adverse effect on the project’s technological assumptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of key deficiency recommendations

Recommendation status versus priority

Overall status of recommendations

Recommendation status by deficiency

Recommendation priority by deficiency
Overall performance

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPI</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>Project performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Behind schedule and underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Behind schedule and underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Behind schedule and overspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Ahead of schedule and underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Ahead of schedule and overspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Ahead of schedule and overspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Ahead of schedule and overspent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- As of 8 June 2018:
  - SPI = 0.983
  - CPI = 1.000

- 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.
  - The total amount of work not completed as scheduled is 198.4 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 increasing since the beginning of the project.
  - Conclusions:
    - None.

- Blue line is duration percent complete.
- Red line is work percent complete.
Project complete date slippage

- This chart shows the forecast slippage of the project complete milestone based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

  **Summary:**
  - There are not enough EVM data points to accurately calculate future milestone completion dates.

  **Conclusions:**
  - Milestone forecast dates are not accurate because calculations have not stabilized.
This chart shows the projected completion dates for future milestones based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

Summary:
- There are not enough EVM data points to accurately calculate future milestone completion dates.

Conclusions:
- Milestone forecast dates are not accurate because calculations have not stabilized.
Open deficiencies and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► P2D1 – Incomplete program governance</td>
<td>► AB Charter has been established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Added inconsistent AB meetings to the program risk register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Identified additional personnel to be assigned to the AB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Conducted April AB meeting and reviewed revised AB Charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Deputy CIO &amp; PMO currently in the process of revising Tier 3 Charter / Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charter Template to incorporate prioritization matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Regular AB meetings scheduled and conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Gartner recommendations for prioritization procedures under review and will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporated into the Tier 3 governance procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► P2D2 – Incomplete program management discipline</td>
<td>► All recommendations have been addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Deficiency is closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MMP2-IVV-312AF May Status v2.0 Final - 20180621
## Process improvement recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress update / resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► No process improvement recommendations identified since the last report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 – Jun 2018 (IVV-302AF)</td>
<td>07/16/2018</td>
<td>07/31/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting information

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies addressed</td>
<td>▶ P2D2 – Incomplete program management discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New deficiencies</td>
<td>▶ No new deficiencies identified since the last report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Risk ratings          | ▶ P2 – Time management changed from Amber (issues and inefficiencies) to Green (no issues)  
                        | ▶ P4 – Human resource management changed from Amber (issues and inefficiencies) to Green (no issues)  |
| Maturity ratings      | ▶ P2 – Time management changed from Level 2 (repeatable) to Level 3 (defined)  
                        | ▶ P4 – Human resource management changed from Level 2 (repeatable) to Level 3 (defined)  |
| Interviews conducted  | ▶ No interviews conducted since last report                                 |
| Artifacts received    | ▶ Numerous artifacts received.                                              |
Open deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas and implications</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2D1 – Incomplete program governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ► G4 – Decision framework  
► G7 – Governance Effectiveness  
► Implications:  
  ► Limited capacity to facilitate timely decision making.  
  ► Misalignment in project operational decisions to the intended project objectives.  
  ► Inconsistent decision awareness. | 1. Complete the definition of the AB including a regular cadence for meetings.  
2. Confirm that all appropriate AB members, delegates, and other requested resources attend all project Board meetings and are involved in all project decisions when necessary.  
3. Revise the Tier 3 governance project approval process to include a quantitative impact analysis on the MM Program.  
  a. The analysis should include impacts on project and operational resources, scope, schedule and budget.  
4. Use the quantitative impact analysis to guide the prioritization of projects approved by Tier 3 governance that may impact the MM Program. | 1. Closed.  
2. Closed.  
3. Currently incorporating recommendations from Gartner.  
4. Currently incorporating recommendations from Gartner. |
## Open deficiencies (continued)

### P2D2 – Incomplete program management discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas and implications</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2 – Time management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 – HR management</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masks true situational awareness, thereby negatively impacting project decisions.</td>
<td>4. Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to establish true visibility and determine forecasting capability in achieving project expectations.</td>
<td>5. Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources required for achieving project objectives are not estimated properly, leading to cost overruns, delayed timelines, and inadequate quality.</td>
<td>6. Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to inaccurate forecasts for milestone completion across the multiple phases of the program.</td>
<td>7. Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Revise the existing time management methodology to include an approach for managing the allocation of shared resources for Phase I and Phase II tasks.
2. Use the time management methodology to support the measurement, monitoring and reporting of project status and overall situational awareness of dependencies between Phase I and Phase II.
3. Incorporate all dependencies between Phase I and Phase II tasks into the project schedules.
4. Validate that shared resource allocations are leveled across Phase I and Phase II.
5. Revise the existing Human Resource (HR) management methodology to include an approach for managing the allocation of shared resources for Phase I and Phase II tasks.
6. Use the revised HR management methodology to manage and control project resources.
7. Incorporate Phase I share resource allocations into the Phase II resource plan.
8. Evaluate the current meeting structure and cadence to determine if the meeting schedules between Phase I and Phase II can be optimized.
## 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>1.4</td>
<td>Initiation Phase Complete</td>
<td>05/24/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.14</td>
<td>Obtain Requirements Approval and Signoff</td>
<td>06/19/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.10</td>
<td>Obtain Validated Requirements Approval and Signoff</td>
<td>07/30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.14.5</td>
<td>Development Complete</td>
<td>12/03/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.15.5</td>
<td>Testing Complete</td>
<td>07/29/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.18.5</td>
<td>Decision Point - Ready to Pilot</td>
<td>08/19/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.18.7</td>
<td>Decision Point - Move to Production (Roll out)</td>
<td>11/07/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.18.12</td>
<td>Statewide Implementation Complete</td>
<td>06/05/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Execution and Monitoring &amp; Control Phase Complete</td>
<td>06/12/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Closeout Phase Complete</td>
<td>06/29/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project Complete</td>
<td>07/19/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Items highlighted are either currently late or projected to be late.
2. Original – Original contract completion date.
3. Scheduled – Scheduled completion date based on the latest schedule baseline.
4. Planned – Planned completion date (should be the same as scheduled).
5. Forecast – Based on ES calculations and the current SPI.
6. Actual – The actual completion date.
Late 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: 1,411
- Total tasks late: 11
- Total open tasks late: 10

**Conclusions:**
- The total number of tasks designated as late is 0.78% 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: 96.2

Conclusions:
- Overall schedule quality is consistent and excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Quality – Entire Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-Jun-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jun-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-May-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-May-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>0 20 40 60 80 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic schedule</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical path</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task durations</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule baseline</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time tasks</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule Parameters</th>
<th>0 20 40 60 80 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary tasks</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone tasks</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal tasks</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</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 schedule quality
Period: 07/01/2018 to 09/30/2018

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: 95.7

Conclusions:
- Overall schedule quality is consistent and excellent

Key Indicators:
- Dynamic schedule: 100.0
- Critical path: 100.0
- Resource allocation: 98.9
- Task durations: 94.5
- Schedule baseline: 100.0
- On time tasks: 100.0

Schedule Parameters:
- Summary tasks: 100.0
- Milestone tasks: 93.8
- Normal tasks: 95.3
- Resources: 98.9

Supporting information:
- 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
Total project budget versus actual expenditures

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

Note: The graph shows the comparison between the total project budget and the actual expenditures over time.
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
Project budget
Contract staff funding

Supporting information

Total contract staff budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

- Total contracted staff - budget
- Total contracted staff - actual
- Cumulative total contracted staff - budget
- Cumulative total contracted staff - actual
Project budget
Expense funding

Total expense budget versus actual expenditures
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Total OCO budget versus actual expenditures

- **Total OCO - budget**
- **Total OCO - actual**
- **Cumulative total OCO - budget**
- **Cumulative total OCO - actual**
Project budget
Other items funding

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
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Budget and actual distribution
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>All Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>POR02</td>
<td>The Portal team needs assistance in defining the scope of the Fleet services functionality within the Portal. There have been several business cases discussed: Sunshine State Screen Scrape, Banks/Credit Unions (Temp Tags, Repossessions, etc.), Leasing Companies (Temp Tags to pick-up cars)</td>
<td>4/13/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>The team will need to schedule a meeting with the stakeholders. Any changes received after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018 deliverable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>POR03</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Records Sales: MVR Report, History Report (Title, Registration, Plate), Images</td>
<td>4/13/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>The team is moving forward based on the discussion with Deepa. Any changes received after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018 deliverable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/2/2018 Update</td>
<td>Robert Kynoch will do more research to determine how much effort is involved in the manual process. 05/15/2018 Update I spoke with Deepa Vasudevan in BOR and she stated they process an est. of 15,000 requests per month resulting in 10,000 - 15,000 documents. We currently charge the following: .50 for the MVR report $1.00 per image $1.00 for history report (Title, Registration, Plate) $3.00 for Certified They are requested by lawyers, OOS dealers, individuals etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>POR04</td>
<td>A request was submitted to the Portal team to allow the seller and buyer to complete and verify all information required (odometer) for a title transfer online with electronic signatures for processing of title transfers via the Portal. The team is concerned about insuring the exchange of money and the title certificate.</td>
<td>5/1/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>The team is moving forward based on the discussion held during the team meeting and feedback from the product owner. Any changes received after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018 deliverable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</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>All 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>POR05</td>
<td>As we design the new system, let's explore whether we can design a secure system that will allow a 100% online process for transferring titles; and (and obtaining registrations) for two vehicles that are currently titled in Florida we could pair this with our ELT system to ensure the title is free of liens. It would allow for the uploading of documents and the accepting of payments (credit card or echeck). This process may set up some type of work queue on the backend that the TC staff would work. It should also send notifications to the vehicle owner as the paperwork is processed and approved. Maybe we would require someone to have a MyDMV portal account before they could use it. The customer should also have the ability to have the resulting title or registration Fed Exed to them the next business day. It should also send a notice to the prior owner or registrant that ownership has been transferred. I'd like to also see something similar for MCOs. The wet e-odometer form will be something we need to overcome.</td>
<td>5/1/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>The team is moving forward based on the discussion held during the team meeting and feedback from the product owner. Any changes received after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>5/2/2018 Update</td>
<td>The team will move forward with the processing of allowing casual sales in the Portal. We will schedule a combined meeting with the Title team.</td>
<td>5/15/2018 Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>POR06</td>
<td>What transaction services will be offered in the Phase II Kiosk solution and what level of user authentication is required?</td>
<td>3/7/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 6/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>4/10/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed with the ESC decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REG01</td>
<td>For a residential address change on a MV transaction, are we going to force the customer to get a replacement DL? The customer has 30 days to change his/her DL address and 30 days to change his/her MV address. What if the county only offers MV services?</td>
<td>3/7/2018</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>4/10/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed with the ESC decision.</td>
<td></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>All Date</td>
<td>DEC 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>REG</td>
<td>REG01</td>
<td>Update Stats from Jan 2017 - Dec 2017</td>
<td>05/08/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>Total - 2.4 million</td>
<td>All likes the idea, but have a concern that if NMVTIS is down, they won't be able to process unless we create a bypass and check on the backend. This would be a big impact to the TC Offices. Same concern as above.</td>
<td>6/8/2018</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>05/02/2018 Update</td>
<td>Check with AAMVA to see if we can do the NMVTIS check on registrations. Florida titles should be cancelled in the system if they have been titled out of state.</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>TLE</td>
<td>TLE01</td>
<td>Should the MV Issuance system pre-populate the vehicle information (including vehicle model) based on data retrieved from VINtelligence (decoding of the vin).</td>
<td>3/7/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>If we let the system pre-populate the vehicle information, then we are risking the clerk not paying attention to the paperwork in front of them.</td>
<td>Recommended that the clerk manually keys the information. Flag the record the error is made on and create a daily report for the Tax Collectors to review.</td>
<td>4/10/2018</td>
<td>Manually key in the information, but verify with VINtelligence that the information is correct.</td>
<td>05/02/2018 Update</td>
<td>03/16/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/02/2018 Update Recommendation was made for the ESC Board members to attend a special meeting for the MV Fraud Unit to discuss in detail the VINtelligence. Diana will schedule this meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/02/2018 Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/02/2018 Update The MV Fraud Mitigation team presented the WRAPs to the ESC today. It was decided we would wait and see the value of manually keying in the VIN for the next 12 months and then determine if we will plan to pre-populate the vehicle information in Phase II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/02/2018 Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REG05</td>
<td>Should the system perform an NLETS (National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System) check on registration-only transactions? Currently, NLETS is only ran on title transactions.</td>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>This would help with fraud issues on the registration side and assist with QA review processes.</td>
<td>Recommended we discuss with FHP on how to handle if a hit returns on the record. Does the registration still process and the record get flagged, or is a process performed on the backend? There is a concern from tax collector leadership that the clerks may have to address the issue with the customer over the counter, which could become a safety concern.</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>Recommended to close.</td>
<td>06/19/2018 Update</td>
<td>03/16/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow entities, such as UPS to issue Temp Tags on demand?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow entities, such as Enterprise Holdings (Car Rental) to process title and registration transactions electronically?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Financials
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## 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>
Budget and Actuals: Current Fiscal Year through June 30, 2018

BUDGET: $9,857,775

$8,933,283

Contracted Services

IV&V Services

Expense (Software, Travel)

OCO

ACTUALS: $9,856,479

$8.9M

$479K

$418K

$27K

Remaining
## Budget and Actuals: Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Variance (Budget to Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Total Funding</td>
<td>$9,857,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$9,857,775</td>
<td>$9,856,479</td>
<td>(.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (June 2018)</td>
<td>$839,965</td>
<td>$839,794</td>
<td>(.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$1,296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Phase II Financial Review

Phase II LBR Requests – Total Project

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

Budget and Actuals: Current Fiscal Year through June 30, 2018

BUDGET: $4,132,180

Contracted Services $3,599,302
IV&V Services $357,190
Expense (Software, Travel) $154,230
OCO $21,458

ACTUALS: $4,131,839

Contracted Services $3,600,000
IV&V Services $357,000
Expense (Software, Travel) $152,000
OCO $21,000

Remaining
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## Motorist Modernization Phase II 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>$4,132,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$4,132,180</td>
<td>$4,131,839</td>
<td>(0.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (June 2018)</td>
<td>$1,735,310</td>
<td>$1,736,326</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
## Motorist Modernization Traffic Light Report
### Requirement Gathering Update
As of Friday, June 29, 2018

### Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS-IS Documentation</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis Report (Increment 1)</td>
<td>4/9/2018</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>TO-BE Documentation</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create to-be process flow diagrams</td>
<td>5/18/2018</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft process flows</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create user stories</td>
<td>5/18/2018</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft user stories</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create acceptance criteria and business rules</td>
<td>5/18/2018</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft acceptance criteria and business rules</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create application mockups</td>
<td>5/18/2018</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft application mockups</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize req's and milestones</td>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder review</td>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Flows</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mockups</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Stories</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Criteria/ROs</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document existing business rules for UNIFACE</td>
<td>5/25/2018</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del 7 - Requirements Report</td>
<td>6/4/2018</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>Del 6 - Gap Analysis Report (Increment 2)</td>
<td>7/15/2018</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key
- **Green**: The team is on schedule for completing by the target date (based on % complete).
- **Yellow**: The team is trending behind schedule for completing by the target date and has established a plan to catch up (based on % complete).
- **Red**: The team is blocked by a major issue or impediment. Team is behind schedule (or late) for completing by the target date (based on % complete).