Motorist Modernization Advisory Board – Phase II Monthly Meeting
November 13, 2018
Neil Kirkman Building, Conference Room B-202
2900 Apalachee Parkway, Tallahassee Florida 32399
2:30 – 4:00 p.m., EST

Invitees
Stephen Boley
Lt. Jason Britt
Diane Buck
Jay Levenstein
Steve Burch
Lisa Cullen
Leticia Torres
Det. Sgt. Ivan Doobrow
TBD

Representing
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
Florida Tax Collectors
Florida Tax Collectors
Law Enforcement
Law Enforcement

Agenda

• Roll Call
• Welcome
• Review and Approval of Last Meeting Minutes
• IV&V Update
• Stakeholder Outreach Update
• Policy and Decisions Review
• MM Phase II Program Update
  o Financial Review
  o Project Updates
• Communications Update
• Q&A
• Adjourn
MOTORIST MODERNIZATION ADVISORY BOARD PHASE II

Monthly Meeting Minutes
Kirkman Building Conference Room B-202
September 11, 2018
2:30 to 4 p.m., EST

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

• The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. Kristin Green began the meeting by welcoming members and visitors and proceeded with the roll call of board members.

Advisory Board Phase II members included

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

• Additional DHSMV members present included – Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Felecia Ford, Laura Freeman, Jessica Espinoza, Judy Johnson, Cheryl Dent, Chad Hutchinson, Craig Benner and Cathy Thomas.

• Visitors present included – Alyene Calvo and Colin Stephens from Ernst & Young, and Nathan Johnson and Michelle McGinley from Accenture. Scott Morgan attended. Rhonda Thomas from Brevard County Tax Collector, Andrew Bell from Florida Auto Tag Agencies, Michael Samaan from Auto Data Direct, Bob Priselac from Title Technology, Brandon Shelley from Orange Auto Tag Agency, Kayla Scarpone from FTCA and Ben Anderson with Okaloosa County Tax Collector also attended.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

• Rachel Graham reviewed the meeting minutes from August 14, 2018. There were no corrections identified. A motion to approve the minutes was accepted by the board members and the August 14, 2018, meeting minutes were approved.

IV&V UPDATE

• Alyene Calvo presented an overview of the August 2018 report for Phase II. The overall risk state was amber. There was one open deficiency regarding incomplete program governance. 3 out of 1,419 tasks were late. The Schedule Performance Index was .999. The program was within the established performance thresholds. The program completion date is projected to be 6.2 days late and the Schedule Quality Score was 96.3.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

• Terrence Samuel discussed the Tax Collector Education Forum on August 27. He stated demos of the DL Issuance system and MyDMV Portal were performed for Phase I. He stated changes for the Phase II Titles and Registrations team were also discussed.
On October 1 – 3, 2018, Phase II Tax Collector Focus Group meetings will be held in Brevard County to discuss MyDMV Portal, Titles and Registration and Global/Batch items.

POLICY & DECISION REVIEW

- POR02 – Defining Scope of Fleet Services; POR04 – Casual Title Transactions Through MyDMV Portal; POR06 – Transaction Services Offered in Phase II Kiosk Solution – Judy Johnson stated there were currently no new updates. She stated they were pending internal meetings to discuss some of these items further.
- REG04 – Should the system do a NMVTIS check prior to approval of a renewal? – Cathy Thomas stated this item would be closed and combined with REG05. The team decided it was not necessary to run NMVTIS on the renewals and run it on registration-only transactions. She stated there will be a phone conference with AAMVA on September 28 to discuss what information NMVTIS can offer versus what information NLETS can offer. She stated the team will report back after the call.
- TLE02 – Where Required Documents Would be Scanned – Ms. Thomas stated a meeting is being scheduled to discuss this further before a decision is made.
  - Lisa Cullen stated she would rather have the documents scanned on the backend rather than at the counters due to scanning at the counters slowing down the process.
  - Mr. Samuel asked what percentage of tax collectors have the capability to scan documents in their own offices.
  - Ms. Cullen stated she would probably need to survey that information. She stated any office that does high speed processing should have scanning capability. She stated counties that do not perform high speed processing may not have an issue scanning at the counter rather than on the backend.
  - Andrew Bell asked what the current turnaround time is from when the tax collectors submit the paperwork to the department until it is scanned in.
  - Ms. Thomas stated she believes it is about a week or less.
- DS01 – Regarding Retaining the Original License Number for Expired Dealers that Reapply After Their Delinquent Period – Felecia Ford stated the team met with the Business to discuss the recommendation to have the dealers retain their original dealer number if they re-apply after the license and delinquent dates have expired. Rick White will provide his recommendation to Robert Kynoch who will advise ESC on his final decision regarding the retention of the original dealer license number.

FINANCIAL REVIEW

- There was no financial review at the meeting.

PROJECT UPDATES

- Mr. Nathan Johnson stated all teams were currently working on requirements validation and detailed business requirements. He overviewed the increments each team was currently working on. Mr. Johnson stated the team would also begin discussing the release plan for Phase II. The tax collector SMEs will be on site next week. He stated a second quarterly All-Hands Meeting will be held in October.
- Titles & Registration – Cathy Thomas discussed the tax collector SMEs approving screens and RQs so the team can finalize them in Blueprint. She stated there will be a walkthrough of an original title and an original registration transaction at the Tax Collector Focus Group meetings in October.
- Dealer Services – Felecia Ford stated the team was scheduled to be completed with increment 1 by October 23. She stated the team is working on requirements validation and
mockups. She stated the SMEs from the field offices and manufactured housing that regulate the dealer licensing program will be meeting soon.

- Globals/Batch/Inventory – Jessica Espinoza stated the team is focusing on field specific functional areas, such as inventory orders and transfers.
- IFTA/IRP – Laura Freeman stated the team has been working on requirements validation and the content for an ITN. The team has been working on identifying letters.
- Portal/Fleet Services – Judy Johnson stated the team is working on registration services and writing eligibility rules for those transactions, which will be used in the field application as well.

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

Q&A
- Ms. Cullen commented on the success of the Tax Collector Education Forum.
- Mr. Samuel stated the team will invite Lisa Cullen and the IT Coalition Chair, Joe Sverak, to future implementation meetings.

ADJOURNMENT
- Mr. Samuel adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:57 p.m.
- The next Advisory Board Phase II Meeting is scheduled for October 9, 2018.

Note: Handouts at this meeting included:
Consolidated in a meeting packet and emailed to members:
- MM Advisory Board Phase II Agenda 1 Page
- MM Advisory Board Phase II Meeting Minutes (8/14/18) 4 Pages
- MM Phase II IV&V Update 31 Pages
- MM Phase II Decision Log 4 Pages
- MM Phase II Legal Opinion Log 5 Pages
- MM Phase II Financials 9 Pages
- Phase II Traffic Light Report 1 Page
Motorist Modernization Program (Phase II)
State of Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV)

Independent verification and validation (IV&V)
Monthly Assessment Report Summary
September 2018

30 October 2018
Topics for discussion

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

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

Data contained in this MAR is as of 18 October 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 0.938
  ► 10 of 1,430 total tasks (0.70%) contained in the project schedule are late
  ► 5 of 375 total tasks (1.33%) 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 24 October 2023, 97.7 days late
  ► Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule
  ► The amount of time the project is behind schedule is increasing

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

Risk state of the MM Program (Phase II)

Program governance
- Benefit realization and sustainability
  - As of 28 October 2018

Technical solution
- Requirements development, quality and transition

Project management
- Processes, controls, and predictability

Risk state with trending

As of 28 October 2018

- Program governance
- Technical solution
- Project management

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

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

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

Indicates that the area being assessed has incomplete information available for a conclusive finding or is not applicable.
This chart shows a summary of the IV&V cube facet ratings (red, amber, green and gray), and open deficiencies.

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

Conclusions:
- The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team.
## 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? | No | ► The Program is currently behind schedule.  
  ► The schedule performance index (SPI) is 0.938.  
  ► 5 of 1,430 total tasks (0.70%) contained in the project schedule are late.  
  ► 5 of 375 total tasks (1.33%) 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 II) is within the scope of the project as defined in the Schedule IV-B Feasibility Study. |
| What are the project’s future risks? | Unknown | ► The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team. |
| Are the project’s risks increasing or decreasing? | Steady | ► The MM Program Team has resolved all open deficiencies identified by the IV&V Team. |
| Are there new or emerging technological solutions that will affect the project’s technology assumptions? | No | ► New and emerging technologies were considered in the Feasibility Study.  
  ► None have an adverse effect on the project’s technological assumptions. |
Status of key deficiency recommendations

**Recommendation status versus priority**

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

**Overall status of recommendations**

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

**Recommendation status by deficiency**

- P2D2: 8
- P2D1: 4

**Recommendation priority by deficiency**

- High: 0
- Medium: 8
- Low: 0
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.

- 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 11 October 2018
SPI = 0.938
CPI = 1.000

Project performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPI</th>
<th>CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahead of schedule and underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind schedule and underspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahead of schedule and overspent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind schedule and overspent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 1,106.9 hours.

**Conclusions:**
- The Program is behind schedule.

---

- Blue area indicates the cumulative PV as of the current reporting period.
- Grey area indicates the cumulative EV as of the current reporting period.
- PV is the work scheduled to be accomplished.
- EV is the value of the work actually performed.
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.
This chart shows the forecast slippage of the project complete milestone based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

Summary:
- The program is behind schedule.

Conclusions:
- The program completion date is forecast to be 24 October 2023, 97.7 days late.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is decreasing.
This chart shows the projected completion dates for future milestones based on historical performance using the schedule performance index (SPI).

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

**Conclusions:**
- The program completion date is forecast to be 24 October 2023, 97.7 days late.
- Future milestones are projected to be completed behind schedule.
- The amount of time the project is behind schedule is decreasing.
# Open deficiencies and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► P2D1 – Incomplete program governance</td>
<td>► This deficiency is closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Process improvement recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress update / resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 – Jul 2018 (IVV-302AG)</td>
<td>08/14/2018</td>
<td>08/29/2018</td>
<td>08/29/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Aug 2018 (IVV-302AH)</td>
<td>09/17/2018</td>
<td>10/02/2018</td>
<td>10/01/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR – Sep 2018 (IVV-302AI)</td>
<td>10/18/2018</td>
<td>11/02/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting information

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

#### Supporting information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies addressed</td>
<td>► P2D1 – Incomplete program governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New deficiencies</td>
<td>► No new deficiencies identified since the last report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Risk ratings             | ► G4 – Decision framework changed from Amber (issues and inefficiencies) to Green (no issues).  
                            | ► G7 – Governance effectiveness changed from Amber (issues and inefficiencies) to Green (no issues). |
| Maturity ratings         | ► G4 – Decision framework changed from Level 3 (defined) to Level 4 (managed).  
                            | ► G7 – Governance effectiveness changed from Level 2 (repeatable) to Level 3 (defined). |
| Interviews conducted     | ► No interviews conducted since last report                                |
| Artifacts received       | ► Numerous artifacts received.                                             |
## Open deficiencies

### P2D1 – Incomplete program governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas and implications</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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. Closed.  
4. Closed.  |
# Project milestones

## Supporting information

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

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

Late 97.7
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: 1,430
  - Total tasks late: 10
  - Total open tasks late: 5
- Conclusions:
  - The total number of tasks designated as late is 0.70% 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
## Project schedule quality

**Period:** 11/01/2018 to 01/31/2019

**Supporting information**

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

**Summary:**
- Overall quality: 96.1

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Overall Quality – Period 11/01/2018 to 01/31/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All tasks</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open tasks</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule Parameters</th>
<th>Overall Quality – Period 11/01/2018 to 01/31/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary tasks</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone tasks</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal tasks</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Thousands

- Jul-17
- Aug-17
- Sep-17
- Oct-17
- Nov-17
- Dec-17
- Jan-18
- Feb-18
- Mar-18
- Apr-18
- May-18
- Jun-18
- Jul-18
- Aug-18
- Sep-18

MMP2-IVV-312AI Sep Status v2.0 Draft - 20181030
Project budget
DHSMV staff funding

Total DHSMV staff budget versus actual expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thousands

Supporting information
Project budget
Contract staff funding

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
Project budget
Expense funding

Supporting information

Total expense budget versus actual expenditures

Thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total expense - budget</th>
<th>Total expense - actual</th>
<th>Cumulative total expense - budget</th>
<th>Cumulative total expense - actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-18</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>$580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project budget
IV&V services funding

Supporting information

Total IV&V services budget versus actual expenditures

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

Supporting information

DHSMV staff
$0
0%
Contracted staff
$8,360,362
88%
Expense
$304,230
3%
OCO
$29,258
1%
Other items
$0
0%
IV&V
$780,430
8%

Budget distribution

DHSMV staff
$0
0%
Contracted staff
$4,483,146
88%
Expense
$155,445
3%
OCO
$21,458
1%
Other items
$0
0%
IV&V
$427,730
8%

Actual distribution

DHSMV staff
$0
0%
Contracted staff
$8,360,362
88%
Expense
$304,230
3%
OCO
$29,258
1%
Other items
$0
0%
IV&V
$780,430
8%
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Motorist Modernization Financials

November 13, 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><strong>$36,829,355</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,178,267</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,536,306</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,745,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,541</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motorist Modernization Phase I Financial Review

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

BUDGET: $7,536,000

- Contrasted Services: $6,976,720
- IV&V Services: $479,280
- Expense (Software, Travel): $80,000

ACTUALS: $2,708,763

- Contrasted Services: $2.54M
- IV&V Services: $320K
- Expense (Software, Travel): $80K

Remaining: $160K

- $4.42M
- $160K
- $80K

Graph showing budget and actuals for Motorist Modernization Phase I.
## Budget and Actuals: Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Variance (Budget to Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Total Funding</td>
<td>$7,536,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$2,708,763</td>
<td>$2,708,843</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (October 2018)</td>
<td>$693,277</td>
<td>$693,277</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$4,827,158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase II LBR Requests – Total Project

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

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

BUDGET: $5,037,000

ACTUALS: $1,270,797

Contracts Services
IV&V Services Expense (Software, Travel)
OCO

$423,240
$150,000
$7,800

$4,255,960

$1.12M
$141K
$152K
$21K
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Remaining
# 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 2018-2019 Total Funding</td>
<td>$5,037,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$1,270,820</td>
<td>$1,270,797</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month to Date (October 2018)</td>
<td>$349,850</td>
<td>$349,850</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Funds</td>
<td>$3,766,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
THANK YOU
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POR</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>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>12/1/2018</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 the need date, will not be included in the 6/2019 deliverable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>12/1/2018</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 the need date, will not be included in the 6/2019 deliverable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>2/28/2019</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/16/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>6/30/2018</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/16/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG01</td>
<td>Stats from Jan 2017 - Dec 2017 Total - 2.4 million 1.0 million (EFS updating address when they are the same - Wrap 3978 to stop this)</td>
<td>8/16/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8/16/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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>REG</td>
<td>REG04</td>
<td>Should the system do a NMVTIS check prior to approval of a renewal? Would potentially slow down (and/or throw errors) on high-speed processing, county web sites, MyDMV Portal, etc.</td>
<td>4/25/2018</td>
<td>9/21/2018</td>
<td>If we did not run the NMVTIS check on the renewals, the fraud issue would continue with customers registering their vehicles in Florida with out-of-state titles.</td>
<td>AB 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 Officers. Same concern as above.</td>
<td>5/15/2018 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>
<td>09/11/2018 Update</td>
<td>REG team decided not to do a NMVTIS check for renewals. Close item+I14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>AB Recommendation</td>
<td>AB Date</td>
<td>ESC Decision/Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLE01</td>
<td>Should the MV Issuance system pre-populate the vehicle information (including vehicle model)</td>
<td>3/7/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG05</td>
<td>Should the system perform an NMVTIS and 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>9/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would help with fraud issues on the registration side and assist with QA review processes. We just need to keep in mind that we do not want to slow down the process on the Tax Collector counter. If we get this approved through AAMVA, do we still need to do a NLETS check as well? NMVTIS runs a Law Enforcement check. Not all states are NMVTIS participants. NLETS will give you real-time information on vehicles that are reported stolen. NMVTIS also shows reg information. 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**05/17/2018 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.

**06/19/2018 Update**: Recommend to close.
For offices with Law Enforcement presence, the manager can ask that the officer investigate the matter and determine if a seizure or arrest is appropriate. Clerk should inform the customer they are unable to process the transaction and refer them to the regional office for further inspection of the vehicle and review of the paperwork.

If the customer leaves the office and the safety of the clerk/manager is not jeopardized, attempt to obtain the tag number, and description of the vehicle. If the transaction is allowed to go through, then we are just prolonging the situation, which eventually ends up with a fraud investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REG05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**07/16/2018 Update Cont.** Recommend that I go back to the team to discuss what information would we receive from NLETS that we don’t already receive from NMVTIS? Is it really necessary to run both for a registration-only transaction?

**08/16/2018 Update** Registration team is scheduled to have a conference call with AAMVA on September 28 to discuss this issue.

**09/11/2018 Update** Registration team is scheduled to have a conference call with AAMVA on September 28 to discuss this issue.

**10/04/2018 Update** The team held a conference call with AAMVA and are in the process of scheduling another conference call with AAMVA and the Enterprise team to provide an overview of the two NMVTIS implementation solutions, AMIE and the Web services.

**10/24/2018 Update** The team decided to only request AAMVA to run a NMVTIS check. The team no longer finds it necessary to run an NLETS check due to the information being the same. The conference call with AAMVA and the Enterprise team is scheduled for Friday, October 26 at 1 p.m.

**11/07/2018 Update** The AAMVA conference call was held and the department needs to decide what implementation solution we are going to use, web service or AMIE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>AB Recommendation</th>
<th>AB Date</th>
<th>ESC Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REG06</td>
<td>The Registration team is working on Specialty Plate Voucher transactions. Currently, when a customer attempts to redeem their voucher with no active registration on file, the customer is not allowed to receive the voucher. The team would like to implement a transfer voucher transaction for the following cases: 1. Spouse has a voucher on file and surviving spouse wants to redeem voucher. a. Currently, a surviving spouse cannot redeem a specialty plate or refund. 2. If customer comes in to buy a voucher for someone else. a. Currently, the receiving customer goes to the TCO office. If there is no active registration for the receiving customer, they cannot redeem voucher. 3. Customer can buy a voucher. a. Currently, the system does not check database for an active registration to prevent sale of voucher. b. The System does not allow customer to redeem voucher that was purchased if there is not active registration on file. 4. Moving forward for modernization, the registration team would like to design a transfer specialty plate voucher transaction for the eligible person to redeem the voucher, transfer the voucher back to original purchaser, or provide refund, if eligible.</td>
<td>10/5/2018</td>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>Currently, FRVIS has no process for transferring a Specialty Plate Voucher and no refund is given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLE</td>
<td>TLE02</td>
<td>The Title and Registration team would like a decision on where the required documents would be scanned. Would the Tax Collectors send the documents to GHQ Scanning Unit or if they have the capability to scan the documents in their office, would they be able to do that, similar to DL?</td>
<td>8/7/2018</td>
<td>1/31/2019</td>
<td>If the counties did not send the documents to GHQ to be scanned, the Tax Collectors would need scanners in all their offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>TL03</td>
<td>The Title and Registration team would like a decision on whether or not the Tax Collector offices will be able to create MVR reports for the customers to purchase in the office.</td>
<td>9/28/2018</td>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>Currently, this is performed at the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

09/06/2018 Update
A meeting is being scheduled to discuss this further before a decision is made. Titles Team will groom stories in Increment 1 assuming there is no change from the current process (scanning in Tallahassee).

09/19/2018 Update
The meeting was held and the decision was made that all MV scanning will continue to be done in Tallahassee, not in the Tax Collector offices. Recommend to close

Closed 9/19/2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Decision/Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REG07</td>
<td>The team would like a decision on whether to make it easier for dealers to process more than one original dealer plate transaction at a time. Be able to do bulk issuance. This would be subject to their GLI/plate limits.</td>
<td>11/5/2018</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>Currently, you can only process one dealer plate at a time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>REG08</td>
<td>The team would like a decision on whether a scanned coversheet should be required to be printed for every registration correction. The team received stats for the past five years for corrections.</td>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, a scan coversheet is not required for this transaction. In modernization, the team would like to have this as part of the transaction for fraud purposes and to provide documentation to scan to the record.

| REG  | REG08  | Total  | 844,020                                                                   | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |

<p>| REG  | REG08  | 2017-2018 | 136,154                                                                     | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |
| REG  | REG08  | 2016-2017 | 157,984                                                                     | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |
| REG  | REG08  | 2015-2016 | 175,619                                                                     | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |
| REG  | REG08  | 2014-2015 | 195,788                                                                     | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |
| REG  | REG08  | 2013-2014 | 178,475                                                                     | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |
| REG  | REG08  | TOTAL     | 844,020                                                                     | 11/7/2018   | 11/30/2018              | This would increase paper and toner for the printers in the Tax Collector offices. |        |            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Legal Recommendation</th>
<th>Legal Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow entities, such as UPS to issue Temp Tags on demand?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>Yes, statutory authority would be necessary. The question is whether UPS and leasing companies can issue and print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration. Section 320.131, F.S., only provides for licensed motor vehicle dealers to utilize this service. 320.131(8) The department shall administer an electronic system for licensed motor vehicle dealers to use for issuing temporary tags. If a dealer fails to comply with the department’s requirements for issuing temporary tags using the electronic system, the department may deny, suspend, or revoke a license under s. 320.27(9)(b)16. upon proof that the licensee has failed to comply with the department’s requirements. The department may adopt rules to administer this section.</td>
<td>9/5/2018</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| POR  | 1 Cont. | | | | (9)(a) The department shall implement a secure print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration, record retention, and issue system required for use by every department-authorized issuer of temporary tags by the end of the 2007-2008 fiscal year. Such system shall enable the department to issue, on demand, a temporary tag number in response to a request from the issuer by way of a secure electronic exchange of data and then enable the issuer to print the temporary tag that has all required information. A motor vehicle dealer licensed under this chapter may charge a fee to comply with this subsection. Based on the foregoing, legislation would be necessary for leasing companies and UPS to issue and print-on-demand electronic temporary tag registration. | | | |
Team | Ref # | Description | Submit Date | Decision Needed By Date | Impact | Legal Recommendation | Legal Date | Status | Close Date
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
POR | 2 | Do we need statutory authority to allow entities, such as Enterprise Holdings (Car Rental) to process title and registration transactions electronically? | 5/17/2018 | 5/30/2018 | Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable. | Yes, statutory authority would be necessary. Non-dealer commercial entities have expressed an interest in having the Department implement an electronic interface to perform title and registration transactions, similar to the process provided in s. 320.03(10), F.S. Section 320.03(10), F.S., limits use of the electronic system to entities that, in the normal course of its business, sell products that must be titled or registered, and provides title and registration services on behalf of its consumers (dealer licensees and entities that sell vessels). 320.03(10) Jurisdiction over the electronic filing system for use by authorized electronic filing system agents to electronically title or register motor vehicles, vessels, mobile homes, or off-highway vehicles; issue or transfer registration license plates or decals; electronically transfer fees due for the title and registration process; and perform inquiries for title, registration, and lienholder verification and certification of service providers is expressly preempted to the state, and the department shall have regulatory authority over the system. | 9/5/2018 | Under review |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Submit Date</th>
<th>Decision Needed By Date</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Legal Recommendation</th>
<th>Legal Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>2 Cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The electronic filing system shall be available for use statewide and applied uniformly throughout the state. An entity that, in the normal course of its business, sells products that must be titled or registered, provides title and registration services on behalf of its consumers and meets all established requirements may be an authorized electronic filing system agent and shall not be precluded from participating in the electronic filing system in any county. Upon request from a qualified entity, the tax collector shall appoint the entity as an authorized electronic filing system agent for that county. The department shall adopt rules in accordance with chapter 120 to replace the December 10, 2009, program standards and to administer the provisions of this section, including, but not limited to, establishing participation requirements, certification of service providers, electronic filing system requirements, and enforcement authority for noncompliance. The December 10, 2009, program standards, excluding any standards which conflict with this subsection, shall remain in effect until the rules are adopted. An authorized electronic filing agent may charge a fee to the customer for use of the electronic filing system. Further, Rules 15C-16.0015C-16.010, F.A.C., EFS Agent Participation Requirements, provides:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>2 Cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Entities requesting authorization to become an EFS agent must meet the following requirements: (a) Sell products that must be titled or registered. (b) Provide title and registration services on behalf of its consumers. (c) Enter into a contract with a Certified Service Provider. (d) Apply to the Department on Form HSMV 82083S (Rev. 08/11), Application to Become an Authorized Electronic Filing System Agent/Change of Certified Service Provider, which is incorporated herein by reference and available via the Department website <a href="http://www.flhsmv.gov/html/forms.html">www.flhsmv.gov/html/forms.html</a>, <a href="https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-00402">https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-00402</a>. Based upon the foregoing, legislation would be necessary to authorize non-leader commercial entities to process title and registration transactions electronically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Ref #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Submit Date</td>
<td>Decision Needed By Date</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Legal Recommendation</td>
<td>Legal Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do we need statutory authority to allow LPAs, such as Sunshine State to process title and registration transactions electronically?</td>
<td>5/17/2018</td>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Any decisions made after 5/30/2018, will not be included in the 6/4/2018, deliverable.</td>
<td>A statutory change is not required; however, this would require a technology change. LPAs have expressed an interest in having a direct, electronic interface to FRVIS to perform title and registration transactions. Section 320.03(1), F.S., provides, in part, that: &quot;(1) The tax collectors in the several counties of the state, as authorized agents of the department, shall issue registration certificates, registration license plates, validation stickers, and mobile home stickers to applicants...&quot; Section 320.03(8), F.S., provides for tax collectors to utilize private tag agents (LPAs). Currently, LPAs use a software known as &quot;Screen Scrape.&quot; It enables them to intercept information being entered on their computer screens, and simulates keyboard activity being communicated to FRVIS. The LPAs want a direct interface to FRVIS to eliminate the need for their software. This would eliminate the need for them to make software updates to address any updates to FRVIS, and they argue that the interface would create a more efficient process. Based upon the foregoing, legislation would not be necessary for this change.</td>
<td>9/5/2108</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td>9/5/2108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Motorist Modernization - Phase II Traffic Light Report**

**Current Stage: Requirements Validation**

*As of Friday 11/2/2018*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1 - Dealer License</th>
<th>Team 2 - Portal/Fleet</th>
<th>Team 3 - IFTA/IRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increment 1 - Manufactured Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 1 - Standalone Apps, Registration Services, Tribe, Fleet, Bulk Registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 1 - Draft Requirements for ITN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/20/2019</td>
<td>Due Date: 12/7/2018</td>
<td>Due Date: 1/7/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete:</td>
<td>% Complete: 81%</td>
<td>% Complete: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items: Green</td>
<td>Action Items: Green</td>
<td>Action Items: Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Code: N/A</td>
<td>Legacy Code: N/A</td>
<td>Legacy Code: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Estimation: Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 4 - Titles</th>
<th>Team 5 - Registrations</th>
<th>Team 6 - Globals/Batch/Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increment 2 - Remaining Title Transactions, Stops, ELT Provider Maint.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 1 - Original Registration, Renewals, Specialty Plates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increment 1 - Inventory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/4/2019</td>
<td>Due Date: 10/15/2018</td>
<td>Due Date: 2/20/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete: 15%</td>
<td>% Complete: 100%</td>
<td>% Complete: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Items: Green</td>
<td>Action Items: Green</td>
<td>Action Items: Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Code: Red</td>
<td>Legacy Code: Red</td>
<td>Legacy Code: Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Estimation: Yellow</td>
<td>Estimation: Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% Complete:** % complete of requirements validation for current Increment

- Green: < 10% overdue
- Yellow: 10%-20% overdue
- Red: ≥ 20% overdue

**Action Items:** % of overdue team action items

- Green: < 10% overdue
- Yellow: 10%-20% overdue
- Red: ≥ 20% overdue

**Legacy Code:** % of as-is processes scheduled to be documented for the Increment

- Green: < 10% overdue
- Yellow: 10%-20% overdue
- Red: ≥ 20% overdue

**Estimation:** % of completed user stories with overdue estimations

- Green: < 10% overdue
- Yellow: 10%-20% overdue
- Red: ≥ 20% overdue