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1 Document Overview
The Florida PALM Project (Project) will ensure it meets its cost, schedule, scope, and quality objectives by employing a set of defined and repeatable project management processes. The Project Management Plan (PMP) details the processes to be used during the Project’s Pre-Design, Development and Implementation (Pre-DDI) phase for all work identified in the Project Charter and supporting Strategies, Plans, Contracts, and Scope documents. Compliance with these repeatable processes will help expedite the successful, on-time completion of the work.

2 Purpose
The purpose of this document is to establish and communicate project management standards and procedures to be adhered to by the Project Team to effectively deliver the Project’s lifecycle stages.

3 Document Scope
This document communicates the complete lifecycle of project management as it relates to delivery of the Florida PALM Pre-DDI phase including the purpose, scope, and process for the following project management processes:

1. Performance
2. Cost
3. Schedule
4. Quality
5. Procurement
6. Staffing
7. Collaboration
8. Project Scope and Change
9. Risk
10. Communication
11. Issue
12. Decision
13. Deliverable
14. Action Item
15. Content
16. Lessons Learned

3.1 Who Should Use This Document?
Project Team Members should use this document for guidance on Project standards and procedures associated with the above identified Project Management processes across all work completed by the various Project Tracks.

3.2 Interdependence and Related Documents
This document shall be used in conjunction with the following Project documents to govern and manage the Project.
• The Project Charter
• Procurement documents and contracts associated with the support of this Project as they are developed and executed, namely:
  o Business Process Standardization Support Services Contract
  o Project Management Office Support Services Contracts
  o Software and System Integrator (SSI) Procurement Support Services Contract
  o Outside Counsel Support Services Contracts
  o Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Services Contract
  o Organizational Change Management Support Services Contract
  o System and Data Strategy Support Services Contracts

3.3 Distribution of Document
This document shall be distributed to Project Team Members, the Executive Steering Committee (ESC), and any other personnel as required or otherwise authorized by the Project Director. This document will also be submitted along with a budget amendment in accordance with 2015-2016 GAA Proviso Line 2331A. Notifications of changes to this document will be circulated by the Project Management Office (PMO) Manager.

4 Out of Scope
This document does not include Project delivery methodologies associated with a specific discipline or business area. This document will not include a comprehensive listing of project management tool(s) used for each process area.

5 Assumptions
To fully understand this document, the reader has a general working knowledge of the project management processes and has read and understands the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK). Updates to the Project Management Plan (after initial approval) will follow the processes defined in the Project Scope and Change Management section.

6 Project Life Cycle
Traditionally, project management includes several elements, four to five stages, and a control system. Regardless of the methodology or terminology used, the same basic project management processes will be used. Major project management stages generally include and will be applied for the Pre-DDI phase of the Florida PALM Project:

1. Initiating
2. Planning
3. Execution
4. Monitoring and Controlling
5. Closing

The Project initiating stage determines the nature and scope of the Project. This stage is complete for the Project. The Project has multiple Tracks staffed to simultaneously support the Project across the four critical dimensions: people, process, technology, and project management. The Project’s Pre-DDI Tracks are listed below:
2. OCM – Organizational Change Management – responsible for developing and executing change management strategies (the people-side of change) in preparation for the new ERP.
3. SDS – Systems and Data Strategy - responsible for developing and executing technical strategies in preparation for the new ERP.
4. PMO – Project Management Office - responsible for developing and executing project management strategies for all Project phases. The PMO will also be responsible for the procurement activities for the new ERP and Software and System Integrator (SSI).

The majority of the content in this document is focused on what the Project’s approach is to fulfill the executing, monitoring, and controlling stages to successfully execute and deliver the Pre-DDI outcomes defined in the approved scope and strategy documents.

After the execution stage, the Project’s Pre-DDI phase will be closed. A strong Project close process enables future benefits to be received by the organization. Significant knowledge capital is developed over the course of a Project and it needs to be captured in a manner that allows it to be leveraged in the future. The key components of Project Closeout are illustrated in the exhibit below:

![Figure 1: Project Closeout Components](image)

**6.1 Archive Project**

Significant documentation will be developed over the course of the Project. Project work products, which are defined as Project Management documents, Project deliverables, supporting documents and data, interview notes, etc., needs to be organized and archived for future reference and use.

Project Team Members will place Project work products on the dedicated Project SharePoint site in adherence with the prescribed file structure. Each Track or Contract Manager is responsible for establishing a final PDF version of the accepted or approved deliverable and storing it in SharePoint. These documents provide historical knowledge and will be critical to answering future questions that arise.

**6.2 Finalize Lessons Learned**

Over the course of the Project, the Project Team will identify areas for improvement as well as strong practices that should be propagated in the future. Lessons Learned will be documented in the Lessons Learned Log as they are identified. See additional information in the Lessons Learned Management section.
6.3 Project Signoff
Upon conclusion of the Pre-DDI phase of the Project, the Project Director will request signoff by the Executive Sponsor to confirm they agree the Project has been completed.

6.4 Contract Close Out
Contract Managers have the responsibility to complete the Contract Close Out Checklist and Contractor Evaluation Form identified in the DFS Contract Management Lifecycle Guide, at the conclusion of the assigned contracts.

7 Roles and Responsibilities
The roles and responsibilities for each Project Management Process are presented in a RACIV responsibility matrix where:

- **Responsible** – Project Team Member is responsible for completion of the action
- **Accepting** – Project Team Member is responsible for accepting the action
- **Consulted** – Project Team Member(s) that are consulted during the action
- **Informed** – Project Team Member(s) who are informed of the progress, completion, or information generated from the action
- **Verify** – Project Team Member is responsible for verifying the action was completed according to the strategy or plan

Note: The Project Director has the authority, per the Project Charter, to delegate assigned responsibilities to the Deputy Project Director, or others as needed.
8 Performance Management

8.1 Overview
Performance Management describes the measures that will be used to measure the performance of the Florida PALM Project (Project) as well as the processes by which they will be collected and reported. Adherence to these Procedures is the responsibility of designated members of the Project Team.

Performance Management identifies a standard set of measures for the Project and provide clear guidance to Project Team members in recording, tracking, and reporting measures across the Project. The Performance Management Measures efficiently, effectively, and consistently measure and report the performance of the Project to all stakeholders.

8.2 Purpose
The purpose of Performance Management is to clearly define measures which can be used to measure the Project, to describe how these measures can be effectively communicated to the appropriate parties, and to implement processes for measure collection and management.

The Performance Measures specifically identified within this document are those which provide insight into the overall performance of the Project. Individual work streams are likely to use and track additional measures to manage their day-to-day activities.

Performance Measures are evaluated elements that indicate whether the Project is likely to reach its intended outcomes and identify an activity’s efficiency and/or effectiveness. These measures should be measurable (quantifiable and qualitative) and tracked over time, to see trending.

8.3 Determination of Measures
The Project Team followed a multi-step process to determine the most appropriate measures to use for measuring the performance of the Project. The process included the following activities:

1. Identification of a broad list of potential measures with input which included:
   a. The Project metrics outlined in version 1.0 of the PMP
   b. The analysis of the Project metrics outlined within the PMP performed as part of the initial Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) assessment
   c. Measures being captured or recommended by the Agency for State Technology (AST)
   d. Project Measures and best practice based reporting processes and formats from other similarly sized, successful projects as identified by the participants during creation of this document
2. Grouping the Project Measures into categories based on the processes described in the PMP (e.g., cost, schedule, risks and issues, etc.)
3. Removal of duplicate measures and those that could not be tied to a value driving question
4. Removal of supporting and secondary measures which might be tracked by individual Project Tracks, but do not provide a clear indicator of Project-wide performance
5. Determination of the appropriate timing to begin tracking the measure based on the value provided by the measure compared to the effort to collect the data
Note: The “Pre-DDI Metric History’ tab on the Pre-DDI Performance Measure workbook, located in SharePoint, contains a history and full disposition of each metric considered as part of the development process.

8.4 Performance Measures
The “Project Performance Measures” spreadsheet, located in SharePoint, contains a listing of each individual performance measure along with additional information about each measure including the data source, and process to generate each metric.

Each measure will be given a colored status indicator that gives an indication as to whether the measures status is positive or negative. The Project will use the following colors and definitions for its status indicators:

- **Green.** The Project performance area is on track without material issues.
- **Yellow.** The Project performance area faces a challenge or set of challenges that could, if left unmanaged, negatively impact the Project’s outcome. The Project Team should prioritize corrective action.
- **Red.** The Project performance area faces a challenge or set of challenges that threatens its outcome. The Project Team should take corrective action immediately.
### Table 1: Project Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Measure Name</th>
<th>Measure Calculation</th>
<th>Status Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Cost                | C-1 | Cost Performance Index (CPI)         | CPI as calculated by MS Project using the current proxy resource value approach     | G = .925 – 1.075  
Y = .85 - .924 or 1.076 – 1.15  
R = < .85 or >1.15                                                                 |
| 2  | Cost                | C-2 | Project Spend Plan Variance (SPV)    | (YTD Spend - YTD Forecast) / YTD Forecast                                         | G = -.25 – .05  
Y = .06 to .15 or under -.25  
R = >.15                                                                 |
| 3  | Schedule            | S-1 | Schedule Performance Index (SPI)     | SPI calculated via MS Project                                                      | G = .95 to 1.1  
Y = .89 to .95 or over 1.1  
R = Less than .88                                                                 |
| 4  | Schedule            | S-2 | Schedule Variance Percentage        | SV% as calculated from MS Project                                                   | G = <5%  
Y = >5% and <=11%  
R = Greater than 11%                                                                 |
| 5  | Risk                | R-1 | Risks Transitioned into Issues      | Number of risks transitioned into issues during the measured period                 | G = 0 or 1  
Y = 1 or 2  
R = Greater than 3                                                                 |
| 6  | Risk                | R-2 | Under Evaluation Risk Aging         | Average age in business days of each risk in the 'under evaluation' status          | G = <20 business days before mitigation / monitoring plan is defined  
Y = > 20 or <=30 business days before mitigation / monitoring plan is defined  
R = > 30 business days before mitigation / monitoring plan is defined                                                                 |
| 7  | Issue               | I-1 | Overdue Issues                      | Number of open issues past their due date                                           | G = 0  
Y = <=2 impacting Project critical path and <5 total open issues  
R = >=5                                                                 |
| 8  | Issue               | I-2 | Issues Not Resolved within Escalation| Number of past due issues not addressed within the standard escalation process.     | G = 0  
Y = <=2 impacting Project critical path and <5 total open issues  
R = >=5                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Measure Name</th>
<th>Measure Calculation</th>
<th>Status Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9  | Scope               | SC-1| Scope Change Requests         | Any Scope Related Change Requests open during the period which: 1) Increase Scope (add deliverable or complexity); 2) Reduce Scope (activity, content, or complexity); Or 3) Change Schedule past current funding period (which pushes an activity out past the end of the current funding period) | G = No Scope Change request, or Processed Scope CR(s) move, add, or remove work, but do not have a material impact on the completion of the Project's Charter or critical path during the current funding period  
Y = Processed Scope CR(s) move, add, or remove work, with an impact on the critical path during the current funding period, but not the Project's Charter  
R = Processed Scope CR(s) has a material impact on the completion of the Project's Charter                                                                 |
| 10 | Scope               | SC-2| Change Request Aging          | Average number of days past the due date for each overdue CR                                                                                                                                                  | G = <=5 days  
Y = >5 and <=10 days  
R = >10 days                                                                                     |
| 11 | Governance          | G-1 | Decision Aging                | Average number of days past the due date for each overdue Decision                                                                                                                                            | G = <=5 days  
Y = >5 and <=10 days  
R = >10 days                                                                                     |
| 12 | Quality             | Q-1 | Contractor Service Quality    | Number of vendors with a score below 100% from evaluations performed in the current period                                                                                                                      | G = 0 or 1 contractor below 100% service quality rating for one month  
Y = More than one contractor with a rating below 100% for one month, or at least one contractor with a rating below 100% for multiple months  
R = At least one contractor with a rating below 100% for 3 or more consecutive months with no positive trend                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Measure Name</th>
<th>Measure Calculation</th>
<th>Status Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13 | Quality             | Q-2 | Technical Deliverable Quality | Number of deliverables reviewed during the period which failed the submission QC review or had a severity 1 defect | G = 0 – 1 deliverables reviewed during the period that have a severity 1 quality deficiency (pre or post submission) and none have more than Severity 1 defect  
Y = 2 of the reviewed during the period have one or more severity 1 quality deficiency (pre or post submission) or one has more than one Severity 1 defect  
R = More than 2 of the deliverables reviewed during the period have one or more than 1 Severity 1 defect |
| 14 | Resource            | ST-1| Project Staffing              | Percentage of planned staff engaged during the period                                | G = 95% of planned positions staffed per the staffing plan  
Y = Between 85% and 95% of planned positions staffed per the staffing plan  
R = Below 85% of planned positions staffed per the staffing plan |
8.5 Process
This section contains the process used to define the collection, measurement, and reporting of each measure and the details for monitoring and reporting each. Measures collection and management consists of several steps that must be carried out by the Project Team, including:

1. Gather and Maintain Data and Draft Reports
2. Review Reports
3. Manage Quality

The PMO Manager has overall responsibility for this process, supported by the Project Team members responsible for managing the measured functions. See the Roles and Responsibilities section below for additional detail.

8.5.1 Gather and Maintain Data and Draft Reports
The designated individuals will be responsible for gathering data or compiling reports for each individual area. Gathering data will require connecting to a source system (e.g. a spreadsheet or SharePoint listing), extracting information from it, and compiling the data into the format specified for the individual measure.

Given the set of tools available to the Project today, extracting information from source systems will typically require manually copying information from the source system into a spreadsheet or report template. As the Project develops, it may be beneficial to identify and implement additional tools or templates to support Performance Management.

8.5.1.1 Collection and Timing
The Project performance measures currently identified are all collected monthly. The Performance Measures will be collected and entered into the Project Performance Measures spreadsheet on SharePoint during the first two weeks of the month.

8.5.1.2 Monthly Monitoring
The PMO will compile the Project performance measures. The PMO Manager will review them with the Track Managers monthly to monitor trends, identify areas of concern, and prioritize corrective action if needed.

8.5.1.3 Project Oversight Analysis Executive Summary Report (I-PMO7)
The Project will use the data collected for each measure to provide the primary evaluation of the Project’s performance in each of the categories reported in the Project Oversight Analysis Executive Summary Report. The Project will use the status indicators defined in the table above to report on each Assessment Criteria. Where there is more than one measure for an assessment Criteria, the Criteria will be given the ‘lowest’ score of the supporting measures.

8.5.2 Review Reports
The primary person responsible for reviewing initial Project performance data is the PMO Manager, however they will be supported in this effort by the Track Managers or designated individuals for each Project function as appropriate. If the PMO Manager identifies a measure that appears out of the ordinary, the PMO Manager will review with the Track Manager or other Project team member to determine if escalation or action is needed.
8.5.3 Manage Quality
A final activity associated with the measures collection and management process is a quality review. On a regular basis, the Project’s Quality Manager will review the process for creating each measure to ensure its accuracy and completeness. This is especially important for this Project as the number of manual processes required to gather data and create reports result in a higher than average number of errors when gathering data and compiling reports.

8.6 Roles and Responsibilities
The Performance Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the three (3) major areas of the Performance Management Process as shown in the figure below.

Figure 2: Major Areas of the Performance Management Process

Table 2: Performance Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Responsible for the overall execution of the Project and accepts Project measures</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO Track Manager</td>
<td>Responsible for developing and confirming the measures with input from each data owner and oversees the collection and reporting of the measures</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO Support</td>
<td>Responsible for collection of monthly measures and populating in the Pre-DDI Performance Measures Spreadsheet and the Oversight Analysis Executive Summary Report</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Owner*</td>
<td>Responsible for gathering and maintaining data for an area of focus and transmitting to PMO Support as needed. (e.g. maintaining the Project’s spend plan from which costing measures are extracted)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Manager</td>
<td>Responsible for overseeing the quality and integrity of the data collection and reporting process</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Different Project Team members will have responsibility for different areas of the measures. Also, the PMO Track Manager and Quality Manager may have responsibilities as a data owner in addition to their other roles.
9 Cost Management

9.1 Overview
Cost Management establishes the procedures for efficiently controlling costs for the Project to be completed within the approved budget. Cost Management includes the estimation and management of funds for resources such as staff, equipment, hardware, software, facilities, and expenses needed to complete Project activities. It also considers the effect of Project changes and decisions that would impact the cost of completing the Project.

9.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions to the PMO and other Project Team Members regarding Cost Management and associated activities. Cost Management is used to ensure the Project will be completed within the approved budget. This includes management of a Spend Plan which contains planned, incurred, and actual expenditures within the appropriated budget categories. Additionally, these procedures will detail the Cost Management processes to be used for planning, monitoring, tracking, posting, and reporting on expenditures and cost.

9.3 Process
The Cost Management process is inclusive of three (3) major areas: Yearly, Releases, and Monthly.

9.3.1 Yearly
The Cost Management Yearly Process Flow explains how the Project receives and is appropriated funding.

9.3.1.1 Projection
The process begins with the Project projection of resources and costs for the upcoming fiscal year. Ideally, projections would be based on historical data. Projections should include current costs, costs for upcoming activities, and contractual obligations for future FY’s. The projections are provided to the Department of Financial Services (DFS) Budget Office for inclusion into the annual Legislative Budget Request (LBR).

9.3.1.2 Legislative Budget Request
Section 216.03, Florida Statute (F.S.) requires all state agencies to submit a LBR no later than October 15 of each year. Therefore, DFS, on behalf of the Project, requests funds based on the Project’s projections for the upcoming fiscal year in its annual LBR submission. Section 3(b) of the Constitution of the State of Florida requires that a Regular Legislative Session (Session) be held each year to consider the LBR’s submitted by each agency. The LBR will be provided to the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) for review.

9.3.1.3 Recommendations
The Executive Office of the Governor (EOG) makes recommendations for funding based on each agency’s LBR. The Florida House of Representatives, and the Florida Senate Appropriations Subcommittees release proposed bills, and make recommendations independently of each other, on what they believe should be funded. Once their recommendations are released, the Florida House of Representatives and the Florida Senate work to pass bills and develop proposed funding for the State of Florida. Upon agreement of the proposed funding, and proviso language, the bill is entitled the General Appropriations Act. The Florida House of Representatives and Florida Senate submit the General Appropriations Act to the Governor of Florida for approval or
veto. The Project Director and Budget Specialist track bills and proviso throughout Session. The Project may be requested to give information, and/or answer questions about its LBR.

9.3.1.4 Appropriations
Once the Governor of Florida approves and signs the General Appropriations Act, it becomes the official Budget for the State of Florida and is put into law. It becomes effective July 1 of each FY. The Office of Policy and Budget (OPB) distributes appropriations for each agency, and the funds are either released or put into reserve, based upon what is specified in the Budget. After the appropriations are made, the Project drafts the annual Spend Plan (using the Project template) based on the appropriations it receives and provides to DFS Budget for review. The figure below, Cost Management Process – Yearly Flow, illustrates the LBR, Recommendations, and Appropriations process.
Figure 3: Yearly Process Flow

- **Submit**
  - **DFS Budget Office**: Process Starts
  - **Project Budget Specialist**: Project needs for upcoming FY
  - **Project Director**: Develop LBR
  - **Executive Steering Committee**: Review LBR

- **Evaluate**
  - **DFS Budget Office**: Submit LBR (no later than October 15 of each year)
  - **Executive Steering Committee**: Review LBR
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: House Releases Proposed Committee Bill (PCB)
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: Senate Releases Senate Proposed Bill (SPB)
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: Conference Review/Approval

- **Execute**
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: Annual Appropriation Made
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: Funds released
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: Funds put into Reserve

- **Close**
  - **Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)**: Process Ends
9.3.2 Releases
At the beginning of the FY, the Project receives an initial release of funds. The Budget may contain proviso language that either releases funds or puts funds into reserve for the Project. If releases are in proviso language, the proviso will specify the information and/or action needed to have the funds pulled out of reserve and released.

9.3.2.1 Budget Amendment
The Project follows proviso language in coordination with the Executive Steering Committee, if appropriate, and performs the action(s) specified. Upon completion of the action(s) specified, the DFS Budget Office submits a Budget Amendment, on behalf of the Project. The Budget Amendment requests the release of funds, specifying how it has met proviso. The OPB receives the Budget Amendment and reviews with the House of Representatives, and the Florida Senate. If additional information is requested, the Project works to provide that information. Once the Budget Amendment has been accepted, it is put in consultation for review and approval. The duration of consultation is dependent upon several factors such as the amount, and what the budget amendment request is for.

9.3.2.2 Release
Once the Budget Amendment has been approved, the funds are released to the Project. The Project reflects the release in the Spend Plan, per the date found in the Master Project Schedule.

The figure below, Cost Management Process - Release Flow, explains how the Project works to request and receive release of appropriations, beyond initial release.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submit</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Execute</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFS Budget Office</td>
<td>Submit Budget Amendment With Action To Request Release of Funds</td>
<td>Requests Information/Changes</td>
<td>Release Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature/Office of Policy &amp; Budget (OPB)</td>
<td>Review Budget Amendment Request</td>
<td>Is Budget Amendment Accepted?</td>
<td>Process Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget Specialist</td>
<td>OPB Puts Budget Amendment on Consultation for 14 Days Before Approval</td>
<td>Is Budget Amendment Approved?</td>
<td>Record to Spend Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Take Action According to Request</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee</td>
<td>Process Starts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Release Process Flow
9.3.3 Monthly

9.3.3.1 Spend Plan
Once the annual Spend Plan is completed, baselined, and approved by the Project Director, projected, incurred, and actual expenditures are monitored, tracked, and posted to the Spend Plan. Historical projections do not change. Future projections do not change unless an event occurs that requires the Spend Plan to be re-baselined.

9.3.3.2 Reconciliation
On the 1st of every month, a reconciliation between the Project Spend Plan, and FLAIR begins. Using FLAIR reports, the Project Budget Specialist reviews expenditures, checks for coding accuracy, and amount accuracy. Additionally, if there are any expenditures not logged in the Spend Plan, those expenditures are then added to the Spend Plan. The totals on the Spend Plan are checked against the Appropriations Ledger Report to ensure accuracy. If the totals aren’t accurate, the reconciliation process begins again. Upon confirming accuracy, the Budget Specialist will use the checklist below as a guide for final review. After final review, the Spend Plan is submitted to the Project Director for approval. Upon approval the Spend Plan is provided to the Project Management Office (PMO) for the Project Monthly Status Reports. The Project meets with the DFS Budget Office staff throughout the FY as needed.

Table 3: Spend Plan Reconciliation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Spend Plan Reconciliation Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensure all expenditures are accurately recorded in the Details tab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure all actions are accurately recorded in the Details tab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ensure that the Spend Plan Total matches the Appropriation Ledger Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ensure that the Monthly Summary tab matches the Details tab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ensure all formulas are updated and calculating correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ensure that the Project is staying within its budget appropriations for each category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3.3.3 Monitoring/Updating
The Spend Plan is monitored on a continuous basis. If an event occurs, it is evaluated to determine if there impact to the Spend Plan. If it is determined that the event has impact to the Spend Plan, the event is reflected in the Spend Plan. Events include but are not limited to:

- Purchases (P-Card)
- Purchase Orders (MFMP/P-Card)
- Contract Execution
- Contract Change Order
- Project Change Request (PCR)
- Deliverable accepted and incurred
- Deliverable invoice is paid

The figure below, Cost Management Process - Monthly Flow, illustrates how the Project reconciles the Spend Plan to FLAIR each month.
Figure 5: Monthly Process Flow
9.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Cost Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the three (3) major areas of the Cost Management Process as shown in the figure below.

![Figure 6: Major Areas of the Cost Management Process](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Manages and leads all Project activities, including approval of all purchases, as well as development and approval of Spend Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement / Budget Specialist</td>
<td>Manages Cost Management Process for the Project, to include the development, monitoring, posting, and reporting on costs of the Project and the Spend Plan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requester / Purchasing</td>
<td>Manages Project administrative purchases and P-Card purchases</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Support</td>
<td>Provides subject matter expertise and offers guidance on budget matters</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee Member</td>
<td>Reviews and receives updates for Project costs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 Schedule Management

10.1 Overview

Schedule Management describes how the Master Project Schedule establishes the breakdown of work to be performed, during the Pre-DDI and Procurement phases of the Project, including Project activities associated with all identified deliverables, work products, and supporting tasks performed by Project Team Members. This section details the Schedule Management standards and procedures to be used while monitoring progress within the Master Project Schedule. Compliance with these processes will help collect and report accurate information in a timely manner.

Effective July 2015, Chapter 74-1, F.A.C. mandated Cost Performance Index (CPI), Schedule Performance Index (SPI), and Earned Value be calculated using a single baselined Project Schedule. In order to be in compliance, the Project integrates each Track’s activities into the Master Project Schedule.

10.2 Purpose

Schedule Management is a tool used to manage the listing of Project milestones, outcomes, deliverables, reviews, and supporting tasks with intended start and finish dates. Additionally, it is used to build processes to establish controls to accomplish timely Project completion.

The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions to the Project Management Office (PMO) and other Project Team Members for developing, maintaining, monitoring, and controlling the schedule during the Pre-DDI phase. Additionally, these standards and procedures define how the Project will manage changes to the Master Project Schedule.

10.3 Process

10.3.1 Initiation Phase

During the Initiation Phase, the PMO and Track Managers will develop the Project Scope document and Track Strategy documents. The outcome of these documents will assist the PMO in developing the Master Project Schedule.

10.3.1.1 Project Scope

The primary goal for the Project Scope document is to identify the major outcomes and deliverables for Pre-DDI. Initial Project deliverables, work products, and supporting tasks considered activities described in the FLAIR Study, Project Charter, and other agreements established between the Project Team, stakeholders, and legislation.

10.3.1.2 Track Strategy

Project deliverables, work products, and supporting tasks identified in the Project Scope will be assigned to the appropriate Project Track. The Florida PALM Project has four Tracks: Business Process Standardization (BPS), Organizational Change Management (OCM), Project Management Office (PMO), and Systems and Data Strategy (SDS). Each Track will identify deliverables, work products, and supporting tasks from the Project Scope that it will take ownership of by providing answers to the who, what, when and where within Track Planning documents. Deliverables, work products, and supporting tasks will be broken down into smaller components, required to be performed by the Track’s resources and be included in the Master Project Schedule.
10.3.1.3 Master Project Schedule Structure
The Master Project Schedule will be created using MS Project starting with the activities identified in the Project Scope and Track Planning documents. All activities will be sequenced to determine the order of work and assign relationships between project activities.

10.3.2 Planning Phase
Upon completion of the Initiation Phase, the Planning Phase will commence and consist of developing the hierarchical Master Project Schedule framework to present all Pre-DDI activities and work to be performed for the fiscal year. The Project will leverage a hierarchical framework to organize tasks. The activities, tasks and accompanying detail will follow standards prescribed by the PMBOK® Project Management guidelines and Florida PALM PMO, as outlined in the Schedule Management section.

10.3.2.1 Master Project Schedule Framework – Level 1
The Master Project Schedule’s Level 1 framework represents the schedule for the Project by its major components. Level 1 is the building block for all subsequent levels and depicts the status of the Project based on progress reported at the lower levels. The Project may identify and implement various methods of categorizing activities as the Project progresses.

10.3.2.2 Project Milestones
The Project Milestones section contains Project “Key” Milestones and Track specific milestones. Project “Key” Milestones have been identified as critical path significant events. The timely execution of these milestones are crucial to the success of the Project.

10.3.2.2.1 Track Deliverables
The Deliverable section of the Master Project Schedule is primarily used to identify the Project’s acceptance of Track Deliverables. Contract deliverables are organized by Track and identified by a standardized nomenclature and deliverable number (e.g., PMO2, BPS20). Internal deliverables identify Track specific deliverables submitted by non-contracted staff and are identified by the prefix “I-” (e.g., I-OCM4, I-SDS1).

10.3.2.3 Contract Payments
The Contract Payments section is used to track the payment of invoices milestones for Contractor Support Services.

10.3.2.4 Track Detail Work Plans
Track Detail Work Plans are organized by Track. Each Track’s section will display deliverables, work products, and supporting tasks. In addition to each Track’s Detail Work Plan, this summary level includes Project Set-up and Pre-DDI Phase Close-Out sections.

10.3.2.5 Master Project Schedule Framework – Beyond Level 1
Additional levels represent a further breakdown/detailing of the Level 1 activities. These levels show the detail tasks needed to accomplish the work and are used by the Project to review, plan, analyze, and control the Project. These levels will have logical relationships that roll up to preceding levels and are organized in such a manner to facilitate critical path analysis and variance analysis reporting.
10.3.2.6 Master Project Schedule Standards
The Project applies the following standards to the Master Project Schedule which take into account specific project management requirements of Chapter 74-1 F.A.C.

10.3.2.7 Schedule Components (Columns)
The Master Project Schedule, at a minimum will consist of the following columns:

- Task Mode
- WBS
- CPI
- SPI
- Task Name
- % Complete
- Duration
- Start Date
- Finish Date
- Baseline Start Date
- Baseline Finish Date
- Predecessor
- Successor
- Resources
- Notes
- Track
- Deliverable
- Task Type

*Baseline start and finish dates are specific to the most current baseline version. The Master Project Schedule release notes identify the current baseline version.

10.3.2.8 Component Standards
The Schedule Components standards are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Mode</td>
<td>Auto Schedule mode is required for all tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBS</td>
<td>Auto calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>Auto calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Performance Index (SPI)</td>
<td>Auto calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Name</td>
<td>Summary Level – Deliverable Name and Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-summary Level - Description of tasks; begins with a verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>0% - Task/work product not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% - Task started and in-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% - Staff assigned to work communicate half of the work is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% - Work product is near complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% - Task/work product is complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For staffing related tasks, the following is used:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% - Planning/Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% - Interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% - Offer Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% - Paperwork Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% - On Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration**
- Number of business days to complete the task.
- All tasks are set to “fixed duration”
- Split tasks across months if the duration is greater than 30 days, with the exception of Review Cycles
- Review Cycle durations can cross over a month
- Holidays and weekend days are marked as “non-working time”
- Activity duration estimating will be used to calculate the number of days required to complete the non-summary level tasks.
- Tracks are encouraged to use the 3-point estimate technique when planning task start dates, finish dates, and duration. The 3-point estimate uses the most optimistic estimate (O), the most likely estimate (M), and the pessimistic estimate (least likely estimate) or (L) when calculating the duration of a task. These values are used to calculate the estimated values, where $E = \frac{(O+P+M)}{3}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Pick from calendar drop down; use business days only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish Date</td>
<td>Pick from calendar drop down; use business days only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Start Date</td>
<td>Date entered as baseline for comparison to actual start date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Finish Date</td>
<td>Date entered as baseline for comparison to actual finish date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predecessor</td>
<td>Task must be finished before the successor task can start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor</td>
<td>Task starts after its predecessors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Name of person(s) performing the task; Track name when applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Explanatory text when applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Pick applicable Track name from drop down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>Descriptive text; shortened deliverable name (e.g., PMO2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Type</td>
<td>Pick from drop down; indicates type of activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.3.2.9 Task Constraints

Since the Project uses dynamic scheduling, there should only be the “as soon as possible” constraint type which schedules the earliest possible start and finish dates for the task, given other scheduling parameters. All tasks will have a predecessor and successor with the exception of milestones.

### 10.3.2.10 Milestones

Key Milestones will be tied to the acceptance of deliverables and will be reported in Florida PALM Monthly Status Report. Track milestones will also appear in the Master Project Schedule however these milestones are typically used to signal an anchor such as the submission of a deliverable and need to begin the Review cycle process. These milestones also help the Track Managers and Project Director monitor performance to determine whether or not the Project is on schedule.

Deliverables and Deliverable Expectation Documents (DED)
In general, Contract deliverables will be preceded by a Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) while Internal Deliverables may or may not require a DED.

The following naming convention and duration is recommended for Deliverables and DEDs within the Master Project Schedule:

- Deliverable Expectation Document
  - Develop/Submit DED (10 days)
  - Review/Update DED (10 days)
- Deliverable
  - Develop <Deliverable Name and Number> (# days TBD)
  - Milestone: Submit <Deliverable Name and Number> (0 days)
  - Round 1 Review - <Deliverable Name and Number> (10 days)
  - Round 1 Edits - <Deliverable Name and Number> (5 days)
  - Round 2 Review - <Deliverable Name and Number> (5 days)
  - Round 2 Edits - <Deliverable Name and Number> (3 days)
  - Final Review - <Deliverable Name and Number> (2 days)
  - Milestone: Accept Deliverable Name and Number> (0 days)
  - Invoice Receipt (Number of days agreed to by Contractor)
  - Invoice Approved by Contract Manager (5 days)
  - Milestone: Invoice Paid (0 days) – this accounts for the 40-day cycle defined by F.S. 215 for invoice receipt to payment

10.3.2.11 Recurring Meetings
Recurring meetings that Project Team Members facilitate or support will not be captured in the Master Project Schedule. These will be maintained in the Project Meeting Log.

10.3.2.12 Cross Track Activities
Project activities and tasks may be the responsibility of a specific Track and its resources but also have support resources from another Track assigned to the task(s). In this case, the work will only appear within the responsible Track’s detail section of the Master Project Schedule with the named resources from the other Track listed in the resource column. Any Track deliverables or activities or dependent on other Track deliverables or activities will be linked with predecessors and successors.

10.3.2.13 Personnel (Staffing Plan)
Included in the Master Project Schedule, is the Project’s full-time positions which have been approved by the Legislature. The positions are arranged by track and position title, and account for the period of time in which each position was open. In the case of positions that have been filled and subsequently vacated, tasks for backfilling those positions is included.

10.3.2.14 Procurement Activities
Procurement activities and tasks (e.g., ITN, RFQ) will be included in the Master Project Schedule for planning and monitoring purposes.

10.3.2.15 Contractual Activities
Contractual deliverable dates will be added to the Master Project Schedule and baselined for the entire life of the contract rather than using the rolling wave planning approach. The exception to this standard is when a contractual activity is event driven and therefore does not have an agreed
upon start and end date. Examples include contractual deliverables that cannot start until a certain number of weeks before or after the release of the ITN. These activities will be included in the Master Project Schedule for planning and monitoring purposes but not be baselined.

10.3.2.16 Baseline Standards
A schedule baseline is a version of the schedule that is the standard against which future schedule performance will be measured. This comparison can identify areas of schedule slippage requiring corrective action to ensure the Project remains on schedule. The baseline will be used throughout the Project for measuring actual performance against planned activities and tasks.

During the Planning phase, the PMO will perform an initial Master Project Schedule baseline. This initial baseline will capture the original schedule as it was first envisioned and will establish a baseline that can be updated as the Project progresses.

Prior to performing the initial baseline, the Project Director and Track Managers will review the details of the Project deliverables, work products, supporting tasks, key milestones, and critical path and verify the Master Project Schedule contains the appropriate predecessors, successors, durations, start and finish dates, and resources. This exercise is also required to validate the work approved in the Project Scope and each Track Strategy has been captured and incorporated in the Master Project Schedule. A successful review and validation will result in the approval of the initial baseline.

When setting the Master Project Schedule initial and subsequent baselines, the Schedule Manager will choose to baseline either the entire project or selected tasks and then set the “Status Date”.

10.3.3 Execution – Monitoring – Controlling
The purpose of this phase is to manage the work planned and approved during the Planning phase to deliver the expected results. In order to do this, the progress of Project’s key activities and tasks will be monitored, maintained, and updated.

10.3.3.1 Rolling Wave/Fiscal Year Planning
It is not always feasible to create accurate projections and estimates through the end of multi-year projects. At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Project will document the major activities for the fiscal year and then refine throughout the year. Beyond a certain time frame, work plans and schedules become unrealistic due to the ever-increasing uncertainty of the future. To avoid investing resources and time in creating plans with unrealistic detail, the concept of “rolling wave” planning is employed in managing the schedule throughout the fiscal year. It facilitates the process of further defining activities, schedules, inter-project dependencies and resource requirements for the Project. In rolling wave planning, the Project includes summary level tasks for all long-range work to be completed within the Fiscal Year. Detail tasks are confirmed monthly and “committed” to (baselined) in the Master Project Schedule.

The PMO will coordinate rolling wave planning by scheduling the planning sessions and working with Track Managers individually, or in groups, as necessary, to define their 30-day commitment and long-range changes to existing or new tasks and resources through the Fiscal Year End. The planning sessions will be scheduled monthly and should occur no later than the last week of the month prior to the month being planned.
Activities and tasks scheduled to begin in the upcoming four weeks are planned in detail, while activities scheduled to start beyond 30 days are only updated if additional detail is known. The expected output of rolling wave planning is an updated Project Schedule with an updated baseline including resources (named individuals replacing the roles identified in high-level plans) allocated to the task(s).

10.3.3.2 Baseline Procedures
The PMO is responsible for updating the Master Project Schedule and baseline based on information received from the Tracks. There are two types of baselines that may be employed: new and selective. A new baseline is used only to capture the original schedule or when there is an update to the critical path. The intention of rolling wave planning is to update the original established and subsequent baselines monthly as the Project progresses.

With the selective baseline process, only selected tasks, such as 30 day committed tasks and contracted activities, rather than the entire schedule are re-baselined. The Florida PALM Project employs the selective baseline process.

10.3.3.3 Maintenance Procedures
In order to effectively monitor, update, and report on the Project’s progress, the following processes are documented in order to communicate the procedures as well as the roles and responsibilities in the process.

10.3.3.4 Track Status Meeting
On a weekly basis, Track Managers or Team Members will document the status of the week’s assigned activities, including the percent of completion of the task. Additionally, each Track will conduct a Weekly Status Update meeting to review and confirm the work completed for that week and what is planned for the next week. A member of the PMO will participate in each Track’s meeting and will compare the current week’s report to the previous week’s report to confirm planned activities were completed and being reported against.

10.3.3.5 Schedule Review Meetings
In addition to Weekly Status Update meetings, each Track will conduct Schedule Reviews to review progress on the Track’s 30-day committed tasks. The Tracks will be able to access the most current released version of the Master Project Schedule, Four-Week Look-Ahead Report, and Full Schedule Remaining Tasks Report on the Florida PALM Project SharePoint home page. The Schedule Manager will publish a snapshot of the Master Project Schedule in Microsoft Project format. The posted Four-Week Look-Ahead Report will consist of all Project activities and tasks to be completed in the following four weeks. Each Track can save a copy of the report and filter the data as needed. The data includes ID Number, Track Name, Deliverable Number, Task Type, Task Name, % Complete, Start Date, Finish Date, and Resource Name(s).

10.3.3.6 Schedule Update Process
The Schedule Manager is responsible for compiling weekly project updates for inclusion in the Master Project Schedule. To ensure a clear and definitive progression of the schedule, these updates will be incorporated once weekly. A best practice for organizing updates throughout the week is to print out a copy of the Four-Week Look-Ahead Report after each weekly update is completed. A Quality Control (QC) check per the Florida PALM Master Project Schedule Publication Checklist in Appendix A will be applied to ensure that the Master Project Schedule meets expected standards.
The weekly lifecycle for updates to the Master Project Schedule typically includes the following:

- **Thursday**
  - Track Status Reconciliation and Reporting; Tracks may report % updates within the Track Status Report or on a hard copy of the Four-Week Look-Ahead Report.
  - The Schedule Manager will use these % updates to update the Master Project Schedule accordingly

- **Friday**
  - QC Track updates weekly updates to the Master Project Schedule

- **Monday**
  - Include updates in the Master Project Schedule and set the Status Date to the previous Friday
  - Review the updated Master Project Schedule with the PMO Manager, and prepare the Master Project Schedule for peer review
  - A PMO Team Member other than the Schedule Manager will complete a peer review
  - Post Four-Week Look-Ahead Report on the Florida PALM SharePoint home page

- **Tuesday**
  - Release updated version of the Master Project Schedule by posting the file on the Florida PALM SharePoint home page.
  - Distribute a copy of the newly released version of the Master Project Schedule to the Agency for State Technology (AST) along with release notes

### 10.3.3.7 Schedule Release Process

Per Chapter 74-1, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), the Project is required to submit an updated Project Schedule to the AST on a weekly basis. The Schedule Manager will reconcile and update the Master Project Schedule per the Quality Control Checklist and save a copy in a designated folder on SharePoint for dissemination and historical record. In addition to the Master Project Schedule, the PMO will also save and submit a Release Notes Document identifying modifications to the Master Project Schedule (e.g., PCRs, corrections). A peer review will occur prior to releasing the Master Project Schedule to AST.

### 10.3.3.8 Project Change Request (PCR) Process

Change requests can occur throughout the life of the Project. Changes that affect the scope, budget, and schedule are documented, prioritized, analyzed, reviewed, and approved before implementation.

Approved PCRs that impact the schedule will be forwarded to the Schedule Manger who will create a PCR Implementation Plan. Once confirmed by the Track(s), adjustments will be made to the Master Project Schedule in accordance with the PCR. The Master Project Schedule will be re-baselined after PCR adjustments are made, if necessary.

### 10.3.3.9 Document Management

The Project utilizes the Florida PALM network shared drive to store and maintain the Master Project Schedule. As a general rule, the Master Project Schedule will only be checked out to the Schedule Manger for updates. The Schedule Manger and other approved administrators will use Release Notes to establish a clearly-defined version history of changes applied to the Master Schedule.
10.3.3.10 Schedule Performance Index (SPI) and Cost Performance Index (CPI)

As part of the weekly schedule reporting to AST, the Project must ensure that SPI and CPI are operationalized and fully functioning within the Master Project Schedule. Since the Project uses fixed cost deliverables, a proxy cost of $1.00 is assigned to all resources within the Master Project Schedule (Planned, Fixed, and Actual Costs will not be inserted). Since the Project is using a proxy cost value, the Master Project Schedule is not used to capture the cost of the Project. The Project maintains a Project Spend Plan to capture and monitor Project costs.

SPI and CPI are methods recommended by the AST to measure the efficiency of a project. SPI is intended to measure the schedule performance of a project representing how close actual work is being completed compared to the schedule. CPI is intended to measure the cost efficiency of a project representing the amount of work being completed for every unit of cost spent. An SPI and CPI value greater than 1 indicates the Project is performing well against the expected schedule and costs. The AST and Project Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) monitor the indices on a recurring basis. The AST defines the acceptable variance of these indices to be between .9 – 1.1.

10.3.3.11 Quality Control

Throughout the Project, certain quality control standards will be maintained concerning the schedule and processes tied to the schedule management. Quality control for schedule management requires the Schedule Manager to inspect the project file to see if it aligns with the Schedule Standards. The Schedule Manager will use the Florida PALM Master Project Schedule Publication Checklist below as a guide to ensure quality control.

Table 6: Master Project Schedule Publication Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Review Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clear all filters and expand all tasks before review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Confirm all tasks are Auto Scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All tasks have predecessors (except parent tasks and “Project Begin” task).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All tasks have successors (except parent tasks and “Invoice Paid” tasks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are no tasks with an estimated duration (“?” adjacent to the number of days).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All tasks have at least one resource assigned (except for parent tasks and milestones).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Confirm accuracy of percent completed for all tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Follow up on all task notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Review SPI for accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Review CPI for accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Review Critical Path for accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Update “Status Date.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Clear all filters and expand all tasks prior to saving file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Archive file for AST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Overwrite “SharePoint Quick Link” file.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the Schedule Manager has conducted quality control per the checklist above, and prior to release of the Master Project Schedule as a result of updates and changes, a different PMO Team Member will conduct a peer review according to the following criteria:
1. Compare the current week’s version to the previous week’s version
   a. Open the current week’s Master Project Schedule
   b. Select “Compare Schedules” from the Report tab
   c. Click “Browse” and select the previous week’s version of the Master Project Schedule
   d. Leave the Task Table and Resource Table value as “Entry”
   e. Click “OK”

2. Analyze the Master Project Schedule data differences from the side by side Comparison Report
   a. Each field type of the Master Project Schedule will be displayed as three columns; Current, Previous, and Difference
   b. Filter the difference columns to verify differences and/or identify anomalies
   c. Verify the note for added or deleted lines indicated by a + or –
   d. Validate added or deleted data

3. Analyze Earned Value Measures
   a. Repeat steps 1.a. – c.
   b. Change the Task Table and Resource Table value to Earned Value; click “OK”
   c. Analyze the difference columns for CPI, SPI, BCWS, BCWP, and ACWP
      i. CPI - Cost Performance Index
      ii. SPI - Schedule Performance Index
      iii. BCWS - Budgeted Cost of Work Scheduled
      iv. BCWP - Budgeted Cost of Work Performed
      v. ACWP - Actual Cost of Work Performed
   d. Filter the difference columns to verify differences and/or identify anomalies

Observations found during the peer review will be sent via email to the PMO Manager and Schedule Manager. The PMO Manager will make the final decision if any changes are required prior to distribution. Acceptable and/or expected differences will be explained in the Release Notes

10.3.3.12 Reporting Elements
The Master Project Schedule provides data to support various reports for the Project Team and Stakeholders including the Track Status, RAIDL, Monthly, and Quarterly Reports.

To manage the Master Project Schedule, the PMO produces and distributes the RADAR and 30-day Commit reports as described in detail below.

10.3.3.13 RADAR (Four-Week Look-Ahead) Report
The Four-Week Look-Ahead Report is an extract of tasks from the Master Project Schedule. It lists all tasks that are due or will be due within four weeks. The Report includes the Master Project Schedule’s ID and WBS, Track, Deliverable Number, Task Type, Task Name, % Complete, Start and Finish Dates, Baseline Start and Finish Dates, and Resources. Users can filter each column. It is compiled and emailed to the Project Team Master Project Schedule updates are completed.

Project Team Members use the Report for a variety of reasons including to confirm and validate progress to date, planned activities, resource overutilization, and slippage.
Figure 7: Sample RADAR Report

10.3.3.14 30-day Commit Report

The 30-day commit report will be used by the Project Team during the monthly Rolling Wave Planning sessions as described in the Rolling Wave Planning section above. The Report will assist the Team with planning and committing to work to be performed for the next 30 days. The Team will also review the Full Schedule Remaining Task Report to identify summary level tasks that fall outside of the next 30 days, and add detail to these if known.
Full Schedule Remaining Tasks Report

The Full Schedule Remaining Tasks Report is an extension of the Four-Week Look-Ahead Report. The only difference is that this report shows all tasks through the Fiscal Year and not just the next four weeks. Project Team Members use the Report for a variety of reason as mentioned above as well as to confirm and validate planned tasks and activities and/or possibly re-planning. It is compiled and emailed to the Project Team after Master Project Schedule updates are completed.

Closing

Knowledge Transfer

The PMO promotes continuous knowledge transfer through varying activities including participating in Track and Project-wide weekly review meetings, maintaining a considerations log, updating templates, participating in Track deliverable review cycles, documenting standards and procedures, and facilitating training.
10.3.4.2 Lessons Learned
The intended use for lessons learned gathered by the Project are to improve the overall productivity and efficiency of its processes. The Project logs, reviews, and tracks Lessons Learned as a RAIDL item and is discussed by the applicable Track during Track RAIDL meetings and by the Project during the Project-wide Bi-weekly meetings.

10.3.4.3 Project Schedule Close-Out
To ensure that the Project maximizes the significant knowledge gathered throughout each phase, it is imperative that this knowledge is captured in a manner that allows it to be leveraged in the future. At a minimum, the following exit criteria must be considered when closing out the Pre-DDI Master Project Schedule:

1. Are all tasks 100% complete?
2. What needs to be done if there are incomplete tasks?

10.4 Roles and Responsibilities
The Schedule Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the four (4) major areas of the Schedule Management Process as shown in the figure below.

![Schedule Management Roles and Responsibilities](image)

**Figure 9: Major Areas of the Schedule Management Process**

**Table 7: Schedule Management Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Manager</td>
<td>• Manage updates to the Master Project Schedule&lt;br&gt;• Ensures Quality Control via Master Project Schedule Publication Checklist&lt;br&gt;• Creates Schedule related Reports&lt;br&gt;• Facilitates 30-day Commit meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC Reviewer</td>
<td>• Performs peer review of Master Project Schedule prior to release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO Manager</td>
<td>• Approves versions of the Master Project Schedule prior to release&lt;br&gt;• Facilitates schedule planning meetings&lt;br&gt;• Approves release of Master Project Schedule&lt;br&gt;• Approves revised baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Managers</td>
<td>• Approves 30-day commit tasks&lt;br&gt;• Provides Weekly Updates&lt;br&gt;• Supports schedule planning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>• Approves Project Scope and Track Strategies&lt;br&gt;• Approves new baselines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee</td>
<td>• Approves changes impacting due dates of major deliverables or key project milestones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Quality Management

11.1 Overview
Quality Management includes two components, Deliverable Quality and Service Quality processes. These processes ensure Deliverable and Service Quality meets Project expectations. The Project expects the highest quality in its Deliverables, work products, and performance from both internal Project Team members and external Contractors. To achieve a positive outcome, these processes will be carried out so expectations are aligned and met.

11.2 Purpose
The purpose of Quality Management is to provide instructions on the processes for Deliverable Quality and Service Quality. The Service Quality processes are specific to evaluating the quality of service for Contractors. It is important that each Contractor staff is fully aware of the Project Quality Management processes.

11.3 Process
Quality Management is about performing discipline inspections throughout the work product life cycle. These inspections are performed at key transition points in the creation, review, and release of documents or information. The list below identifies the quality management control points used by the Project.

1) Cost Management, Section 9: the Procurement/Budget Specialist performs a quality review described in the checklist table prior to submitting the spend plan.
2) Schedule Management, Section 10: the Schedule Manager performs a quality review described in in checklist table Prior to releasing the Master Schedule.
3) Communication Management, Section 17: For all content to be shared with entities or people outside of the Project, the quality activities are described in this section.
4) Deliverable Management, Section 21: These five quality events are associated with the development of a deliverable: DED, Peer Review(s), Submission QC, Deliverable Review Comments, and Pre-Release QC.
5) Content Management, Section 23: All information accepted or released to outside entities employs the processes described in this section of the PMP.

The remaining content in this section will describe in more detail the deliverable quality and service quality expectations.

11.3.1 Deliverable Quality
The diagram below depicts the Deliverable Quality process. The Deliverable Management plan provides the detailed steps for completing the elements below. Each yellow star indicates a quality management element. These elements are described in more detail below.
Figure 10: Quality Management Process Overview

The Project’s Deliverable Quality Management process has elements designed into each of the three key stages of a Deliverable. The following section outlines the Quality Management elements within each of the stages.

1. Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) Development
   The DED is the first step in establishing the quality expectations for the deliverable before deliverable development begins. It establishes the criteria and format by which the eventual deliverable submission will be measured. Through the review and acceptance of the DED, the impacted stakeholders collaborate to set clear expectations and agree upon outcomes as well as communicating the approach for developing and accepting the content in parts or in its entirety.

2. Deliverable Development
   The Project encourages coordination and collaboration throughout the development of a deliverable. The deliverable Owner establishes quality checkpoints to confirm acceptance criteria and approach is being demonstrated during the development of a deliverable. For Contractual deliverables, the Project monitors and evaluates the level of interaction between a Contractor and the Project Team following the Service Quality Evaluation process as described in the next section. Prior to submission of the deliverable, the deliverable Owner shall use the Submission Quality Control (QC) Checklist to confirm that quality expectations have been included in the deliverable.

3. Technical Quality Evaluation
   a. Submission QC Review – The first step in the Technical Quality Evaluation process is to review the deliverable against a standard checklist to confirm it meets the Project’s quality standards prior to the deliverable review process. If any issues are found, the submission is not accepted and the deliverable is returned to the Owner. This step helps ensure the most efficient use of the Reviewers’ time and provides a clear indicator of the quality to the deliverable Owner.

   b. Deliverable Review – The quality component during the deliverable review process confirms accuracy and completeness meets the deliverable acceptance criteria communicated in the DED.
11.3.2 Service Quality

The purpose and scope of Service Quality is focused on the overall interactions and performance of the Contactor(s) during a specific period of time. Service Quality Management and Procedures, in conjunction with the Deliverable Quality, Schedule, and Deliverable Management, will provide a complete view of a Contractor’s performance. The performance of Contractors providing services to the Project will be monitored and evaluated at the direction of the Contract Manager, Track Manager, and Project Director.

The Project has a process for evaluating Contractor service quality. The diagram below provides an overview of the Service Quality Evaluation process.

![Service Quality Evaluation Process Overview Diagram]

**Figure 11: Service Quality Management Process Overview**

11.3.2.1 Initial Meeting

Within the first thirty days of the contract start date, the Contract Manager and Contractor Lead, Contractor Engagement Executive, or other representatives will meet to confirm contractual and service level expectations for the Contractor(s) on the Project. The key outputs of this meeting are:

- For each role in the RACIV and responsibilities table, a Project team member name will be provided
- Education on the Project’s Quality Management System expectations:
  - Technical Quality Evaluation as described within Deliverable Management
  - Service Quality Evaluation as described within Quality Management
    - Planned timeline for regular Service Quality Evaluation Reviews
    - Planned timeline for periodic Quality Reviews
    - Primary Contractor contact for Service Quality Evaluation feedback
    - Contractor contact for issue escalation
- Contractual Expectations
  - Confirmation of deliverables and Contractor responsibilities
  - Discussion of communication channels and protocols
  - Discussion of technical and service quality risks
  - Discuss any delivery and performance risks from the contracted services

During the initial meeting, the Contract Manager and Contractor will determine a schedule for performing the regular Service Quality Evaluations. The timing of these evaluations is at the
discretion of the Project Director and Contract Manager. Reviews are typically performed on a regular schedule (e.g., monthly). The Project may choose to perform non-schedule service quality evaluation to coincide with significant Project events, deliverables, milestones, or transition points throughout the Project lifecycle.

11.3.2.2 Service Quality Evaluation

The Contract Manager will collect feedback on the performance of the Contractor from Service Quality Evaluators who are involved in work and interactions with the Contractor staff. The Service Quality Evaluators may change from one review period to the next based on changes in the Contractor’s work as well as what Project Team Member(s) is involved in creating work products in collaboration with the Contractors.

Feedback will take the form of answers to a series of ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ questions, with the positive result being an answer of ‘Yes’. The table below outlines the Service Quality measures for the Project and apply to all contracted services. During the evaluation, any answer of “No” or “Can’t Confirm” will require additional information to be documented by the Service Quality Evaluator and Contract Manager and could result in items on the service improvement plan (SIP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Service Quality Evaluation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measure Evaluation Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Does the Contractor complete tasks/deliverables by the agreed completion dates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Does the Contractor respect other Project Team Members and their roles, adapt to the Florida PALM environment, and demonstrate a positive and cooperative attitude?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Contract Manager will collect and collate the feedback from each of the Service Quality Evaluators. In the case where there are differences in responses for a question from the Service Quality Evaluators, the Contract Manager will coordinate, consolidate, and confirm the answers and comments for that question.

After collating, and addressing any ambiguity with the Service Quality Evaluators, the Contract Manager will share the Service Quality Evaluation results with the Contractor Lead. The Contract Manager will then meet with the Contractor Lead and develop a SIP related to any negative responses from the Service Quality Evaluators. This meeting and the finalization of the SIP should happen as soon as possible after the Service Quality Evaluation. The Contractor Lead is expected to formulate, gain acceptance from the Approver, and begin making progress on the SIP before the next scheduled Service Quality Evaluation.

The format for the SIP may vary depending on the Contractor and situation, but should provide at a minimum the following elements:

- A clear description of the concern or issue identified during the Service Quality Evaluation
- Identify specific steps and timing which will be taken by the Contractor to address the concern
- Identify specific measures or criteria which demonstrates evidence the concern has been remediated

If there is negative feedback from the Service Quality Evaluation, or there is insufficient improvement for a Contractor with a SIP, the Contract Manager will escalate this shortcoming according to the table below. Escalation is at the discretion of the Contract Manager and Project Director.

### Table 9: Service Quality Evaluation Escalation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escalation Level</th>
<th>Description and Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 – Contractor Lead</td>
<td>For initial feedback or minor SIP opportunities, the Contract Manager will work with the Contractor Lead to develop a SIP. Minor SIP being defined as, there has been no impact to schedule commitments or state staff have been required to expended unplanned effort to get the deliverable in acceptable quality prior to submission to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 – Contractor Engagement Executive</td>
<td>If the concerns are significant, they impact the performance or reputation of the Project, or if the Contractor is not making progress against the SIP, the Contract Manager and Project Director or designee will escalate the concerns to the Contractor Engagement Executive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a periodic basis, typically quarterly, the Contract Manager and Contractor Engagement Executive will meet to proactively review and confirm the service expectations established during
the initial meeting and any feedback from the regular Service Quality Evaluation. The purpose of these meetings is to provide a designated opportunity to share and discuss the Service Quality Evaluation results and determine if any of the initial expectations need to be revised. Outputs of this meeting can include a revision to the timing of the regular Service Quality Evaluation Assessments, updates to the Contractor expectations, or changes to the SIP.

The Project Quality Manager will review the results of the Service Quality Evaluations, to monitor the progress of the SIP, overall improvement in the service level being provided to the Project, and to look for trends in the results which may not be apparent to the Contract Manager. Examples of potential trends the Project Quality Manager might identify include consistently lower (or higher) evaluation scores from one individual or individuals within a Project Track indicating a misalignment of expectations or that Track being underserved. A Project issues could be generated if an identified completion date in the SIP is not met by the Contractor.

The Project Quality Manager will also be responsible for monitoring the overall effectiveness of the Service Quality Evaluation process, including the amount of time spent collecting the evaluation data versus the effort expended by the Project to collect and compile that data. On a regular basis, likely bi-annually, the Project Quality Manager will meet with the Contract Managers and PMO to review:

- The effectiveness of the Service Quality Evaluation process,
- The lessons learned from Periodic and Final Service Quality Evaluation Reviews, and
- Work with the PMO to determine if any changes are needed to the Service Quality Management processes.

11.3.2.3 Final Evaluation and Review
At the end of each contract, the Contract Manager and the Contractor Lead will conduct a final Service Quality Evaluation and feedback session. The purpose of this session is to review the overall quality performance of the Contractor, and obtain the Contractor’s input and feedback on the Service Quality Management process. The Contract Manager will evaluate the feedback from the Contractor, document any lessons learned, and determine if any changes need to be made to the Project’s Service Quality Management standards, procedures, processes, or tools. The Project Quality Manager may participate in this session to obtain firsthand information on the performance of the Service Quality Management process. The Contract Manager will document the observations in the Project’s Lessons Learned repository and distribute as appropriate to other Project Team members.
## Service Quality Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submit</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Execute</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contract Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contractor Lead or Engagement Executive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accepter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review Evaluator List</td>
<td>- Complete Evaluation and Return to Owner</td>
<td>- Provide Additional Information and Clarification</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Add Evaluators?</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No</td>
<td></td>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No</td>
<td>- No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Service Quality Evaluation (SQE) roles and responsibilities are described in the table below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role during each of the three (3) major areas of the SQE Process as shown in the figure below.

Figure 13: Major Areas of the Service Quality Evaluation Management Process

Table 10: Service Quality Evaluation Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contract Manager                 | • Manages the overall process  
                                 | • Initiates and conducts regular Service Quality Evaluations  
                                 | • Monitors the defined continuous process improvement and remediation process using a Service Improvement Plan (SIP) for identified service concerns or issues | R | R | R |
| Contractor Lead                  | • Participates in setting contractual and service level expectations for the Contractor(s)  
                                 | • Contributes and monitors the Contractor’s performance throughout the process | C | C | C |
| Contractor Engagement Executive  | • Participates in setting contractual and service level expectations for the Contractor(s)  
                                 | • Accountable for Contractor’s service delivery performance throughout the process | C | C | C |
| Contractor                       | • Responsible for meeting agreed upon contractual and service level expectations and SIP, if applicable | I | I | C/I |
| Reviewers                        | • Conducts Service Quality Evaluation | I | C | C |
| Quality Manager                  | • Monitors overall adherence to the process  
                                 | • Reviews results across Contractors and time periods to identify trends  
                                 | • Supports Periodic Quality Checkpoint meetings; Participates in the Final Evaluation and Review to capture and analyze feedback on the overall process | I/V | I/V | I/V |
| Acceptor                         | • Accepts the final SQE and SIP | C | A | A |
12 Procurement Management

12.1 Overview
Procurement Management establishes the processes utilized to procure support services and to acquire goods and services necessary for the operation of the Project. Procurement Management also includes the process to manage contracts and vendor relationships.

12.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions to the PMO and other Project Team Members regarding Procurement Management and related contract management. All standards and procedures described are in accordance with the DFS Agency Policy and Procedures (AP&P) #2-02, Purchase of Commodities and Contractual Services which references relevant Florida procurement laws and rules.

12.3 Process
The Procurement Management process includes four (4) major areas: procurement, contract management, deliverable acceptance (or receiving), and contract closeout. The standards and procedures of Procurement Management take input from the Quality Management processes included in this document. Quality Management provides standards for which all work products are developed by Contractors or Project Tracks. Additionally, the Project has incorporated procurement and contract procedures from the DFS Contract Management Life Cycle Guide into the Procurement Management process.

12.3.1 Procurement
At the beginning of the Fiscal Year, the Project plans procurement activities which serve as inputs to the creation of the Project Spend Plan as well as the Master Project Schedule to account for the activities, timing, and staff required for each procurement. More complex procurement activities require an approved Procurement Strategy document.

12.3.1.1 Purchase Authority
The Project Director has the authority to purchase the necessary goods and services to achieve the outcomes of the Project within the defined budget.

12.3.1.2 Spend Plan
The annual budget process includes estimation of all Project expenses and costs. The Spend Plan must include significant or complex contractual services requirements such as statutorily mandated services (e.g., Independent Validation and Verification [IV&V] services) and other consultant or specialized services approved to support the Project.

The Spend Plan must also account for the purchase of supplies throughout the fiscal year. Supply requisition purchases are generally small purchases, or state contract purchases\(^1\), and include office consumables, computers, equipment, and office furniture as well as subscription services. The Project continually reviews and forecasts any changes in future products and services needed in the monthly updates to the Project Spend Plan.

---

\(^1\) Reference section 287.017 F.S., Purchasing categories. Reference 287.056, F.S., Purchases from purchasing agreements and state term contracts.
The estimation of cost for goods and services is based on historical Project spend data as well as averages of State Term Contract rates. Refer to the Cost Management Standards and Procedures for more details about the Project Spend Plan and annual budget process.

12.3.1.3 Schedule Planning
The procurement of contractual services requires detailed schedule planning. The Master Project Schedule is utilized to plan all activities, time requirements, and human resources needed to develop and evaluate the appropriate solicitation for complex services. Supply requisition purchases described later in this section are not included in the Master Project Schedule as they are purchased on an as needed, or “just in time” basis throughout the fiscal year.

The Master Project Schedule includes the steps and resources assigned to each procurement which typically include:

- Draft development;
- Draft review cycles;
- Solicitation release date range;
- Evaluation date range;
- Award or vendor selection date;
- Contract approval and execution; and
- Detailed service delivery schedules and deliverable acceptance review cycles.

For more information about the Master Project Schedule, see the Schedule Management section of this document.

12.3.1.4 Solicitation Process
Procurement professionals on the PMO staff are responsible for the development and oversight of each Project procurement activity. The PMO Track Manager assigns a procurement professional to each procurement activity as a resource in the Master Project Schedule. The Procurement professionals also serve as liaisons with the DFS Purchasing, DFS Contract Management, and the DFS Legal Offices. The Project’s procurement professionals work with Track Managers to document and verify that strategies, reviews, and required documentation are obtained prior to the release and throughout each solicitation.

All documentation is stored on the Project SharePoint PMO/Procurement Libraries. As required by DFS policy, each procurement that results in a contract includes a corresponding contract management directory.

The selection of the most appropriate method of procurement is determined pursuant to Section 287.057(5)(f), F.S., and Rule 60A-1.002(f), F.A.C. Refer to Section 5.5, “Determine Solicitation Method” of the DFS Contract Management Life Cycle Guide for additional information for selection process definitions (i.e., competitive and noncompetitive methods) and detailed DFS process flows for the development and approval of informal and formal solicitations. All procurements in the amount of $35,000 or greater require documented approval of a Business Needs Analysis (BNA) which identifies the Purchasing Methods and Rules and Statutes affected, or authorizing the activities.

The Florida PALM Procurement Manager will obtain and maintain BNA documentation in the Project SharePoint PMO/Procurement Libraries for each procurement activity.
12.3.1.5 Supply Requisition Purchases
Supply requisition purchases are small purchases or commodities state contract purchases and include office consumables, computers, equipment, and office furniture as well as subscription services. The Project plans for supplies and small purchases in the Project Spend Plan. Those supplies are purchased on a “just in time” basis throughout the fiscal year or on a subscription basis when appropriate.

The Project Director and Track Managers direct the Procurement Manager (typically, the Florida PALM Office Manager) to create requisitions in MFMP for approved supplies purchases. See MyFloridaMarketPlace (MFMP) “Agency Customers” for guidance on the State of Florida’s eProcurement System.

http://www.dms.myflorida.com/business_operations/state_purchasing/myfloridamarketplace/mfmp_agency_customers

12.3.1.6 Support Services Purchases
Unlike supply requisition purchases, support services purchases are more often complex activities, each planned and executed by the PMO. Support services purchases require the development of a detailed scope of work, evaluation or vendor selection criteria, and the execution of a two-party contract or purchase order contract. Support services purchases may also include the purchase of software or other tools required to support the project that require an RFQ or formal solicitation, negotiation of terms, or licensing agreements.

12.3.1.7 Procurement Strategy Document Development
All procurement activities for support services that require development of a Request for Quote (RFQ) from State Term Contract or a competitive solicitation are identified and planned for in the Track Strategy document. The Project Director accepts all Track Strategy documents.

The Track Strategy document typically includes:

- Overview or objective of the procurement;
- Procurement scope and any optional or desired additional services;
- Market analysis;
- Timeline or timeframe for the solicitation and awarded services;
- Minimum and preferred experience or other qualifications;
- Relationship to other Project contracts;
- Method of procurement options;
- Proposed evaluation team;
- Proposed pricing model; and
- Recommendations.

12.3.2 Contract Management
Support services procurements that result in a contract must be managed by a certified Contract Manager. A Project Contract Manager is assigned to each contract executed for the Project. Each contract specifies the scope of work and tasks the contractor is required to perform by dividing the contract into quantifiable, measurable, and verifiable units of deliverables that must be received and accepted in writing by the Contact Manager before payment. The responsibilities

---

2 Reference section 287.057(1), F.S., competitive solicitation processes authorized.
3 Section 287.056(b)
and procedures for each duly certified Contract Manager are provided in the DFS Contract Manager Life Cycle guide and processes for project compliance with those procedures is summarized below, including evaluation of vendor performance throughout the contract term.

12.3.2.1 Contract Routing and Execution
The DFS Contract Management Life Cycle Guide describes general information about the contract routing and execution procedures. When the proposed contract documents are complete and ready for internal approval, the Project proceeds with the appropriate contract routing process. The contract routing process flows are described in the Contract Management Life Cycle Guide and include:

- MFMP Requisition Process flow for Non-Technology contracts
- MFMP Technology Process flow
- The Two Party Contract Routing Process flow (Pre and Post Contractor Execution)

12.3.2.2 Contract Monitoring
The Project Track Managers coordinate work effort from contractors and State staff that support each Track. The Project Contract Managers work with Track Managers to document and verify that contract deliverables and work products are received from contractors as scheduled and in accordance with the Project’s quality standards as described in the Quality Management section of this document. The Project Contract Managers are responsible for monitoring all assigned contracts to verify all contract deliverables (goods and services) are provided in accordance with each contract. The Project leverages MFMP and SharePoint resources to manage and monitor each contract upon completion of the routing and execution. Summary information for each contract is maintained in the DFS Florida Accountability Contract Tracking System (FACTS) for public access.

Contract Managers maintain a contract/purchase order log for services and subscriptions. The log provides summary information about the agreements and monitors expiration dates for planning future procurement activities or contract renewal lead time. The log is maintained in the PMO SharePoint directory and includes:

- PO/Contract Number
- Contractor Name
- Date of Execution
- Expiration Date
- Contract Amount
- Service Type
- Track and Track Manager
- Contract Manager

The log includes automatic email notifications to the designated Contract beginning 6 months prior to the expiration of each agreement.

12.3.2.3 SharePoint Contract Manager File Content and Structure
All documentation for each contract or purchase order contract is maintained by the assigned Contract Manager in the SharePoint PMO Procurement Documents Library. All contract file content is maintained by the Contract Manager for the term of the agreement is and maintained
in accordance with the State’s records retention schedules after completion of the services and closeout of the contract. The content and structure for each contract file must include:

- The fully executed agreement;
  - Documentation of the procurement,
  - Routing and approval for the executed contract
- Documented contract management and monitoring activities
  - DFS Contract Monitoring Checklist
  - Vendor onboarding records
  - Deliverable acceptance documentation
  - Deliverable tracking document (for multiple deliverables)
  - Invoicing and Payment
  - Risk Assessment
  - Attestation of No Conflict of Interest
  - Contract Audit Records

Link for DFS Contract Management Tools/Templates:
http://dfsintranet.fldoi.gov/Administration/generalservices/Lists/Contract%20Management/AllItems.aspx

12.3.3 Deliverable Acceptance
The Contract Manager collaborates with each Track Manager and other assigned reviewers to develop (when appropriate), review, and accept contract deliverables and work products provided by the Project’s Contractors through the process defined in the Deliverable Management section of this document.

12.3.3.1 Deliverable Tracking and Management
The Deliverable Management section defines the activities for the collaborative development, review, and approval of each contract deliverable and work product. Deliverable Management procedures establish the roles, approach and timeline for acceptance review, and the development of a Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) for each deliverable that includes contractual and more detailed acceptance criteria.

Upon contract award, the review cycles, agreed upon acceptance dates, invoicing, and payment dates are entered and tracked in the Project Master Schedule. The Contract Manager works with the Schedule Manager to record the completion of each scheduled activity or the percentage of work completed to date in the Master Schedule.

12.3.3.2 Acceptance of Deliverables
Upon completion of review cycles, the Contract Manager verifies that all terms and conditions of the contract and any additional criteria set forth in the DED have been met. Once verified, the Contract Manager makes a written recommendation to the Project Director via email to accept the deliverable. If the Project Director accepts the recommendation, the Contract Manager obtains signatures on the Deliverable Acceptance Form Template to document the contract file and to notify the contractor of formal acceptance prior to invoicing for payment.

12.3.3.3 Invoice Processing
Upon completion and documentation of all contract activities, vendors submit invoices for payment of deliverables or billable hours worked. The payment and processing of invoices is
accomplished when the Contract Manager sends approved invoices and accompanying documentation via email to the DFS Bureau of Financial Services (InvoicesToPay@fldoi.gov), or, if an electronic invoice is submitted, it may be processed directly in MFMP. The Contract Manager communicates payment activities with the Budget Specialist and indicates the acceptance date and payment dates in the contract management deliverable tracking document.

12.3.4 Contract Closeout
A Service Quality Evaluation (SQE), as part of the Quality Management procedures, is conducted on an ongoing basis during the term of any Project contract. At a minimum, SQE must be performed as a part of contract closeout. The SQE defines the Contractor and Contractor services that are subject to ongoing evaluation and identifies the appropriate Project Team Member(s) who provide evaluation of the services. Time and materials contracts should define the criteria and timing for review of results from service evaluations. However, both time and materials or deliverables based contracts rely on SQE procedures for development of corrective action plans if contractors do not meet the expected level of service quality.

Contract closeout contains three components:

1. Programmatic closeout documents that all deliverables, reports, and services were delivered and accepted in writing, all performance standards were met, and the contract file is complete.
2. Fiscal closeout verifies that all funds associated with the contract were appropriately spent and invoices are documented and paid. This includes closeout of FACTS records.
3. Security closeout ensures the protection of the DFS assets. During the Security closeout, the Contract Manager verifies the removal of information technology access by contractors and the return of any DFS devices or tools.

12.4 Referenced Documents
- Department of Financial Services (DFS), Contract Management Lifecycle Guide
  - Process Flows
  - DFS Purchasing Services Tools/Templates: [http://dfsintranet/Administration/generalservices/Lists/Purchasing%20Services%20Links/AllItems.aspx](http://dfsintranet/Administration/generalservices/Lists/Purchasing%20Services%20Links/AllItems.aspx)
- DFS Agency Policies and Procedures (AP&P), #2-02 Purchase of Commodities/Contractual Services
- Florida PALM Master Project Schedule
- Florida PALM Spend Plan
- MyFloridaMarketPlace Agency Customer Resources

12.5 Roles and Responsibilities
The Procurement Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role during each of the four (4) major areas of the Procurement Management Process as shown in the figure below.
Figure 14: Major Areas of the Procurement Management Process

Table 11: Procurement Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Manages and leads all Project activities, approves all procurement activities, and accepts all contracted deliverables.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO Manager</td>
<td>Manages Project Management Office, reviews all procurement activities and contracted deliverables.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>Manages Project Track (BPS, SDS, PMO and OCM) including the evaluation of contract award or vendor selection in Track related procurement processes; provides subject matter expertise in the development of related solicitations for goods and services for each Track; responsible for day to day operations within any contract.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee</td>
<td>Overall responsibility for ensuring that the Project meets its primary business objectives including the approval of all major Project Deliverables and solicitation related documents associated with the replacement of FLAIR and CMS.</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Manager</td>
<td>Manages the Master Project Schedule to include approved procurement activities.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Specialist</td>
<td>Administers the Cost Management Process for the Project to include the development, monitoring, posting, and reporting on costs of the Project Spend Plan.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Manager</td>
<td>Manages the procurement process to include strategy development, execution, and award or vendor selection for services and goods.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Manager</td>
<td>Manages Contract and vendor relations.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFS Purchasing</td>
<td>Reviews and executes procurement activities in accordance with DFS Policies and Procedures on behalf of the Project resulting in purchase orders/contracts; serves as the sole point of contact during all formal solicitations.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I/V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Reviews procurement documentation and processes for legal sufficiency.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13 Staffing Management

13.1 Overview
Staffing Management establishes the processes for onboarding and management related activities concerning state employees/full time equivalents (FTE) and contracted staff (Contractor). Project Team Members include both State and Contracted Team Members.

13.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions to the PMO and other Project Team Members regarding Staffing Management and associated activities. Staffing Management is used to identify project roles, skills, number of positions, resource types, and specify the method(s) for acquiring new personnel or incorporating and backfilling the current responsibilities of existing personnel. All standards and procedures described are in accordance with the DFS Agency Policy and Procedures (AP&P).

13.3 Process
The Staffing Management process is inclusive of four (4) major areas: Planning, Recruitment, Administration, and Separation.

13.3.1 Planning

13.3.1.1 Resource Planning
At the start of the Project and each fiscal year, the Project Team projects the number of resources needed and related costs for the upcoming fiscal year. Planning activities include establishing resource types, roles, and skills needed. The Project utilizes a “What If” spreadsheet to plan and forecast cost for FTEs and Project Spend Plan to forecast for Contractors. Projections include salary and benefits for FTEs and Contractor costs and are provided to the DFS Budget Office for inclusion into the annual Legislative Budget Request (LBR).

13.3.1.2 Position Creation
Track Managers create position descriptions for FTE resources. The position description shall include an accurate description of the duties and responsibilities assigned to the position; the job-related knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the position; any licensure, certification or registration required for the position (including testing); and any position designators. A Scope of Work defines the minimum and preferred qualifications of the position assigned to work on the Project.

13.3.2 Recruitment
When the Project receives funding and authority, it uses a variety of channels for recruiting FTEs including People First and Career Builder. The Project also has the ability to appoint an individual to a position. The Project follows this process in accordance with the DFS Agency Policy and Procedures (AP&P) #5-07, Recruitment and Appointments for Vacancies.

Standard interview questions are used for each interview and Track Managers are responsible for including Track related questions. The Project maintains an Interview Log that tracks each interview the Project conducts. Once the interviews are completed, the Track Manager will evaluate the candidates based on skills, interview, and needs of the Project, to select a qualifying candidate. The Track Manager will contact the qualifying candidate to provide a verbal offer contingent on background screening and reference checks. The Track Manager will request a
list of references along with a signed State of Florida Application. Once the candidate start date is known, the salary information is provided to the Budget Manager to update the Project Spend Plan.

The Procurement Management section of this document includes information pertaining to the recruitment and placement of Contractors.

13.3.3 Administration
The Administration process describes how the Project onboards and tracks Project Team Members.

13.3.3.1 State Team Onboarding
There are several steps the Project will follow when onboarding State Team Members. Track Managers will complete and submit the Employer Reference Check form. The Project Office Manager will then package the hire packet together for approval and submit to DFS Human Resources (HR) for review and processing. The packet consists of a completed Appointment Processing Form, Appointment Request Form, signed State of Florida Application, reference check forms, Position Description, and Personnel Action Memo. HR reviews the New Hire Package and sends notification of receipt. Once the package is reviewed and processed, HR will send a notification of approval to the Track Manager and Office Manager to proceed with fingerprinting. Additional onboarding steps include:

- The candidate is required to contact the HR representative to schedule a fingerprinting appointment at DFS. HR will complete the background screening and notify the Office Manager and hiring Track Manager when screening is cleared and approved.
- The hiring Track Manager contacts the candidate to confirm a start date.
- The Office Manager will notify HR and HR will generate an offer letter.
- After the offer letter is generated, the Office Manager completes the following forms and the candidate is approved to start on the date agreed to with the Track Manager:
  - DFS Form 1820
  - Building Access Form(s)
  - Parking
  - Updates Team Tracker Log
- The candidate is sent a “Day 0” welcome email including the Project Guidelines and Day 1 information at their provided email address.

13.3.3.2 Contractor Onboarding
When executing contracts and onboarding Contractors, the Track Manager/Contract Manager is responsible for monitoring the onboarding steps to ensure a smooth process. Onboarding can take several weeks and stretches across various divisions within DFS. The Contractor onboarding steps/requirements below take place after the contract is executed:

- Acquire start date of Contractor(s)
- Contractor(s) submit signed Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA)
- Fingerprinting and Background Screening
  - Contractor to register/make appointment for fingerprinting
    - Local: Fingerprinting will take place at the UPS store next to the Lake Ella Publix. Processing time is on average 24-48 hours.
    - Non-Local: Individuals that do not reside in the State of Florida must register at the site [http://www.l1enrollment.com/](http://www.l1enrollment.com/), request fingerprinting, and mail in completed fingerprint cards per the site’s instructions. Processing time is on
average 5-7 days. The Contractor may also call MorphoTrust at 1-800-528-1358 to complete the registration process.

- Regardless of location, the Contractor will notify the Project Office Manager and appropriate HR contact with the date/time of their fingerprint appointment so the results can be tracked.

- Once background screening is complete, the Office Manager completes:
  - DFS Form 1820
  - Building Access Form(s)
  - Sends the Contractor information regarding parking
    - Monthly parking reservations are handled by Republic Parking. Their contact information is 850-561-3066. Only check or cash is accepted and the Contractor must obtain the tag at the Republic Parking office.
    - Duval Street lot is paved - $30 per month
    - Bronough Street lot is unpaved - $20 per month

- The Contractor is sent a “Day 0” welcome email including the Project Guidelines and Day 1 information at their provided email address.

13.3.4 Orientation
The Organizational Change Management (OCM) Team conducts Project Team Orientation and Project Management Plan (PMP) training for all new Project Team Members.

13.3.4.1 State Team Member Performance Evaluations
State Team Members are required to have SMART Expectations by their assigned Track Managers and performance evaluations are to be conducted using these annually. The Project follows this process in accordance with the DFS Agency Policy and Procedures (AP&P) #5 - Employee Performance Evaluation.

13.3.4.2 Contracted Team Member Performance Evaluations
Each Track’s Strategy identifies contractual services needed and desired knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs). Executed contracts define the minimum and preferred qualifications of Contractors assigned to work on the Project. State Team Members are ultimately responsible for managing Project Contractor(s). To ensure the timely delivery and high quality of work products from Contractors, the Track Manager, or his/her designee, will meet weekly with the Contractor to discuss the progress of the procured services. These meetings will be in person, or when agreed upon, by teleconference. The purpose of these meetings will be to:

- Review significant activities that have been conducted or are underway
- Discuss any tasks/activities that are behind schedule and a plan to bring them current
- Discuss any problems that have been encountered and their resolution or plan for future resolution
- Review goals or upcoming deadlines

The weekly meetings serve as an opportunity to ask questions ahead of time to prevent delays in delivery and schedule. All Contractors are expected to operate as partners and work in good faith to provide professional services based on best practices and industry standards

For Support Services Contractors, the Contract Manager will provide a monthly performance assessment (quality, communication, timely completion of tasks) on the Contractor’s time sheet provided by the Project.
13.3.4.3 Tracking and Monitoring
The Project maintains a Team Tracker Log of all Project Team Members that have worked on the Project. The Log contains name, Track, access, software, training, and separation information. The Project also maintains Project Organizational charts which are updated as Team Members onboard and separate from the Project.

13.3.5 Separation
13.3.5.1 State Team Members
To facilitate the roll-off of State Team Members, the Track Manager will notify the Project Office Manager to begin the exit process. Additionally, the Track Manager will need to ensure the appropriate transfer of knowledge and final acceptance of work are complete. The exit process includes the following:
- Complete CAR form and submit to Human Resources
- DFS Form 1820
- Collect Keys/Badges/Parking Tag/PCard
- Return Badges to DFS/Capitol Police
- Update Team Tracker Log

The Project utilizes the same recruitment procedures describes earlier, to back fill a position following separation.

13.3.5.2 Contracted Team Members
To facilitate the roll-off of Contractors, the Track Manager will notify the Project Office Manager and Contract Manager to begin the exit process. The Track Manager and Contract Manager will need to ensure the appropriate transfer of knowledge and final acceptance of work are complete. The exit process includes the following:
- DFS Form 1820
- Collect Keys/Badges/Parking Tag
- Return Badges to DFS/Capitol Police
- Update Team Tracker Log

13.4 Roles and Responsibilities
The Staffing Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role during each of the four (4) major areas of the Staffing Management Process as shown in the figure below.

```
1 Planning
2 Recruitment
3 Administration
4 Separation
```

Figure 15: Major Areas of the Staffing Management Process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Manages and leads all Project activities, including the development and approval of all Staff for the Project.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Managers</td>
<td>Manages and leads their tracks activities, including the development and approval of all Staff for their track.</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>Manages Staff Management Process for the Project to include the creation, administration, and tracking of staff for the project.</td>
<td>R/V</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/ Budget Specialist</td>
<td>Provides subject matter expertise and offers guidance on budget matters.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee Member</td>
<td>Reviews and receives updates for Project Team Member(s).</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Collaboration Management

14.1 Overview
Collaboration Management establishes the processes of effectively identifying and engaging in collaboration activities with the appropriate collaborative partners. This section details the Collaboration Management Standards and Procedures to be used when participating in collaboration activities, engaging collaborative partners, reporting on collaboration metrics, and managing overall Project collaboration.

14.2 Purpose
The purpose of this section is to provide instructions to the Project Team regarding Collaboration Management. Collaboration Management ensures the Project effectively engages and communicates with Project stakeholders and other entities to support the goals and objectives identified in the Project’s Collaboration Strategy.

14.3 Process
The Collaboration Management process is described as four distinct time periods and outputs: Annual Collaboration Strategy, Quarterly Collaboration and Communication Status Report, and Monthly Collaboration Checkpoint.
### Collaboration Management Work Process Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Start</th>
<th>Annually (State Fiscal Year)</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCM Coordinator</td>
<td>Develop Draft Fiscal Year Collaboration Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update Draft Collaboration Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publish Fiscal Year Collaboration Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Managers</td>
<td>Review Draft Collaboration Strategy</td>
<td>Conduct/Attend Collaboration Events and Update Track Status Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO Team Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16: Collaboration Management Work Process Flow**
14.3.1 **Annually**

Prior to the beginning of each FY, the Project Team begins development of a new Collaboration Strategy. First, OCM Collaboration Coordinator reviews the previous FY’s Collaboration Strategy and data in order to evaluate its applicability to the new FY. If the Strategy is still consistent with the Project’s collaboration goals and objectives, it’s carried over to the new FY. If the Strategy is not consistent with those goals and objectives, a new strategy is developed. The OCC consults with the Track Managers on continuing or new directions in collaboration for each Track and the Project as a whole. The OCC reviews topics that were identified during monthly collaboration checkpoint meetings, and Lessons Learned (as appropriate), for the previous FY. Using this information, the OCC develops the draft Collaboration Strategy for the new FY and submits it to the Project for review, acceptance, and later release.

14.3.2 **Quarterly**

The OCC and OCM Track Team members develop a quarterly Collaboration and Communication Status Report. This Report attached to the Project’s monthly Status Report submitted on the final month of each quarter. The Status Report is reviewed during the last Checkpoint meeting of the quarter.

14.3.3 **Monthly**

The Project Track Managers (or their designees), Deputy Project Director, Project Director, and the OCC participate in monthly collaboration checkpoint meetings. The purpose of this meeting is to:

1. Review and verify the previous month’s collaboration activity information (as needed);
2. Discuss upcoming collaboration activities; and
3. Evaluate the progress of collaboration activities against the objectives outlined in the Collaboration Strategy.

The OCC presents data on the Project’s collaboration activities for the month to the Track Managers, Project Deputy Director, and Project Director for verification.

14.3.4 **Weekly**

Project Team Members conduct and/or participate in a variety of collaboration activities throughout the FY. Information from these activities is collected, and entered in the Meeting Log Summary table by each Track.

14.3.5 **Reporting**

The Project reports on collaboration activities using four reporting mechanisms. Each mechanism provides support to, and information for, a specific time period listed above.

First, as described in the Annual section above, the Project produces an FY Collaboration Strategy. Each FY Collaboration Strategy defines the focus for the Project’s collaboration efforts and identifies potential collaboration partners and activities.

The second reporting mechanism is the Track Status Report. Each Track is responsible for updating the Track Meeting Log Summary table in the Track Status Report. The OCC verifies this information when populating the Meeting Log on the Project’s SharePoint main page. The Meeting Log serves as the Project’s official record of meetings/activities that occur between Project Team member(s) and at least one person from outside the project where the meeting was conducted by Project Team Member(s); or if not conducted by Project Team Member(s), a discussion about
the Project was a component of the meeting. The Meeting Log is updated weekly following the submission of Track Status Reports.

The third reporting mechanism are the Monthly Collaboration Checkpoint meetings. The OCC, Track Managers, Deputy Project Director, and Project Director review and verify collaboration activity details from the previous month (as needed) and discuss upcoming collaboration activities. They evaluate the progress of collaboration activities against the objectives and goals identified in the Collaboration Strategy. If progress is not consistent with the objectives and goals, the OCC and the Track Managers determine where and how corrections need to be made. (e.g., Adjust future collaboration efforts to be in-line with the accepted Collaboration Strategy.)

The final reporting mechanism is the Collaboration and Communication Quarterly Status Report. This report is prepared by the OCC and submitted at the end of each quarter. The final accepted report is attached to the Project Monthly Status Report submitted the last month of the quarter.

The Project has identified three collaboration metrics for evaluating the Project's collaboration efforts:

- **Collaboration Activity Efficacy** – did the Project realize the expected benefit from the activity? For example: Project Team Members attended a meeting where the focus was possible pitfalls. Where potential pitfalls identified during the meeting?
  - Yes – the meeting provided Project Team Members with excellent examples of potential pitfalls
  - No – the meeting did not provide Project Team Members examples of potential pitfalls
- **Collaboration Rates**
  - The total number of collaboration activities per month, quarter, and annum
  - The total activities held with selected collaborative partners per month, quarter, and annum
- **Collaboration with State Agencies** – The number of State agencies that use the FLAIR and/or CMS with whom the Project has collaborated, and the frequency of collaboration.

While the Project will use some metrics across multiple FYs and evaluate for trends, the Project will also continue to assess applicability of existing metrics and potential new metrics as the Project matures.

### 14.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Collaboration Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the four (4) major areas of the Collaboration Management Process as shown in the figure below.
### Table 13: Collaboration Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Manages and leads all Project activities, including acceptance and verification of collaboration management documents</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager(s)</td>
<td>Manages Project Track activities, represents each Track during monthly collaboration checkpoint meetings, leads and/or participates in collaboration activities, and provides comments and feedback on collaboration activities</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>Manages the Project’s Collaboration Management process including the development of Collaboration documents, monitoring of collaboration activities, and reporting collaboration activities</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Members</td>
<td>In addition to Project work responsibilities; participates in, and provides comments and feedback on, collaboration activities</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO Team Member</td>
<td>Ensures the Collaboration and Communication Status Report is attached to the Project’s Monthly Status Report submitted for the last month of each quarter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 Project Scope and Change Management

15.1 Overview
Project Scope and Change Management describes the change control process for tracking and gaining approval on Project changes. The process exists to communicate to all necessary parties a change is needed and will be managed to ensure the Project is protected against unauthorized work activities.

A Project change is an addition, modification, or deletion to any element within the established Project Charter, supporting strategies, or plans. Anyone internal or external to the Project may request a change by submitting a Project Change Request (PCR).

The Project Scope and Change process is crucial to Project completion and successfully managing expectations. It entails making choices about resource allocation, making trade-offs among competing objectives and alternatives, and managing the interdependencies among project management processes (e.g., cost management, scope management). Planning and management of scope, human resources, schedule, risks, quality, or costs cannot be done in a vacuum. Changes in scope can affect the schedule. Changes in staffing can affect costs.

Project Scope and Change Management is an ongoing process. Identifying and qualifying changes in a timely manner is a critical success factor for the Project. Both Project and Contractor Team Members will apply appropriate effort to support a timely Project Change Request process.

15.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions and define how the Project will manage changes that impact scope, cost, schedule, and/or quality.

15.3 Process
A PCR can occur throughout the life of the Project and are often the result of a Project risk or issue that has been evaluated to determine that a change is required. A PCR can come from newly identified or changing needs, or external factors having an impact on the Project.

15.3.1 Project Change Identification
The process begins when a Requestor has identified a change that impacts the Project’s scope, schedule, budget, or resources. The Requestor is responsible for logging an identified change for additional resources, additional funding, a change in the Project schedule, or change as necessary for Project success.

The Requestor will draft a PCR Form and then enter the request in the PCR Log, which is used to document and track change requests. The PCR Log is located on the Project’s SharePoint site and includes all the information contained in the PCR Form. The PMO is responsible for the maintenance of items in the PCR Log as well as monitoring the progress.

15.3.1.1 Minor Project Adjustments
As a basic guideline, any change that requires less than eight hours of work, or is not an addition or deletion of scope, will be classified as a minor adjustment and does not require the formal PCR process. Changes to meeting schedules is an example of a minor adjustment, as long as the overall timeline or deliverable schedule is not impacted. Each Track Manager is responsible for determining whether a change is a minor adjustment or a significant change. Minor adjustments
can be reclassified and moved to the PCR process if it is determined to be a substantial change or if it occurs so late in the Project that it presents an unacceptable risk.

The minor adjustment process is listed below:

- The Project change is identified by a member of the Project Team to the Track Manager.
- The Project change is vetted by the Track Team to make sure it is reasonable.
- The Project change is reviewed by the Track Team to determine if it is a major change or requires a large number of hours to complete. If not, the change is made and the Project Director is notified, if applicable.

### 15.3.2 Project Change Evaluation

The Project Management Office (PMO) is responsible for evaluating and determining the validity of a PCR. If the PCR is determined to be not valid, the PMO will mark the PCR as Removed. If determined to be a valid request, the PMO will work with the respective Track Manager to review and update the PCR. A list of items to consider during review, can be found in the table below.

#### Table 14: Project Change Request Review Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has a PCR been filed by a member of the Project Team or by a stakeholder (requirement, change, problem, defect, or other change)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the PCR been documented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the PCR request been prioritized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has an approach been identified to handle the PCR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has a workaround been identified if the PCR is not implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has it been acknowledged that the PCR applies to this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has an independent team or member (not the originator) reviewed the PCR to determine whether or not it is worth evaluation for action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have estimates been developed for the effort, cost, schedule, and resources required by the PCR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has the PCR, with estimates, been evaluated and authorized by a Change Control Board or other authority?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Have the results of the above evaluation been communicated to the requester?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If the change is denied, has the requester been notified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any questions or issues regarding the PCR should be addressed, to make sure the documentation is complete, clear, and accurate prior to submitting it to the Change Control Board. Once the PCR has been determined to be ready for submission, the PMO will notify the Project Director and request the Project Director conduct a preliminary review. Upon satisfactory review from the Project Director, the PCR is scheduled for review by the Change Control Board (CCB). After favorable recommendation from the CCB, the Project Director will review PCRs meeting Tier 1, as defined in the Project Charter. PCRs meeting Tier 2 criteria, as defined in the Project Charter, are scheduled for review by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC). In both cases, a decision will be rendered of Approved or Rejected. The PMO will update the PCR Log to reflect the decision by the ESC.
Figure 18: Project Scope and Change Management Process
15.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Project Scope and Change Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the four (4) major areas of the Project Scope and Change Management Process as shown in the figure below.

**Figure 19: Major Areas of the Project Scope and Change Management Process**

**Table 15: Project Scope and Change Management Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requester</td>
<td>• Identify, document, log, and submit PCR.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>• Works with the PMO to review all PCRs for completeness and impact quantification (schedule, cost) prior to review by the Project Director and Change Control Board.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>• Owns and manages the PCR process.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews all PCRs for completeness and impact quantification (schedule, cost) prior to review by the Project Director and Change Control Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintains PCR Log, monitors progress, and reports on PCR decisions and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updates Project work products (scope, schedule, resource plan, etc.) as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>• Performs preliminary review of PCR prior to CCB submission.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approves or rejects PCRs that meet the Tier 1 criteria, as defined in the Project Charter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Escalates changes that meet the Tier 2 criteria to the ESC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicates PCR status to the CCB and Project Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Control Board</td>
<td>• Members will include PMO Manager, Track Managers, Project Risk Manager, and designated PMO Team Members.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews and provides considerations for changes requested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participates as needed in determination of whether change is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If change request is rejected, determine appropriate course of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee</td>
<td>• Approves or rejects changes meeting Tier 2 criteria defined in the Project Charter - Appendix A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16 Risk Management

16.1 Overview
Risk Management proactively identifies or manages potential events that can adversely affect the Project’s ability to achieve its stated goals or objectives. Risk Management employs mitigation strategies to avoid risks turning into issues. The identification, tracking, and remediation of risks is critical to the Project’s success.

16.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions for the Project, Project’s Risk Manager, and Project Team Members regarding Risk Management.

16.3 Process
Risk Management methods consists of four primary components: Assessment, Evaluation, Control, and Reporting. Each component includes two elements as illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Management</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>Prioritize</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Resolve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risks assessments are performed on a regular basis throughout the project life cycle. The Project shall adopt the following risk assessment events.

1. An assessment shall be conducted annually where risks are recorded in the Project’s tracking tool.
2. At the completion of Project strategy, plans, or procurement documents, a risk assessment exercise will be performed to record any challenges the Project may face to operationalize and fulfill the objectives of the document.
3. After significant events, such as scope changes to schedule, cost, staffing, Project major deliverables or outcomes, as well as staff turnover.

The remaining part of this section will provide an explanation of risk components and elements illustrated in Table 16 above.

16.3.1 Risk Assessment Elements
16.3.1.1 Risk Identification
Risk Identification produces a list of Project-wide and Track-specific risk items likely to compromise the Project’s outcomes. Risks can be identified through risk surveys, interviews, assessment meetings, and personal experience.

A Risk Log will be utilized to enter, track, review, modify, monitor, and update status. The Project’s Risk Manager monitors the Risk Log to verify risks are recorded and updated appropriately. New Risks will be reviewed, including determination of validity, by the Risk Management Team on a bi-weekly basis. If the risk is deemed to be invalid, the status will be changed to “Removed” in the Risk Log.

The following are guidelines for risk data collection attributes:
1. Risk Breakdown Structure (RBS) attributes are used in the risk log to categories the risks.

2. Risk status classified as “monitoring” is used when the actions required for mitigating are outside the control of the Project.

3. Risk status classified as “mitigating” is used when the Project has direct control of the outcomes.

4. Due dates differ for Risk status classified as monitoring versus mitigating.
   a. Risk with a status classification of monitoring will use the end of fiscal year date. Example: 06/30/2017
   b. Risk with a status classification of “mitigating” will use a date identified on the master project schedule that corresponds to a deliverable, milestone, or event that matches the recorded risk. In the event a specific schedule due date is not identified, the Risk Management Team will identify an appropriate due date, based on the agreed to actions.

5. Ownership is assigned as Project-Wide or to a specific Project track.
   a. Project-Wide ownership are risks having a mitigation or monitoring plan involving participation from more than one Project track. These types of risks will be assigned to the Project Director and plan task execution will be assigned to the PMO.
   b. Project track ownership are risks assigned to a Track Manager when the activities of responsibilities fall within the functional responsibilities of a specific Project track.

6. Risk trending attributes are stable, increasing, or decreasing. This value is also established at the initial Project agreement to manage and record the risk and will likely change during the risk mitigation life cycle. Risk trending values are updated, most often when a risk mitigation step has been completed. The value also can be updated if an unforeseen event occurs.

### 16.3.1.2 Risk Analysis

Qualitative risk analysis is the process of characterizing an identified risk into a set of impact categories. The risk Owner, in collaboration with the Project’s Risk Manager, will present the risk qualification description to the Risk Management team as part of the risk submission process.

Quantitative Risk Analysis is the process of quantifying the risk impact to determine their likely impact to the Project’s identified outcomes in the Project’s charter, scope, and supporting strategy documents.

Table 17 below provides the risk impact descriptions as a result of the qualitative and quantitative analysis.
Given risks are a forecast of potential issues, a probability value must be derived. Table 18 provides the values for risk probability.

Table 18: Risk Probability Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibility of Occurrence</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 50%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 50%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Risk Impact and Probability are updated in the Risk Log and the Risk Evaluation process begins.

16.3.2 Risk Evaluation Elements

16.3.2.1 Risk Prioritization

The first step in the risk prioritization process is to confirm or revise the risk impact analysis documented by the qualitative and quantitative values. The Risk Management team performs this activity as a part of the evaluation step in the process.

The risk score is the product of the impact and probability values, and is calculated in the Risk Log. This score sets the prioritization of the risk and aids in the mitigation and response planning, as well as frequency of risk monitoring. The table below illustrates the derived calculations.

Table 19: Impact and Probability Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Rating Matrix</th>
<th>Risk Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low = 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate = 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important = 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical = 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the risk score/prioritization has been determined, the Risk Management Team will determine whether the risk will be mitigated, monitored, transferred, or accepted. The risk score never changes after it has been approved to be worked on by the Risk Management team. The risk trending value may change through the risk management life cycle. This is explained in further detail in the Risk Control Elements section.

Risks with a score of “20” will be included in the Project’s monthly status report.

16.3.2.2 Risk Planning
The goal of risk planning is to determine close criteria and supporting action steps to be taken for mitigating or monitoring risks. The results of the quantitative, qualitative, and risk score should be considered when developing the action steps. The resulting information documented for risk resolution includes:

1. The close criteria, most often associated with a Project milestone, deliverable, decision, or action item.
2. Sequence of action steps to achieve the close criteria.
3. Resources who will own the action steps.
4. Expected completion dates for the action steps.
5. Action step status reporting: Not Started, In Progress, Completed

Typical risk resolution techniques include use of contractual agreements, expert judgment, and lessons learned on previous projects. Executing preventive actions involves an investment of finances and human capital to mitigate the threat of negative events to the Project’s planned objectives and outcomes.

Upon completion of risk planning, the data is recorded in the Risk Log and presented to the Risk Management team for review and acceptance.

16.3.3 Risk Control Elements
16.3.3.1 Risk Actions
Risk actions come in one of two forms: risk mitigation and risk monitoring. Risk mitigation includes completing the identified steps to achieve the risk close criteria. Risks identified to be monitored may have an event occur which could result in the need to identify risk response actions. These actions are performed to minimize the impact of a risk.

The Project will track all risk actions to closure, taking any corrective action as appropriate and will report on the risk mitigation progress and any impediment to close the risk. Additionally, the Owner or Project Risk Manager will update the trending of the risk as stable, increasing, or decreasing.

16.3.3.2 Risk Resolution
The primary goal of risk resolution is to successfully resolve the risks by executing the identified actions for mitigating or monitoring described in the Risk Planning section above. These actions are designed to prevent adverse impacts to the Project and address events which may lead to the risk becoming an issue.

If a risk turns into an issue, follow the procedures document in the Issue Management section of this document.
Figure 20: Risk Submission and Resolution Process
16.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Risk Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the three (3) major areas of the Risk Management Process as shown in the figure below.

![Figure 21: Major Areas of the Risk Management Process](image)

Table 20: Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requester (anyone)</td>
<td>• Identifies and records the risk in the risk log.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>• Works with Project Risk Manager to characterize the risk(s) and formulate and execute the mitigation or monitor action plan.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Track Manager owns, manages, and reports on task progress for risks assigned to their Track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The PMO Manager owns, manages, and reports on task progress for risks identified as Project-wide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Team*</td>
<td>• Owns the creation, implementation, and continuous process improvement of risk management.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Manager</td>
<td>• Coordinates and facilitates risk assessments.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>R/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Works with Track Managers to identify and create risk response and mitigation plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports progress on all risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Members of the Risk Management Team include the Project Risk Manager, Project Track Managers, Deputy Director, and Project Director.
17 Communication Management

17.1 Overview
Communication Management establishes the process of effectively communicating with and disseminating information to the Project’s stakeholders and the public, and includes the generation, collection, storage, dissemination, monitoring, and disposition of Project information. Efficient and effective communication management is critical to overall Project success. Both Project leadership and Project Team members benefit greatly from timely, accurate, and predictable communications. In addition, communication of progress to stakeholders supports their alignment with Project goals, objectives, status, and upcoming events.

17.2 Purpose
Good communication management enables Project leadership and team members to be kept in sync and progress of project activities are transparent to stakeholders. This will support stakeholder alignment to the Project goals, objectives, status, and upcoming events.

Project status communication is focused on internal communication with Project sponsors, Project leadership, and stakeholders, managed by the PMO. The Organizational Change Management (OCM) Track will develop a change communication strategy to facilitate awareness and support among the Project’s external stakeholders.

As representatives of the Project Team, all individuals are responsible for delivery of clear and consistent communication for the Project. There are many stakeholders with interest in the progression of the Project. As such, it is vital for the Project Team to have established communication standards within the organization to effectively deliver the intended message to the target audience.

Overall objectives include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Raise and maintain stakeholder awareness of Project’s status/activities, which aligns with the CFO's commitment to encouraging responsible government, accountability, and transparency
- Provide messaging which acknowledges and addresses audience concerns
- Increase desire for change among stakeholders
- Support ongoing collaboration activities
- Assist in readiness activities for stakeholders

Additionally, this section will identify:
- What will be communicated
- Who is responsible for communicating with each audience
- When the communication will take place
- How information will be communicated
- Where the sent communication will be documented

The following sections describe the Project’s Communication Management approach including Communication Infrastructure, Project Brand Management, Stakeholder Groups, General Public, Media, Vendors, Content Standards, and Communication Tactics.
17.3 Communication Infrastructure
While the Project has created a communication infrastructure, which is augmented by supporting technologies (including SharePoint) and explicitly aligned resources, all members of the Project Team are considered to be part of this necessary aspect of the Project. The OCM Team and the Project’s Management Team collaborate and coordinate on Project-related communications with the DFS Office of Communications as well as various stakeholders. The communication infrastructure also includes utilization of several Project Support Tools (PSTs). The Project uses these tools to distribute and/or manage communication tactics like surveys, emails, and the website. In addition, the DFS Office of Communications and Office of Publications provide creative and graphic design support services to the Project, as needed.

17.4 Project Brand Management
Given the volume of projects and programs implemented by varied State entities, it is important that the Project continue to build and maintain its own unique brand. This Plan provides tools and approaches to create and maintain positive brand awareness, as well as monitoring the use of the brand both within the Project Team and among external audiences.

17.4.1 Project Style Guide and Templates
The Project has adopted a Project Style Guide that provides a set of standards for writing and distributing Project content. This set of standards is used to establish a consistent approach to Project communications and includes items such as logo usage guidelines, color templates, and document standards. The intention of using a Style Guide is to help both Project Team members create consistent and cohesive brand recognition for the Project. The Style Guide is updated quarterly, and training on Style Guide updates is provided to the Project Team as needed.

The Project has also adopted several standard formats (e.g., agenda, meeting summary, status report, and presentations) as commonly used templates. These templates are used to ensure brand consistency across Project publications and are available to all Project Team members on the main SharePoint page. Project Team members coordinate with the OCM Team for additional needs when an existing template may not be suitable.

17.4.2 Brand Monitoring
In addition to monitoring efforts performed by the DFS Office of Communications, the Project’s OCM tracks several keywords to monitor the Project’s online presence using Google Alerts. Keyword detection often picks up new mentions of the keyword in news articles, blogs, and message boards. Significant mentions of the Project are shared with the Project Director, OCM Team, and DFS Office of Communications. The Project Team will coordinate and collaborate with the DFS Office of Communications, as appropriate, should a response be necessary.

Keywords tracked by the Project include:
- CFO’s name
- Department of Financial Services PALM
- Department of Financial Services Planning, Accounting, and Ledger Management
- Department of Financial Services Project
- DFS PALM
- DFS Planning, Accounting, and Ledger Management
- DFS Project
- Florida Accounting Information Resource
17.5 Stakeholder Groups

Project stakeholder groups are broken into target audiences for Project communications. Communications are generally tailored by audience, and some individuals who receive Project messages may be a part of multiple stakeholder groups. These groups have been categorized and identified below as follows: State Government; General Public; Media; and Vendors.

17.5.1 State Government

Elected officials, employees, or contractors of the State of Florida. The Project has identified the following State government groups that may impact or may be impacted by the future system.

17.5.1.1 Executive Office of the Governor (EOG)

The Governor is the State’s Chief Executive Officer and oversees the majority of State agencies. The EOG also maintains the Office of Policy and Budget (OPB) as well as the State’s official appropriations system called Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem (LAS/PBS).

17.5.1.2 Governor and Cabinet

The Florida Cabinet is made up of the following three statewide elected officials: Attorney General; Chief Financial Officer; and Commissioner of Agriculture. The Governor and Cabinet are collectively responsible for overseeing several State agencies. Each member of the Cabinet also individually oversees an agency related to their position. In addition, the Governor, Attorney General, and Chief Financial Officer oversee the State Board of Administration.

17.5.1.3 Florida Legislature

The Florida Legislature is the legislative branch of Florida government and includes the Florida House of Representatives, Florida Senate, and legislative staff. The House is comprised of 120 members elected from single-member districts across Florida, and the Senate is comprised of 40 members elected from single-member districts across Florida. In regard to the Project, the Legislature, with the support of legislative staff, is responsible for appropriating funding for the Project, creating proviso that stipulates requirements for funding to be released, and considering legislative policy changes for successful financial management solution implementation.
17.5.1.4 Executive Steering Committee (ESC)
The 15-member Project governance body that has the overall responsibility for ensuring that the Project to replace FLAIR and CMS meets its primary business objectives. The Chief Financial Officer or Executive Sponsor serves as the Chair of the ESC.

17.5.1.5 Project Sponsor
The State Agency senior management role that approves the allocation of resources for an endeavor, develops a common vision, provides ongoing commitment to the project, and continually assesses success. Florida PALM Project Sponsors include leadership from the Division of Accounting and Auditing, Office of Information Technology, Division of Treasury, and the Deputy CFO of Operations.

17.5.1.6 FFMIS Partners
The accounting, budgeting, cash management, human resources, and procurement subsystems of the State of Florida established by section 215.93, F.S. Each of the five Florida Financial Management Information Systems (FFMIS) and their functions/owners are listed below:

- **Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem (LAS/PBS)**
  - A system that serves as the statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the (EOG).

- **Florida Accounting Information Resource (FLAIR)**
  - A computer-based accounting system consisting of the following four components: departmental accounting (a double entry general ledger based subsystem used by agencies); central accounting used by the Chief Financial Officer (Division of Accounting and Auditing) for appropriation and fund cash control; payroll processing; and information warehouse. FLAIR is owned and maintained by DFS.

- **Cash Management System (CMS)**
  - A collection of Treasury-operated, separate systems that supports DFS Division of Treasury’s responsibilities: of monitoring cash levels and activities in State bank accounts; keeping detailed records of cash transactions and investments for State agencies; and paying of warrants and other disbursements issued by Florida’s Chief Financial Officer. CMS is owned and maintained by DFS.

- **MyFloridaMarketPlace (MFMP)**
  - A system that serves as Florida’s web-based source for centralized procurement activities, streamlining interactions between vendors and State government entities, and providing the tools to support procurement. Department of Management Services (DMS) is the functional owner of MyFloridaMarketPlace.

- **People First (PF)**
  - A system that serves as the State of Florida’s self-service, secure, web-based human resource information system, and enterprise-wide suite of human resource services. DMS is the functional owner of People First.

17.5.1.7 Agency Leadership and Employees
Agency leadership include State agency heads or those who oversee a State agency (e.g., agency secretaries and directors) and their executive management teams. Communication to agency leadership typically should originate from DFS leadership (e.g., the Chief Financial Officer, Chief of Staff, or Project Director). Employees includes all staff (outside of DFS) who comprise the workforce within their respective State agencies.
17.5.1.8 DFS Employees  
DFS employees in the Division of Audit and Accounting (A&A), Division of Treasury, and Office of Information Technology (OIT) will continue to be heavily engaged with the Project due to their role as functional and technical owners of the current systems (FLAIR/CMS).

17.5.1.9 Agency for State Technology (AST)  
Agency for State Technology (AST) was established in 2014 to oversee the State’s essential technology projects and house the State Chief Information Officer. AST serves as an oversight entity for large State IT projects.

17.5.1.10 Agency Administrative Services Directors (ASDs)  
The Administrative Services Directors (ASDs) are the individuals at State agencies responsible for the human resource (personnel), purchasing/procurement, and finance & accounting functions of their agency. The Division of Accounting and Auditing (A&A) coordinates monthly Florida Association of State Agency Administrative Services Directors (FASAAD) meetings with ASDs.

17.5.1.11 Agency Chief Information Officers (CIOs)  
The Chief Information Officers (CIOs) are the individuals at State agencies responsible for the information technology (IT) functions of their agency. AST coordinates monthly CIO workgroup meetings with agency CIOs.

17.5.2 General Public  
DFS is dedicated to accountability, efficiency, and transparency. While most of the Florida PALM Project’s activities are considered to be public record, the Project identifies the general public as a target audience in an effort to increase transparency and share information about the Project and its status.

17.5.3 Media  
News organizations or other organizations dedicated to delivering news and mass communication to the general public or targeted audiences.

17.5.3.1 Traditional Media  
Traditional media include local, statewide, national, and international news organizations such as newspapers, magazines, blogs, radio, and television. Examples of traditional media outlets include organizations like: CNN, Tallahassee Democrat, WFSU, Florida Trend, SaintPetersBlog, and WCTV.

17.5.3.2 Trade and Specialized Media  
Trade publications are news organizations dedicated to targeted audiences and typically publish articles tailored for their specified audience. Examples of trade publications include publications like: Accounting Today, e.Republic, Florida CPA Today, and WIRED.

17.5.4 Vendors  
Vendors are categorized in two non-exclusive categories described below.

17.5.4.1 Vendors Currently Doing Business with the State of Florida  
The State of Florida has more than 80,000 vendors registered to do business with the State. Florida PALM’s implementation will have broader implications for the State’s existing vendor
community (e.g., the Department intends to migrate the majority of vendor payments from paper warrants to electronic funds transfer (EFT)).

17.5.4.2 Vendors Interested in the Project’s Procurements
Numerous vendors may be interested in the Project’s procurements for support services, including those that may propose to be the SSI.

17.6 Content Guidelines
The Project has identified standards that all Project communications should consider incorporating during development and release. Some of these standards are listed below:

- **Data points**: Communications should include interesting statistics or data relevant to the topic (e.g., “Did you know there are more than 80,000 vendors registered to do business with the State of Florida?”).
- **DFS themes**: The Project should seek to capitalize on the Department’s established themes in all external and public communication. The Department’s themes are:
  - Encouraging responsible government
  - Expanding economic capacity
  - Broadening consumer advocacy
  - Fighting fraud and abuse
  - Accountable and transparent financial transactions
- **Project story**: Communications should include components of the Project’s vision and story while answering questions related to the Project.
- **Graphics**: The Project should use infographics, including charts and other images, to provide visual representation of information, data trends or other knowledge that support key messages
- **Plain language**: The Project understands the importance of speaking and writing in plain language. All Project communications should be easily understood the first time they are read or heard.
- **Quotes**: Direct quotes will be included in Project messages where relevant. Quotes will be taken from varied executives, key stakeholders, and other individuals, and will primarily be used with public communications.
- **Project Talking Points**: The Project has developed Talking Points, which are included in Appendix A of this document. These Talking Points combine many of the content standards mentioned in this section. The Talking Points will be updated as necessary by the OCM Team, added to the Project SharePoint site, and disseminated to the broader Project Team via email and in team meetings as the Pre-DDI Phase continues.
- **Project themes**: In addition to the aforementioned DFS themes, the Project also has unique themes. Some of these themes are listed below:
  - Collaboration
  - Deliberate planning
  - Documentation
  - Risk mitigation
  - Transparency

17.7 Communication Tactics
As previously mentioned, successful communication is critical to the Project’s overall success. The Project routinely communicates with identified stakeholders through various communication tactics as deemed appropriate. There are several communication tactics available for releasing
communications. Each of these tactics are briefly described below. These tactics are not exclusive or exhaustive, and others may be added to this Plan and deployed as the project proceeds.

17.7.1 Ad Hoc/As Needed Communication
In an effort to adapt to the unique needs of such a large-scale project, ad hoc or as-needed communications may be developed and released when deemed appropriate. These types of communications may be reactive or proactive to various Project accomplishments, milestones, and engagement opportunities. The Project’s Management Team and OCM Team are responsible for identifying when this type of communication is warranted.

17.7.2 Conference Calls
Conference calls connect three or more individuals. Conference calls should be used to accommodate meetings and collaboration with individuals not able to participate in person. In general, conference calls should be set up through the FloridaPALM@myfloridacfo.com calendar.

17.7.3 Emails
Emails are used daily as part of Project operations, but mass email messages, which are primarily be sent from FloridaPALM@myfloridacfo.com, may be used to distribute appropriate Project information. Emails may also be sent using existing DFS infrastructure or an email marketing Project Support Tool.

17.7.4 Events and Meetings
The Project may host events and meetings for targeted audiences to deliver up-to-date information relevant to that audience. This tactic is often used in conjunction with other tactics like printed materials and presentations.

17.7.5 Letters
Usually written by DFS leadership with support from the Project Team, letters may be used to share information about the Project and/or make formal requests.

17.7.6 Press Releases
Press releases are a communication that is released to the news media. The Project Team will coordinate with the DFS Office of Communications on all media-related outreach. The Project may not leverage press releases until later in the DDI phase.

17.7.7 Meeting Invitations
Meeting invitations are used to invite individuals to a meeting or event. Meeting invitations may be used to place calendar appointments on event or meeting registrants’ calendars, and should be sent from FloridaPALM@myfloridacfo.com in most cases.

17.7.8 Newsletters
Newsletters may contain multiple articles related to a specified topic. The Project is considering the development of a newsletter with Project branding.

17.7.9 Presentations/Speeches
Formal, verbal communication events, presentations/speeches may be presented to an audience where two-way communication is minimal. If the audience is comprised entirely of members of
the media, it would be considered a news conference. The Project Team will coordinate appropriately on speeches given by DFS leadership. Presentations should be created from the approved Project PowerPoint template.

17.7.10 Printed Materials
Printed materials include one pagers, meetings agendas, and other printed collateral. The Project has several approved templates for various printed materials.

17.7.11 Publications and Reports
Formal releases of information, publications and reports are typically intended for public and/or external communications. These reports are created after a series of events or meetings to summarize the meeting and highlight significant outcomes.

17.7.12 Social Media
Social media includes website and applications that enable users to socially create and share content. DFS currently maintains a social media presence on Facebook and Twitter. The Project Team, specifically the OCM Team and Project Director, will coordinate with the DFS Office of Communications on all social media efforts. The Project does not intend on leveraging social media during the Pre-DDI Phase.

17.7.13 Status Reports
Status reports outline status and other related indicators on a regular basis. The Project has several mandatory reporting requirements, which are managed by the PMO. The majority of status reports are considered a regularly scheduled communication.

17.7.14 Surveys, Questionnaires, and Assessments
An evaluation is typically given to an audience to assess an audience's perception and understanding of a topic or event. Surveys are typically administered to attendees after every workshop or workgroup. The Project currently uses Survey Monkey® to distribute surveys and collate data. Additionally, these tools are focused on reinforcing and measuring awareness during the Pre-DDI Phase but will be adapted as the Project progresses to measure other elements of change and readiness. Survey tools will also be used to solicit other feedback on communication efforts as the Pre-DDI Phase proceeds, as deemed appropriate by Project Management and the OCM Team. Examples of input which would be solicited via surveys include the perceived effectiveness and relevance of communications recently distributed, preferences for the use of specific tactics for targeted audiences, and suggestions for future project messaging.

17.7.15 Talking Points
Talking points are used during discussions with various audiences to provide consistency in messaging. The Project Team will be trained and updated on various talking points, as needed. The full set of Project’s Talking Points as documented to date appears in Appendix A of this document.

17.7.16 Trainings
Trainings teach individuals a particular skill or skillset. The Project may hold trainings on skills needed during the Pre-DDI Phase of the Project but the Project does not intend to leverage trainings on a large scale to agencies during the Pre-DDI Phase.
17.7.17 Videos
A video recording of events, speeches, news conferences, meetings, or trainings are an effective way to capture information for later use. The Project may record major events such as an announcement of the launch of the DDI Phase, as an example. The Project Team, specifically the OCM Team, will coordinate with the DFS Office of Publications for video recording needs. The Florida Channel may record ESC meetings from time to time.

17.7.18 Webinars
Webinars are an online-based training or presentation that may be self-paced or facilitated live. The Project does not intend on leveraging webinars on a large scale during the Pre-DDI Phase.

17.7.19 Website
A grouping of webpages, a website delivers information to the various target audiences outlined in this Plan and may contain copies of meeting materials, released reports, videos, research, and webinars. This public facing tool should be used to increase the transparency of the Project’s status and activities.

17.7.20 Workgroups/Workshops
Workgroups/Workshops encourage interactive discussions. A workgroup is typically smaller and more interactive than a workshop. In workgroups, participants engage in active discussion in a collaborative manner, and workshops are more presentation-like in nature with less interaction. The Project often hosts both workgroups and workshops to engage and collaborate with the appropriate stakeholders to gain input and feedback.

17.8 Communication Channels
The Project routinely communicates with identified stakeholders through various communication channels as deemed appropriate. There are several channels available for releasing communications. These channels are not exclusive or exhaustive, and others may be added and deployed as the Project proceeds. The table below is a listing of the channel types used by the Project. For each tactic, the table displays the:

- audience receiving the message,
- topic(s) of the message,
- objective of the message,
- medium used to send the message,
- frequency, and
- message owner.
Table 21: Communication Channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Project Status Report</td>
<td>• Chair of Senate Committee on Appropriation and designated staff</td>
<td>• Project Progress during the reporting period</td>
<td>Fulfill proviso and AST requirements to report status and activities</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chair of the House Appropriations Committee and designated staff</td>
<td>• Overall Schedule, Budget, Scope, Risks, and Issues status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive Office of the Governor’s (EOG’s) Office of Policy &amp; Budget (OPB) and designated staff</td>
<td>• Project Schedule Performance Index (SPI) and Project Cost Performance Index (CPI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive Steering Committee (ESC)</td>
<td>• Status of Project Milestones, Deliverables, and Major Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Sponsors</td>
<td>• Detail of Scope Changes, Issues, Risks, and Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADAR Report</td>
<td>• Project Team</td>
<td>• Open Risks, Action Items, Issues, Decisions, and Lessons Learned</td>
<td>Keep the Project Director and Track Managers apprised of activities scheduled during the upcoming four weeks</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>PMO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Sponsors</td>
<td>• One week look-ahead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Four week look-ahead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Collaborations</td>
<td>• Executive Steering Committee (ESC)</td>
<td>Opportunities for engagement</td>
<td>Share ERP selection, implementation, development, and maintenance strategies</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>OCM Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Report</td>
<td>• Project Sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Team</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oversight Analysis                           | General Public                                                          | • AST Monthly Oversight Assessment  
• IV&V Monthly Assessment  
• Project Performance Review                          | Share side-by-side comparisons of oversight assessment data               | Website | Quarterly   | PMO Team       |
| Quarterly Dashboard                          |                                                                         |                                                                         |                                                                                                |         |             |                |
| Florida Association of State Agency Administrative Services Directors (FASAASD) Update | State Agency Administrative Services Directors (ASDs)                    | • Project status updates  
• Opportunities for engagement                   | • Keep ASDs apprised of Project status  
• Manage expectations for stakeholder involvement | Meeting | Monthly     | BPS Manager    |
| Chief Information Officers (CIOs) Workgroup Update | State agency CIOs                                                      | • Project status updates  
• Opportunities for engagement                   | • Keep CIOs apprised of Project status  
• Manage expectations for stakeholder involvement | Meeting | As needed   | Project Director |
| Florida Financial Management Information System (FFMIS) Partner Update | • MyFloridaMarket Place (MFMP) staff  
• People First (PF) staff  
• Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem (LAS/PBS) staff  
• FLAIR and CMS owners | • Project status updates  
• Opportunities for engagement                   | • Keep FFMIS partners apprised of Project status  
• Manage expectations for stakeholder involvement | Meeting | Monthly or as needed | OCM Team     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Website         | • State Government Employees  
                          • General Public  
                          • Media  
                          • Vendors | All                        | • Public relevant and up-to-date information regarding the Project to keep all stakeholders informed  
                          • Encourage continued interest in the Project | Wordpress | As needed | All Tracks       |
| Project-wide RAIDL (Risks, Action Items, Issues, Decisions, and Lessons) | Risk Management Team (Project Director, Project Deputy Director, and Track Managers) | • Status of open risks  
                          • Newly identified risks | • Communicate mitigation plans and progress status  
                          • Monetize the risk impact  
                          • Ensure there is a clear association between the identified risk and a project outcomes or contract deliverable  
                          • Establish clear close criteria | Meeting  | Bi-weekly | Risk Manager   |
| Track RAIDL (Risks, Action Items, Issues, Decisions, and Lessons Learned) Review Meeting | PMO Manager | • Status of Track RAIDL items status  
                          • Newly identified RAIDL items  
                          • RAIDL items ownership  
                          • Updates to RAIDL items | Share RAIDL status across Tracks and team members | Meeting  | Weekly    | Track Manager   |
| Executive Steering Committee Meeting | Executive Steering Committee Members | Communicate project status, spend plan, and impacts | Brief and obtain direction from Project sponsorship | Meeting  | Monthly   | Project Director |

---

Department of Financial Services
Pre-DDI Project Management Plan

Page 82 of 138  11/09/2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Sponsor Meeting</td>
<td>• DFS Chief of Staff</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Brief and obtain direction from executive sponsorship</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Bi-Weekly</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deputy CFO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Working Meeting</td>
<td>• Project Sponsors</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Group collaboration on a Strategy and Deliverables</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Track Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Track/Phase Close-out Meeting</td>
<td>• Sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Express appreciation for their support during the Project</td>
<td>Closeout Track/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Team Member(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct and record lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key DFS Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Verification and Validation</td>
<td>• Project Director</td>
<td>Updates from the IV&amp;V Contractor Lead</td>
<td>Discuss IV&amp;V Observations</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Monthly or as needed</td>
<td>IV&amp;V Contractor Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>• Project Deputy Director</td>
<td>• IV&amp;V Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PMO Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contract Manager</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ Meeting</td>
<td>• Project Director</td>
<td>Updates from the Project Director</td>
<td>Integration and coordinate priorities across Tracks</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Deputy Director</td>
<td>• Status updates from Track Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Track Managers</td>
<td>• Follow-up on outstanding action items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Status Meetings</td>
<td>Track Manager and Team</td>
<td>Updates from the Track Manager</td>
<td>Integration of activities within Track</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Daily or Weekly</td>
<td>Track Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Status updates from team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow-up on outstanding action items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes status of Deliverables, Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities, and Project and Other Track Support</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes current and next period accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST Bi-weekly Meeting</td>
<td>• Project Director</td>
<td>• Project status updates</td>
<td>• Keep AST apprised of Project status</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Bi-weekly</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Deputy Director</td>
<td>• Opportunities for engagement</td>
<td>• Manage expectations for oversight involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PMO Manager</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Staff Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>• Updates from the Project Directors</td>
<td>Updates of activities across the Project</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Updates from Track Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Staff Briefings</td>
<td>• EOG</td>
<td>Project Status Updates</td>
<td>Manage expectations for stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Legislature and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.9 Process
Communication Management occurs in three stages: identification of need; communication draft and review; and disseminate and monitor communication.

17.9.1 Identification of Need
Any Project Team member can identify a potential Project communication need. A Project communication need may be precipitated by a direct communication with the Project such as an email, letter, memo, or telephone call; or a communication outside the Project such as a news story, article, or other agency communication. If a Project Team member believes they have identified a communication need, they should inform their Track Manager and notify the Project’s Communication Coordinator.

The Communication Coordinator will review the potential communication need and consult with the Management Team to determine if a Project communication is warranted. If the need is verified, the Communication Coordinator with coordinate with the Track Managers to identify an Author for the communication. The Author may be the Initiator, the Communication Coordinator, or any other Project Team member depending on the area of expertise and need.

17.9.2 Communication Draft and Review
The Initiator and the Author (if different) will coordinate to develop the draft communication. They should refer to the Project Style Guide and the Pre-DDI Communication Plan when developing the draft communication.

The completed draft communication should be sent to the Reviewer(s) for review and comment. In most cases, the Reviewer(s) will be a group of Project Team members and Track Managers.

Once the Reviewer(s) have completed their review, the Author will incorporate comments and edits as appropriate and send the updated draft to the Project Director for review. All Project communications to be released outside the Project must be accepted by the Project Director or the Director’s designee before release.

The Project Director will review the draft communication and provide comments if needed. The author will incorporate the Director’s comments as appropriate and return the updated draft to the Director for review. This will continue until the Director is satisfied that the Draft is ready for the next step in the draft and review process.

Once the Project Director has completed their review, the Author will determine if the draft communication requires external review. Communications that may warrant outside review can include meeting summaries for meetings with other State agencies, communications being prepared and delivered by the Project for the Chief Financial Officer, and other communications that require legal review due to their content. If the communication requires external review, the Author will coordinate the external review and incorporate any comments received as appropriate. The updated draft will be sent to the Project Director to begin the same review process listed above.

Once this review is complete, or if the draft does not require an external review, the final draft communication must go through the Content Release Management Process which establishes
Quality Control (QC) components that must be applied to the draft communication. Refer to the Content Management section of this document for more information regarding the Quality Control process and Appendix E – Master Quality Control Checklist applied to all communications. Upon a successful quality review, the Author will forward the final draft communication to the Communication Coordinator for final review and formatting. The final review and formatting will confirm the communication meets the following criteria (as applicable):

1. The content is consistent with the guidance in the Pre-DDI Communication Plan.
2. The format is consistent with the Project Style Guide. *This is important when messaging is delivered via email, document, or other written communication vehicles.*
3. The format is compatible with the communication vehicle (e.g., if the communication is to be published on the Project’s website, the PDF should be optimally formatted for web publication).

The Communication Coordinator will coordinate with the Project Director to update the document to meet any of the criteria listed above. In the figure below, the Communication Management Process Flow, illustrates the three stages described herein.

### 17.9.3 Disseminate and Monitor Communication

The Initiator is the default role responsible for disseminating final communications. However, this may not always be the case. Once the communication has been approved, the appropriate Project Team member will disseminate the communication as is commensurate with the communication audience and communication vehicle, and notify the Communication Coordinator. The Communication Coordinator will monitor the communication and coordinate with the Initiator and the Author if a follow up communication is needed.

The Project tracks and reports on communications using several tools. The first is the Project's Communication Log. Located on the OCM Track SharePoint main page, the Communication Log is the Project’s official record of Project-related communications. After disseminating communication, the Initiator or Track staff member designee enters the communication into the log and notifies the Communication Coordinator. The log is reported on monthly by the Communication Coordinator but relies on track staff members to update the log on a regular basis.

The second tool, or rather set of tools, is Project Monthly Status Reports. The Project will also produce a quarterly Collaboration and Communication Report.

Each Project Track is responsible for recording Project communications originating from their Track in the Track Status Report's Communication Log Summary. The Initiator will work with the Project Track owning the communication to make sure the Track Status Report is updated to reflect the communication release. In the case where the communication is initiated from the Project as a whole and not from a Track concerning the Project, the OCM Track will include the communication on the OCM Status Report.
### Figure 22: Communication Management Process Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of Need</th>
<th>Communication Draft and Review</th>
<th>Disseminate and Monitor Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Need for Communication?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Team Manager to Select the Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Required?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Received or Identified Need to send Communication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Message and Incorporate Edits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Draft to Reviewers and Notify Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Content and Perform Q&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate and Monitor Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Notice of Message Being Sent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Communication Log</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 22: Communication Management Process Flow**
17.10 Roles and Responsibilities

The Communication Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the three (3) major areas of the Communication Management Process as shown in the figure below.

![Figure 23: Major Areas of the Communication Management Process](image)

Table 22: Communication Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiator*</td>
<td>Identifies the need for communication. This can be any member of the Florida PALM Project Team.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Responsible for working with the Initiator to draft the communication.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Responsible for reviewing draft communications and providing comments as necessary prior to submission to the Project Director for review and approval.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Coordinator</td>
<td>Monitors and tracks all communications from the Project to maintain consistent Project Messaging. Provides final review and formatting for all communications from the Project. Coordinates major communication initiatives.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Manages and leads all Project activities, including acceptance and verification of Project communications</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Project Team Member responsible for distributing the communication may be any of the roles listed in the Table.

* The Initiator may be any Project Team member, including those fulfilling the Roles listed in the Table.
18 Issue Management

18.1 Overview
Issue Management establishes the process used to identify and resolve issues that arise due to unplanned events, unexpected events, or a materialized risk. An issue tends to have a negative impact on Project scope, schedule, and cost and therefore will have a resolution plan to minimize the negative effects on the Project. This process enables the Project to resolve an issue in a consistent manner.

18.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide a clear framework to facilitate effective, efficient, and consistent issue resolution.

18.3 Process

18.3.1 Issue Identification
The process begins when a Requestor has identified an issue that impacts the Project’s scope, schedule, and/or cost and subsequently logs the issue in the Issue Log. The Issue Log is used to document and track Issues including steps for resolution. The resolution steps will focus on speedy closure of Issues to maintain the Project schedule and quality of deliverables.

Both the PMO and assigned Track Manager are responsible for the maintenance and monitoring of items in the Issue Log. Issue progress will be monitored daily and reviewed at the Track and Project-wide levels on a bi-weekly basis.

18.3.2 Issue Evaluation
The Project Management Office (PMO) is responsible for evaluating the issue and determining its validity. If the PMO deems the issue to be invalid, the status of the Issue will be changed to “Removed” in the Issue Log. The PMO will assign an Owner for valid issues and work together with the designated Track Manager to perform further evaluation. Together they will determine the priority, due date, and resolution action plan. Issues are evaluated and categorized by priority according to impact:

- Critical – Work has or will come to a complete stop in the next 24 hours
- High – Impacts either cost, schedule, contract deliverable, contract payment or any combination thereof
- Low – All impacts not listed as Critical or High

The Project Director must be notified immediately if an issue has been categorized as Critical. In addition, the action plan is required to be established and communicated to the Project Director within eight hours of identification. The Project Director is responsible for the approval of all resolution action plans.

The action plan is documented in the Issue Log and consists of the following components:

- Resolution strategy, including action steps
- Sequence of actions to be taken
- Resources responsible for the actions
- Expected due dates for the actions
- Reporting and Communication requirements
- Escalation schedule dates
• Contingency actions, in the event of failure

18.3.3  Issue Management
Issues will be managed to resolution by following the steps identified in the action plan. At a minimum, progress on the action plan will be communicated each day via email to designated stakeholders until resolved. The Project Director or Track Lead has authority to specify more frequent and different communication mechanisms (phone, in person, meetings) for “Critical Issues”.

18.3.3.1 Critical Priority Escalation
The Project Director must be notified immediately if an issue has been categorized as a Critical priority. In addition, the action plan is required to be established and communicated to the Project Director within eight hours of the identification of the issue. The Project Director is responsible for the approval of all resolution action plans.

18.3.3.2 High Priority Escalation
An escalation process is triggered in the event a high priority issue remains unresolved by its due date. The escalation process identifies the level of escalation, change in ownership, and timeframe to determine the change in ownership. The Issue Escalation Levels are shown in the Table below.

18.3.3.3 Low Priority Escalation
The escalation process for Low priority issues will be defined and agreed upon between the issue owner and the Project Director. This issue priority will leverage the operating framework described in the High Priority Escalation, described in the next section. The escalation owners and timing are determined by the Project Director.

Table 23: Issue Escalation Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Issue Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Executive Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Track Manager(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Priority Issues that cannot be resolved by the established due date will change ownership through the various Escalation Levels listed in the above table and is based on the number of days past the due date. Issue ownership changes will occur as depicted in the figure below.

![Figure 24: Issue Escalation Process](image-url)
Figure 25: Issue Management Process
18.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Issue Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the four (4) major areas of the Issue Management Process as shown in the figure below.

Figure 26: Major Areas of the Issue Management Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requester</td>
<td>• Identifies the potential issue and enters into the Issue Log.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>• Works Low and High priority issue action plans to resolution.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>• Works with PMO to determine if the issue is valid.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies the priority, Owner, and due date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creates the action plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Works Low and High priority action plans to resolution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>• Determines if the Issue is valid.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies the priority, Owner, and due date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creates the action plan and updates the Issue Log accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>• Approves action plans.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/A</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Works with PMO to identify the priority, Owner, and due date, and create and approve the action plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Owns the Critical priority issues to resolution or escalates to the CFO / Executive Sponsor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO / Executive Sponsor</td>
<td>• Works past due, escalated High or Critical priority issue action plans to resolution.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 Decision Management

19.1 Overview
The Decision Management process, in the context of running the day-to-day operations of the Project, establishes and implements a defined structure that will facilitate an effective decision making process using all available information to increase the precision, consistency, and agility of Decisions. Additionally, good decision making is about making good choices while considering risks and scope/schedule/cost constraints. The Project Director and the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) will make all significant Project Decisions. This multi-tiered governance structure is in place for the Project as described below.

19.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide a clear framework to facilitate effective, efficient, and timely decision making across all levels of the Project.

19.3 Process
19.3.1 Identify Decision
The process begins when a Requester determines that a decision needs to be made that is going to have an impact outside of their immediate area. The Decision Log is used to document and track Project Decisions including next steps and the impacted parties. Both the PMO and Track Managers have responsibility for the maintenance and monitoring of items in the Decision Log. Decision progress will be reviewed at the Track and Project-wide levels on a bi-weekly basis.

19.3.2 Evaluate Decision
After the Requester enters a record for the identified Decision into the Decision Log, the appropriate Track Manager evaluates the requested decision to determine relevance, completeness of the request, and if it should be categorized as either a Tier 1 (minor), or a Tier 2 (major); see below for additional detail on the characteristics of the Decision Tiers. At this point, the Track Manager also makes the determination whether the decision is to be managed by the Track Manager or the PMO. The PMO track will manage the decision process if the decision impacts multiple tracks or requires a decision by the ESC or Project Director.

Decisions that must follow the formal Decision Management process have the following characteristics:

- Does not impact scope, schedule, or cost, but represents a significant choice for the project (Tier 1). These decisions shall be recorded exclusively in the Project’s Decision Log with no PCR required.
- Impacts to scope, schedule, or cost (Tier 2). The decision will be entered in the Decision Log and a Project Change Request (PCR) will be created. These decisions and resulting PCRs will be escalated through the defined multi-tiered governance structure included in the Project Charter, as well as follow the process described in the Project Scope and Change Management section of this document.
- Impacts the Project objectives or the functional/technical direction of the Project (Tier 2). These types of decisions require collaboration and agreement across multiple Project Tracks and the ESC.

Decision due dates should tie to a specific event, milestone, or deliverable task in the Project’s master schedule.
19.3.2.1 Tier 1: Florida PALM Project Director
The Project Director is charged with managing the Project and approving Tier 1 Decisions in conformance with the Project Charter. The Project Director may delegate decisions to other Project Team members, but retains responsibility for the decisions made. Tier 1 Decisions do not significantly affect scope, schedule, or cost and include decisions regarding staffing changes, risks, multi-Track issues, and the approval of Project deliverables not categorized as major Project deliverables.

1. Scope – Changes that do not modify the Project scope as documented in the approved Pre-DDI Project Charter.
2. Schedule – Changes not associated with major deliverable due dates or key Project milestone dates (critical path).
3. Cost – Variances of +/- 10% of Project budget within spend plan categories, provided it does not result in overall Project cost overruns.

19.3.2.2 Tier 2: Florida PALM Executive Steering Committee
The ESC is responsible for approving Tier 2 Decisions which are beyond the authority of the Project Director. The following three areas comprise Tier 2 decisions and will be presented to, and made by the ESC:

1. Scope – Changes that modify the Project scope as documented in the approved Pre-DDI Project Charter.
2. Schedule – Changes to major deliverable due dates or key Project milestone dates which impact the overall Project critical path.
3. Cost – Variances of greater than +/- 10% of Project budget within spend plan categories.

19.3.3 Formalize Decision
After all necessary information is gathered and evaluated, the decision is presented to the appropriate decision maker(s) based on the Tier of the Decision. The decision maker(s) will then evaluate the options and choose one that best meets the needs of the State. Either the PMO or Track Manager will then update the Decision record in SharePoint.
Figure 27: Decision Management Process
19.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Decision Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the three major areas of the Decision Management Process as shown in the figure below:

![Figure 28: Stages of the Decision Management Process](image)

### Table 25: Decision Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requester</td>
<td>• Initiates the Decision Management process based on need identified.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Logs the request and completes all fields of the Decision Log.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submits the request to the associated Track Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>• Evaluates the Decision and determines the Decision-making level.</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>R/V</td>
<td>I/C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determines whether the decision is to be managed by the Track Manager or the PMO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develops the Decision Request and updates the Decision Log.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>• Owns the Decision and PCR process.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A/V</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>I/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has same responsibilities as Track Managers when it affects multiple tracks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tracks and reports all PCR decisions escalated to the ESC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updates the decision information and status in the Decision Log.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director – Tier 1</td>
<td>• Manages the Project and approves or rejects Tier 1 Decisions.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A/R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Escalates and presents decisions and associated PCRs, that meet the Tier 2 criteria, to the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) for consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Steering Committee (ESC) – Tier 2</td>
<td>• Reviews and approves or rejects any decisions and PCRs regarding the Project’s scope, schedule, and cost beyond the Project Director’s authority.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A/R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20 Deliverable Management

20.1 Overview
Deliverable Management describes the processes to be followed when developing, reviewing, and accepting Project Deliverables. Adherence to this process is the responsibility of all members of the Project Team. To achieve a positive outcome, this process must be carried out over the life of the Project to ensure expectations are aligned and met. This process applies to all Project Deliverables (contractual and non-contractual).

20.2 Purpose
The purpose of Deliverable Management is to provide instructions to Project Team Members regarding Deliverable Management and associated activities.

20.3 Process
The process for deliverable management includes development and approval of a DED, deliverable development, and deliverable acceptance. The figure below illustrates the Deliverable Management Process.

![Diagram of Deliverable Management Process]

Figure 29: Overview of Deliverable Management Process

The DED development process includes the steps the Project takes to establish the acceptance criteria, the roles and responsibilities for the deliverable activities, and the development methodology. Considering the acceptance criteria is a key element in the Submission QC Review, as core requirements for accepting the deliverable.

The deliverable development process includes the steps to be carried out to create the deliverable. The deliverable Owner, the deliverable Contributors, and the Project’s Track and Contract Managers identify what approach or methodology will be used to generate the deliverable.

The deliverable acceptance process includes the steps used to review, document feedback, and gain Project acceptance.

Deliverables will be developed using tools and techniques appropriate to their form. This may include the use of Microsoft Office software (for written deliverables), Commercial of the Shelf (COTS), custom software, or other tools. Each deliverable will be developed using a standard
template that is approved during the DED process. Version control and updates can be found in the Content Management section of the PMP.

Deliverable numbers and titles will be chosen by the Track Manager. The title shall not include the Track acronym and shall use the numbering conventions below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th>Non-Contractual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track Acronym-Number</td>
<td>The letter I-Track Acronym-Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX-#</td>
<td>I-XXX-#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deliverables that are multi-part can include A,B,C, etc. as part of the deliverable number.

20.3.1 **Deliverable Expectations Document (DED)**
The figure below provides a high-level overview of the DED development process.

![Figure 30: Overview of DED Development Process](image)

20.3.1.1 **DED Development**
The DED shall be developed by the Owner of the Deliverable, and vice versa, when possible. Each DED shall contain sufficient detail to provide clear expectations of the Deliverable’s contents and acceptance criteria. The DED will be used by the QC Reviewer during the Deliverable Submission Quality Control (QC) Review to ensure compliance with the acceptance criteria.

For contractual Deliverables, the Deliverable acceptance criteria included in the contract shall be used as the basis for the DED. The DED will serve as evaluation criteria for fulfilling completeness of any given Deliverable. The Owner and Coordinator shall ensure that all contractual elements are included in the DED.

Once finalized, the DED is linked to the Deliverable and shall be in the same file location as the Deliverable being developed. This includes version control and updates after approval as specified by the Content Management section.

DEDs vary dependent upon the type of Deliverable, but each DED shall include at a minimum:

- DED Purpose
- Deliverable Objectives
- Content Draft Outline
- Deliverable Acceptance Criteria/Format
- Content Release Plan
- Deliverable Roles
- Deliverable Development Approach and Timeline
- Appendix (if applicable)
As part of the Deliverable Development Approach and Timeline, the Coordinator and the PMO shall determine the amount of time needed to review the deliverable. The actual review period for each deliverable will be included in the Master Project Schedule. Typically, the Master Project Schedule accounts for the following:

- Initial Review and Edits (Round 1)
- Second Review and Edits (if needed) (Round 2)
- Final Review

Complex and multi-part Deliverables may require a segmented review process in which individual sections are reviewed as they are completed. The format and schedule for this review shall be agreed to by the Owner and Reviewers as part of the DED development process. As an additional option, the Deliverable may be split during the creation of the DED, in which case each individual element would be reviewed separately. When all sections are completed, the final Deliverable shall be subject to the same full review process as any other Deliverable. Performing a segmented review of the Deliverable helps ensure the Project can perform a thorough review of the content, and suggested revisions will be made within the desired review period.

The last step in DED development process is to perform a DED submission QC review per Appendix E – Master Quality Control Checklist. The results are document and provided to the deliverable owner.

**20.3.1.2 DED Review and Accept**

The DED review process includes:

- Walkthrough the DED to clarify content, answer questions, and/or to familiarize the Reviewers with the deliverable.
- The option for interactive review sessions to incorporate deliverable feedback in the most effective manner.

Each DED shall be reviewed and accepted by the Acceptor. If the Deliverable is contractual, the Contract Manager shall serve as the Coordinator. For internal Deliverables, the Track Manager will name the Coordinator when development of the DED begins. Track Managers will identify Reviewers for the DED.

**20.3.1.3 DED Updates and Change Control**

After a DED has been approved, it will only be updated and submitted for re-approval when a change in scope content, schedule, or acceptance criteria was either initiated through a Project Change Request (PCR), or agreement between the Deliverable Owner, Coordinator, and/or Acceptor.

The figure below communicates the life cycle for the DED.
Figure 31: DED Development, Review, and Accept Process
20.3.2 Deliverable Development, Review, and Acceptance

20.3.2.1 Deliverable Development

The figure below provides a high-level overview of the deliverable development process.

![Figure 32: Overview of the Deliverable Development Process]

When creating the Deliverable, the Owner shall adhere to the criteria, format, and development approach set forth in the DED. Some Deliverables may have Contributors (Project Team Members), as identified in the DED, assisting the Owner during the development of the content. Deliverable Owners are encouraged to review and discuss Deliverable content with other Project Team Members via a peer review prior to submission, allowing the Deliverable review process to be one of validation instead of a review of new content. Each deliverable shall contain sufficient detail to meet the acceptance criteria specified in the DED.

Deliverables vary dependent upon the topic, but each deliverable shall include at a minimum:

- Number
- Name
- Revision History
- Date

After development is complete, the Deliverable along with the Deliverable Review Form (Appendix C), is submitted to the Quality Control (QC) Reviewer. The QC Reviewer is responsible for determining if the Deliverable meets the Project's quality expectations and if the submission should be accepted. The Submission Checklist is included in the Deliverable Review Form (Appendix C).

20.3.2.2 Deliverable Review

The figure below provides a high-level overview of the deliverable review process.

![Figure 33: Overview of Deliverable Review Process]
The deliverable review process includes:

- A Submission QC Review Checklist, included in the Deliverable Review Form (Appendix C), of the deliverable to determine if it meets the Project’s quality standards before the review process begins.
- Walkthroughs of each deliverable to clarify content, answer questions, and/or to familiarize the Reviewers with the deliverable.
- A formal review and written comments from Reviewers with the results tracked on the Deliverable Review Form (Appendix C).
- The option for interactive review sessions to incorporate deliverable feedback in the most effective manner.
- Formal written acceptance of deliverables by the Project Director, Project Sponsors, and/or Executive Steering Committee.
- Archival of all deliverables in the designated Project repository.

The Submission QC Review is the first step in the Technical Quality Evaluation (TQE) process. The QC Reviewer reviews the deliverable for submission acceptance prior to the formal review process. Deliverables must pass the Submission QC Review before a formal deliverable review can begin. Any defects recorded as part of the Submission QC Review, which do not address the acceptance criteria, are recorded as Severity 1 Defects and the deliverable is sent back to the Owner for correction and resubmission.

Once the deliverable has passed the Submission QC Review, the submission is officially accepted and the formal review begins. If the Reviewer identifies a Severity 1 Defect during their review, they should discuss the defect with the Coordinator to determine if the review process should stop and the deliverable be sent back to the Owner, or it should be addressed during the edit process.

The review process can happen one of two ways: 1. Individual reviewers can document their comments and requested changes individually on the Deliverable Review Form and send to the Coordinator for consolidation, or 2. The Coordinator facilitates a group review where comments and requested changes are compiled and documented using track changes. After the changes are accepted, the Coordinator shall log the consolidated comments onto the Deliverable Review Form. During the initial review cycle, the deliverable shall be reviewed and commented in its entirety.

After round 1 review, subsequent reviews shall be focused on any added or modified content except where the modifications have an impact on other Deliverable content. Prior to resubmission, the Deliverable shall be reviewed by the Coordinator, or designee to ensure that all comments and requested changes have been addressed. After the Coordinator or designee reviews and verifies changes, the Owner shall re-submit the Deliverable and clearly identify changes to the draft document. In addition, the Owner shall provide a response to each comment, explaining how the requested change was addressed, or why it was not addressed.

### 20.3.2.3 Deliverable Acceptance

All Deliverables are accepted by the Project Director. If the Deliverable is contractual, the Contract Manager will document the acceptance in writing on a Notice of Deliverable Acceptance Form (Appendix D). Acceptance of non-contractual Deliverables will be documented in writing via email.

The figure below communicates the life cycle for the deliverable development.
**Figure 34: Deliverable Development and Review Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QC Reviewer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accepter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Start Process**
  - Develop Deliverable to match the criteria in the DCC and submit along with Deliverable Review Form
  - QC Reviewer ("Submission QC" and record issues in PH CHECK LIST)
  - Perform QC
  - Update Deliverable based upon comments
  - Inform Owner of acceptance and post approved revision

- **Accept**
  - Recommend Acceptance
  - Acceptance approved?
  - Submit Project deliverables
  - Review and provide formal notice of acceptance

- **Close**
  - Content released right
20.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Deliverable Management roles and responsibilities are described in the table below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Accept, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role during each of the four (4) major areas of the Deliverable Management Process as shown in the figure below.

![Figure 35: Major Areas of the Deliverable Management Process](image)

**Table 26: Deliverable Management Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>• Serves as primary Owner of the DED and Deliverable</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsible for ensuring content is created and fulfills the acceptance criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor(s)</td>
<td>• Assists the Owner with content or other development</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serves as an Advisor to the Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>• Performs DED Quality Control</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contract Manager for contract deliverables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Verifies acceptance criteria is met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsible for facilitating and coordinating the review and compiling comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommends Deliverable acceptance or rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer(s)</td>
<td>• Reviews the DED and Deliverable and documents findings and feedback</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptor</td>
<td>• The Track Manager is responsible for reviewing DED’s with the Project Director, prior to their acceptance</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Project Director accepts all deliverables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upon Project Director acceptance, the Executive Steering Committee is responsible for approving major Project deliverables that have been agreed upon by the ESC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informed on progress being made throughout the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC Reviewer</td>
<td>• Conducts the Submission QC Review verifying the content meets the acceptance criteria and Project quality standards</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I/V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 Action Item Management

21.1 Overview
Action Item Management enables the Project Team to effectively complete work in a timely manner to keep the Project on track and provide the mechanism to bring Action Items to closure. Action Items address a specific need in order to provide an outcome that is not on the Project schedule or addressed in the Risk, Issue, or Decision Logs. Action Items are unique needs created out of discussions, recorded, and require follow up.

21.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions to facilitate effective, efficient, and timely completion and closure of Action Items across all levels of the Project.

21.3 Process
21.3.1 Identification
The process is initiated with the identification and logging of an Action Item in the Action Item Log, by the Requester. The Requester will identify and contact the Owner to describe the need or desired outcome and include any other information that could be helpful to resolve the Action Item. The Owner or delegate will review the information for completeness. If the Owner is satisfied with the information, they will request a review with the Track Manager to proceed with developing the Action Plan to be followed.

21.3.2 Evaluation
The Track Manager is responsible for evaluating the action item and determining its validity. The Track Manager will validate the action item Owner and finalize the action plan steps. Together they will determine the priority, due date, and outcome of the action plan. The Action Item due date will be determined during this evaluation. This due date should be tied to a specific task or deliverable on the Project’s master schedule.

Note: Action Items may be assigned to individuals external to the Project, however they may not be the named Owner. The Project Director, Deputy Project Director, or Track Manager will be assigned as the Owner.

21.3.3 Execution
Upon approval by the Track Manager, the Owner will work the Action Plan to completion. The Owner will inform the Requestor when the Action Plan has been worked to completion and obtain the Requestor’s agreement for the Owner to close the Action Item. The figure below shows the various stages of the Action Item Management process.

The Owner is responsible for maintenance of items in the Action Item Log. Action Item progress will be reviewed at the Track and Project-wide levels on a bi-weekly basis.
Figure 36: Action Item Management Process
21.4 Roles and Responsibilities

The Action Item Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the four (4) major areas of the Action Item Management Process as shown in the figure below.

Figure 37: Major Areas of the Action Item Process

Table 27: Action Item Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requester</td>
<td>• Responsible for identifying, logging, and defining the outcome of the Action Item.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews the Action Plan to ensure request as originally defined will be resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>• Reviews Action Item request to determine validity.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V/A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirms Action Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner / Delegate</td>
<td>• Participates in discussions with the Requester to fully understand the need.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Researches and documents the Action Plan steps to be executed to resolution and closure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manages Action Item Log.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 Content Management

22.1 Overview
Content Management describes the standard document management, content release, and website management processes to be used by the Project. These processes are provided as separate parts to this section; however, they are directly related and have multiple points of overlap. Document management provides the Project standards for version control, document retention, and revision history tracking. Content release provides the process for document content review and update, and content release to Project stakeholders and the public. Website management provides the process for requesting, reviewing, approving, developing, and verifying updates to the Project’s website.

For information pertaining to project communication, style, or website standards, please consult the following documents:

- Communication Management section of the PMP for communications standards;
- The Website User’s Guide for technical information about creating website updates, and standards; and

22.2 Purpose
The purpose of this section is to provide instructions to the Project Team related to document management, content release, and website management. This is intended to confirm:

- Project documents are managed in a consistent manner;
- Content is reviewed for Project message continuity and consistency with Project standards prior to release; and
- Information included on the website is accurate and consistent with the Project’s communications and content release standards.

22.3 Document Management
There are three components to document management: versioning, file naming conventions, and managing. Versioning provides the standards used when identifying the draft, final, and updated documents. File naming conventions provide the standards to be used when assigning file names to document files. Managing pertains to the repository and retention of documents.

22.3.1 Versioning
The Project uses two versioning conventions depending on the document: date versioning and version numbering. Date versioning is used for documents that are developed and released on a recurring basis (e.g., Project and Track status reports, FASAASD updates). Version numbering is used for deliverables and large Project products (e.g., Project Management Plan, Project Charter, or Business Requirements).

22.3.1.1 Date Versioning
Date versioning is used for documents that are released on a recurring basis. As mentioned above, these include Track and Project status reports. Within this group, there are several categories of documents; annual; quarterly; and weekly/periodically. A slightly different date versioning format is used for each. These rules apply when using date versioning:
1. The file names for documents using date versioning will include the date is described later in this section.
2. The date version may also be included in the title of the document, though it is not required.
3. The date version is not included in the footer (refer to the Project’s Style Guide).

Annual documents (e.g., Fiscal Year Schedule Planning) use the fiscal year date versioning format. This format has a space between the “FY” and the fiscal year. The fiscal year is represented by the last two digits of the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins and the last two digits of the calendar year in which the fiscal year ends, separated by a hyphen.

\[
\text{FY XX-XX}
\]

\[
\text{FY (fiscal year) Two Digit first and last Year}
\]

*Figure 38: Fiscal Year*

Quarterly documents (e.g., collaboration and communication status report) use the fiscal year and quarterly date versioning format. This format includes the information used for annual documents with the fiscal year quarter (e.g., 1, 2, 3, or 4) added to the end. There is a space between the fiscal year and the quarter.

\[
\text{FY XX-XX Qn}
\]

\[
\text{FY (fiscal year) Two Digit first and last year Q (quarter) Fiscal Year Quarter}
\]

*Figure 39: Fiscal Year and Quarter*

Weekly/periodic documents (e.g., status reports) use the year, month, day date versioning format. There are no spaces between the each. A zero will precede single digit months and days. Therefore, each date version number will have eight digits.

\[
\text{YYYYMMDD}
\]

\[
\text{Four Digit Year Two Digit Month Two Digit Day}
\]

*Figure 40: Year-Month-Day*

**Important:** Date versioning does not apply to documents that are updated on a regular/prescribed basis (e.g., Project Team Orientation, Project Management Plan). Those documents will still use version numbering described in the next section.
The Project Style Guide contains guidance on the location of date versioning information in documents of different file formats (e.g., Excel, PowerPoint, Word, Visio).

22.3.1.2 Version Numbering

The Project uses a two-level version numbering format for approved/accepted documents that may be updated from time to time. As indicated above, these include Project deliverables. Version numbering is only used for final accepted/approved documents. Drafts do not receive a version number. They are marked to as “draft.” Refer to the Project Style guide for draft formatting.

The version numbering format consists of two pairs of integers where XX represents major updates and YY represents minor updates:

\[XX.YY\]

Figure 41: Version Numbering

Zeros are not added to the version number for single digits. For example, version 1.0 is not represented as 01.00.

Major updates are substantial changes that alter the document’s message including additions or deletions of substantial content. Minor updates are minimal in nature and include corrections in grammar, data, formatting, and/or clarification of terminology. Draft documents do not receive a version number. Accepted/approved documents should not be updated only to bring terminology current with changes in Project jargon. However, terminology can be updated if done in conjunction with another update. In all cases you should consult your Track Manager before updating a deliverable.

Example version numbers

- Initial approved/accepted document – Version 1.0
- Major update to the initial document – Version 2.0
- Minor update to the previous major update – Version 2.1

Version numbers are referenced in the document’s cover page footer only. They are not added to the file name. Refer to the Project Style Guide for document cover page and footer standards.

22.3.2 Version History

Updates made to Project documents are tracked using different methods for draft and accepted/approved documents.

22.3.2.1 Draft Documents

Draft documents are not assigned a version number at any time during their development. They are simply “draft.” Version history for draft documents is tracked using SharePoint’s Version
Comments function. Each time a draft document is saved to SharePoint, the author of the original or updated document will enter a summary of the updates in the Version Comments window. The following rules should be followed when entering version comments:

1. Notes should be succinct, explicit, and brief.
2. Do not enter the date of the update.
3. Do not enter the name of the author unless multiple persons contributed to the edits during the update.
4. Notes must be entered each time a document is initially saved or checked-in to SharePoint.

Revision notes should identify the types of updates made with enough detail to describe the updates, but not so much as to list exhaustive detail. For example:

- Too little information: The document was updated
- Too much detail: Page seven, paragraph 3, line 2 was updated to replace “target” with “objective”
- Recommended detail: Document terminology was updated to be consistent with recent Project decisions

These rules should also be followed when entering revision notes for accepted/approved documents.

22.3.2.2 Accepted/Approved Documents
In addition to SharePoint version comments, the Project uses a version table to track updates made to documents that use the version numbering format. The Version History table is used to identify and track the version numbers, the date each version was accepted, and revision notes for each accepted/approved revision. Revisions are listed in numerical order beginning with the first initial version in the top row. The location of the table depends on the documents file type.

Table 28: Location of the version table by file type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Table Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Title page and the first page following the title page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>First tab in the Excel workbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
<td>First slide following the Project logo slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visio</td>
<td>First page of the Visio diagram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to the Project Style Guide for more information on the version table and how to use it with different file types.

Table 29: Version history table template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The version number</td>
<td>Date of this version</td>
<td>Summary of the changes made from the last version</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Example version history table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>01/03/2016</td>
<td>Initial accepted version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>02/02/2016</td>
<td>Minor formatting updates to be consistent with new Project guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Version tables are only used for final accepted/approved documents. As indicated above, draft document history will be tracked using SharePoint’s Version Comments function.

22.3.3 **File Naming**

File naming structures are designed to coincide with versioning conventions *described above*. Although there are differences between the two conventions (date versioning and version numbering), the following rules apply to each:

1. The title of the document (or a recognizable abbreviation) should be in the file name.
2. File names should be 30 characters or less while still identifying the document.
3. Draft document file names should not include:
   a. “Draft”
   b. “Final”
   c. Version numbers
   d. Names or initials of editors

4. File names may include spaces; however, the following characters are not allowed:
   a. Ampersand - &
   b. Asterisk - *
   c. Backslash - \
   d. Braces – [ ]
   e. Colon - :
   f. Number sign - #
   g. Percent - %
   h. Tilde - ~
   i. Underscores - _

### 22.3.3.1 File Naming for Documents Using Date Versioning

The file name structure for documents using the *date versioning* will include the document name (or abbreviation) and the date version based on the formats provided in the previous section. Include a space between the document name and the date version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date Version Format</th>
<th>Example File Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Collaboration Strategy</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Collaboration Strategy FY 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and Communications Status Report</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Collaboration and Communications Status Report FY 16-17 Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22.3.3.2 File Naming for Documents Using Version Numbering

Documents using version numbering use only the document title for the file name. Do not add the date or the version to the file name.
Table 32: Example file names for documents using version numbering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Titles</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>File Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Charter for Florida PALM</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Project Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI) Project Management Plan (PMP)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Pre-DDI PMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan for Pre-SSI OCM Activities (OCM2)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>OCM Pre-SSI Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.3.4 Managing Documents on SharePoint

SharePoint is used to retain (i.e., store) and manage Project documents. It is the Project’s direction that all Project documents should be saved to the Project’s SharePoint site. There are several reasons for this:

1. Files on SharePoint can be accessed by Project Team members at any location with an internet access and a virtual private network connection.
2. Files on SharePoint are backed up on a regular basis helping to avoid file loss and facilitate file recovery.
3. Saving a file to a location other than SharePoint restricts access.
4. Each time a document is checked-out, it creates a record in the version history.
5. Except on rare occasions the Project does not allow files to be attached to emails or copied to external storage devices (e.g., flash drives and laptops).

Each Project Track has developed a file structure for their SharePoint sites. Consult a Track Team member for the site to which you’re saving your document to identify the proper location.

These rules apply when managing documents in SharePoint:

1. Documents should not be checked-out unless updates are being made
2. Version Comments must be entered for each document (e.g., new, draft, or accepted/approved versions) when saved or checked-in to SharePoint.
3. A PDF copy of the final accepted/approved version of a document will be created and uploaded to SharePoint in the same location as the original file.
4. Multiple copies of a document should not be created and saved on SharePoint.
5. When a new accepted/approved version of a document is created, a new PDF copy is created and uploaded.

Project Team members will be prompted to enter version comments in the “Check in” pop-up window each time they save a document to SharePoint. The same rules identified in Draft documents section apply to version comments in SharePoint. For example:

- SharePoint Version Comments for draft documents
  - Draft – updated table xx and provided comments on section x.y.; Ready for review
  - Draft – Incorporated comments from AB, CD, and EF.

- SharePoint Version Comments accepted/approved documents
  - Version 1.0 – Initial accepted version
  - Version 1.1 – Corrected minor error in table x.y
  - Version 2.0 – Updated document summary and added new data table

On rare occasions, documents are no longer appropriate or applicable to the Project. In these instances, the Project retires a document. This will generally happen to documents using version numbering. When retiring a document:
• The version number should be updated to “RETIRED.”
• The version table should be updated to indicate the document has been retired and the new location of any information that may have been moved to other documents.
• The version comments on SharePoint should read “document retired.”
• RETIRED should be added to the end of the file name.

22.3.5 Document Standards
Documents will be managed according to the following standards:

• Default Paper Document Management Standard
  o Applies to deliverables, working documents, work papers, and any other paper documents.
  o Project Team and staff are to treat all documents in accordance with the Staff Guidelines for the Project. The Project’s Public Records Coordinator should be consulted regarding documents for their status as exempt or confidential and exempt under the Florida Public Records Law before any destruction of documents appropriately in accordance with the referenced rules and the requirements of sections 119.0701, and 501.171, F.S.
  o Paper documents may be taken off-site, but cannot be left out and available, unattended, unless they are in a secure space with minimal access, such as a locked room or office.

• Default Electronic Document Management Standard.
  o Applies to deliverables, working documents, work papers, and any other electronic documents.
  o Project Team Member(s) are to treat all procurement-related documents as sensitive and confidential, and maintain them, in accordance with applicable laws, rules, and the Staff Guidelines for the Project. For example:
    ▪ Documents will not be attached to e-mail messages unless absolutely necessary; instead, links to SharePoint documents will be sent.
    ▪ If sensitive or confidential information is sent via an e-mail message:
      • The message will be encrypted.
      • A word(s) will be placed in the subject line to denote the message contains sensitive or confidential information in an attachment and/or the body of the message, as follows:
        o UNREDACTED – Signifies that the content has not been reviewed and redacted and may contain confidential information
        o REDACTED – Signifies that the content has been redacted to protect confidential and/or sensitive information
        o CONFIDENTIAL – Signifies that the content is not classified as public
    ▪ If sensitive or confidential information is stored on a mobile storage device (e.g., USB flash drive), that device will have encryption technology enabled.
  o Electronic documents shall be kept in the SharePoint environment. SharePoint version control shall be utilized and enforced.
  o Electronic documents may not be left up and available on a computer, unattended, even for brief periods. Locking the computer when away from the computer is required.
22.4 Content Release
Content Release describes the processes to be followed for any content to be released or shared outside of the Project. The Content Release process includes content inspection to check for publication compliance with Project standards and finalization of supporting content release notes. Content includes website content, direct communications (e.g., emails), recurring distributed documents (e.g., Project Status Reports), or presentations to stakeholders. It is assumed that any Project document identified for release has been through the appropriate PMP processes and accepted/approved. Additional review steps beyond what are outlined below may be required when content is released by entities outside the Project (e.g., DFS Publications).

22.4.1 Process
22.4.1.1 Content Release Review
Content identified for release will go through two quality review control points. The first quality review is performed after the content review and edit task has been completed and prior to the Project Director’s acceptance. The second is after content has been accepted by the Project and has been transmitted to target audiences or posted to designated repository. This is identified as Post Release Quality Control (QC).

The first QC is performed during the respective PMP process areas where content is originally created. Those areas are Cost, Schedule, Communication, Deliverable, and Website. Appendix E - Master Quality Control Checklist captures all of the inspection elements across the mentioned PMP process areas.

After the Project has accepted the content, it is now ready for post release review. Content that does not pass this QC review will be sent back to the Owner for update and then resubmitted to the QC reviewer. These steps will be repeated until the content passes QC review. This Post Release QC review should not result in significant changes to document content. If there are significant changes to content, the content must go through both first QC and Post Release QC. These processes are communicated in the Content Release Review workflow figure, below.

22.4.1.2 Release Notes Instructions
Release notes may accompany updates to technical documents. The determination to include release notes shall be made on a case-by-case basis. Release notes are in addition to the information provided in the Version History table described in section 22.3. They provide a higher level of detail intended to assist readers in finding recently updated information. This is important for documents like the Website User Guide, where updates may be for a software or plug-in and they do not affect the entire document. However, they do alter a process. “Release notes” must be maintained on the Project’s SharePoint site in the same location as the document to which they apply. Release notes should be written as follows:

1. Created in Microsoft Word format and be consistent with the Project Style Guide;
2. Contain a new section for each revision;
3. Each new section should provide the version number, date the updates were accepted, and a summary of the major update;
4. Sections should be ordered from newest to oldest; and

---

*The Management Team may make exceptions*
5. Contain a table at the end of the document providing the location and a detailed description of each update. (See Table below)

Table 33: Example release notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description of update made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date the revision was</td>
<td>Location of each revision</td>
<td>A detailed description of the update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 42: Content Release Review workflow
22.4.2 Roles and Responsibilities

The Release Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the two (2) major areas of the Release Management Process as shown in the figure below.

![Post Release Review]

Figure 43: Major Areas of the Content Release Management Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Submits document for release review and acceptance; updates document based on QC review; If necessary, assist with communicating the release; can be any Project Team members</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC Reviewer</td>
<td>Reviews the document against the QC checklist and passes the document for release</td>
<td>A/V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Website Management Roles and Responsibilities
22.5 Website Management
This part provides instructions to the Project Team regarding website update request submission and approval and development, review, and verification of updates ensuring that Website content is accurate and consistent with the Project’s communications and content release standards.

22.5.1 Process
22.5.1.1 Request, Evaluate Submission, and Communication Consistency Review
The steps for requesting, evaluation, and completing the Communication Consistency Review are:

1. The Requestor identifies the need for an update.
2. The Track Manager of the Track requesting the update, or Project Director (or their delegate[s]) will review the Request for approval.
3. The Request will be edited as needed to receive approval, if appropriate.
4. The Communication Consistency and QC Reviewer will review the proposed update for consistency with the Project Communications Plan, Style Guide, and overall messaging.\(^8\)
5. The Request will be edited as needed to meet the Communication Consistency review. Steps 2, 3, and 4 will be repeated as necessary until the Request has been approved or is no longer being considered.
6. The Requestor will create a new log item in the Website Request and Tracking log. It is important that the Requestor complete all the required log fields. Omission of requested information may delay assignment of the Request.
7. The Requestor will send an email to the Website Coordinator (WC) informing them of the new Request.
8. The WC will review the new Request and work with the Requestor to gather any additional information that might be needed to complete the Website Request and Tracking log.
9. The WC will evaluate the Request to determine whether the Request is for a content-only (e.g., updating Website text or uploading new documents) or a technical update (e.g., creating new pages or installing new functionality). Content-only updates will be developed by the WC (or their backup). Technical updates will be developed by the Technical Coordinator (TC) (or their backup).

22.5.1.2 Update Development and Quality Control (QC) Review
The steps for update development and QC review are provided below. Steps vary depending on the update type (e.g., Content-only, or Technical).

22.5.1.2.1 Content-Only
Content-Only updates will follow these steps for developing updates and completing the QC review:

1. The developer (WC, TC or backup) will develop the update using a clone of the target page. The developer may need to consult the Requestor when modifications to the initial Request are necessary.
2. The Requestor (or their designee) will review the draft update for QC and identify any edits or corrections that need to be made.
3. The developer will incorporate the edits identified during the QC review. Steps 2 and 3 will be repeated until the update is ready to be published.

---

\(^8\) In some instances, the communication consistency review may not be necessary. These include minor text updates and uploading new documents. Requestors should consult with their Track Managers or the OCM Track if there are any questions.
4. The developer will publish the update to Production.

22.5.1.2.2 Technical Updates
As indicated in the Request, Evaluation Submission, and Communication Consistency Review section, technical updates are developed by the TC or their backup. The TC will first evaluate the update request to determine if it is a Stand-alone or Initiative update. Development and QC review for Stand-alone updates will follow the same steps described in the content-only section above. Initiative updates will be placed on the product backlog and may be managed using Agile Scrum.

22.5.1.2.3 Prelease QC Review and Release
The steps for Website Pre-Release QC review and publish update are:
   1. The QC Reviewer will review the updates and determine if it meets the Website Pre-Release QC Review as described in Appendix E. If the update does not meet the criteria, the WC or TC (or backup) will correct the update as appropriate. This step will be repeated until the update meets the QC criteria and has been deemed released.
   2. The Requestor will close the Website Request and Tracking log item.
   3. The Requestor (or other Team Member as assigned) may communicate the update to the appropriate audience in coordination with the Organizational Change Management (OCM) Track.
Figure 44: Website Management workflow
22.5.2 Roles and Responsibilities

The Website Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the three (3) major areas of the Release Management Process as shown in the figure below.

Figure 45: Major Areas of the Website Management Process

Table 35: Website Management Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2⁹</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requestor</td>
<td>Enters the initial Request on the Website Update and Tracking Log; Provides QC review of the draft update; Coordinates with the OCM Track to communicate the update release as appropriate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A/V</td>
<td>A/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>Approves or denies Requests prior to submittal.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Consistency and QC Reviewer</td>
<td>Provides communications consistency review and final QC review for the update¹⁰; Coordinates with the Requestor to communicate the update release as appropriate</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Coordinator (WC)</td>
<td>Responsible for coordinating the website management process for updates (not including Initiatives). Reviews Requests to determine update type (e.g., content-only, technical); Develops content-only updates.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Coordinator (TC)</td>
<td>Researches Requests for technical updates; Determines if a technical update is a Stand-alone or Initiative update. Develops technical updates.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ Responsibilities for development of an update are dependent upon the type of update requested
¹⁰ This is generally assigned to an OCM Track member.
23 Lessons Learned Management

23.1 Overview
Lessons Learned Management describes the process of identifying useful information the organization should retain for future adoption. Depending on the Lesson Learned, it could be a valuable technique or an outcome the Project might want to repeat. Conversely, a Lesson Learned could be an undesirable result to avoid. Often, identifying Lessons Learned is as simple as asking the question, “What worked well, what didn’t work so well, and what should have been done that was not?”

23.2 Purpose
The purpose of these procedures is to provide instructions to Project Team Members regarding Lessons Learned Management. Ultimately, Lessons Learned are a matter of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of a process. Individuals or Teams can benefit from the knowledge gained through the experience of those who have gone before them. Many organizations that label themselves as “learning organizations” often overlook their own experiences as a platform for learning. They assume their collective experiences are passed along to the next person or group. To be considered a learning organization we must be proactive, capture Lessons Learned, and “cross-pollienate” the concepts through training or other techniques that shares information to others who may benefit from it.

23.3 Process
Lessons Learned Management contains four phases: Identification, Evaluation, Execution, and Closing. As Lessons Learned are identified by Project Team staff, the following process is utilized.

23.3.1 Identification
The process is initiated with the identification, submission, and logging of a Lessons Learned item in the Lessons Learned log. The individual logging the Lesson Learned will set the status to “Developing” and inform their Track Manager of the submission.

A Lessons Learned Log will be used to document, track, and manage Lessons Learned. Lessons Learned progress will be reviewed at the Track and Project-wide levels on a bi-weekly basis. It is important for the Project Team to regularly revisit the log and to stay up to date with its contents.

The following three questions should be considered when identifying Lessons Learned:

1. *What worked well, so it can be repeated?*
   In asking this question the team, or individual, should focus on accomplishments. This is an opportunity to recognize the value of the effort performed and to focus on the positive outcomes of the activity/activities. These are the lessons to be repeated in future activities.

2. *What did not work so well, so it can be avoided?*
   The purpose of asking this question is to facilitate discussion and to focus on areas of improvement. The emphasis should be on reflecting on the team’s performance and specific deficiencies which can lead to future solutions. During this exercise the team should focus on facts as opposed to assigning responsibility for complications. These are the lessons to avoid and/or improve upon in future activities.

3. *What should have been done that was not?*
   When asking this question, the objective for the team is to think about how it can adjust, enhance, or increase desired outcomes in the future on similar initiatives. Essentially, this
question gives team members an opportunity to look back, knowing all that they know now, and determine what opportunities were missed. These are the lessons to implement in future activities.

The goal of asking these questions is to develop some conclusions that may lead to process improvement and will aid as an organizational process asset for the Project.

23.3.2 Evaluation
During the Evaluation phase, a Track Manager will evaluate the log item for completion and validity. If the Track Manager deems the Lesson Learned to be incomplete, it will be sent back to the Identifier to provide more information. If the information provided is sufficient, the Track Manager will evaluate the Lesson Learned to determine its validity. If determined to invalid, the status will be set to “Removed” and the Lesson Learned closed. Should the item be found to be valid, the Lesson Learned will transition to the Execution phase.

23.3.3 Execution
Within the Execution phase, the Track Manager, Owner, or both will initiate the Lessons Learned documentation process. Document components will be identified during Lessons Learned working sessions, and may include the business areas/function, point of contact, Project track, Project phase, situation, resolution, and any information that can be used to avoid or improve the process in the future. After completing the Lessons Learned working sessions, the Owner or Track Manager will submit the updated Lesson Learned to the Identifier for verification. The Lesson Learned will either be requested for rework or recommended for closure.

Documenting a useful Lesson Learned requires a clear understanding of the purpose and importance of recording the successes and/or failures of the event. Because Lessons Learned serve as an important management tool in retaining organizational knowledge, reducing Project risk, and improving Project performance, they must have relevance to future Project work.

The following are to be considered for building relevance into Lessons Learned and creating value to others in addressing similar situations:

- Identify the process or event in which the situation arose,
- Describe how the situation arose and define the problem or positive development encountered, and,
- Provide concrete, practical solutions or recommendations based on this experience.

To be easily accessible and beneficial across the Project, Lessons Learned should have the same form and function. To preserve institutional knowledge, Lessons Learned sessions should be performed within two weeks after the significant Project events/activities and should be documented within the Lessons Learned log.

In addition, Lessons Learned will be organized and captured for sorting by “strength” or “weakness”.

1. Strength are events, processes, or activities the Project desires to repeat in the future.
2. Weakness are those events, processes, or activities the Project desires to avoid in the future.
Figure 46: Lessons Learned Management Process
23.4 Roles and Responsibilities
The Lessons Learned Management roles and responsibilities are described below. This information is presented in a RACIV (Responsible, Acceptor, Consulted, Informed, or Verify) responsibility-matrix format, as defined in Section 7 of this document. The table below depicts the RACIV role and responsibilities during each of the four (4) major areas of the Lessons Learned Management Process as shown in the figure below.

Figure 47: Major Areas of the Lessons Learned Management Process

Table 36: Lessons Learned Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>• Identify a Lesson Learned worthy of sharing and documenting</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creates content for Lessons Learned Log</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Manager</td>
<td>• Participating in discussions to fully understand the Lessons Learned</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate a meaningful resolution/solution description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shares the information with other Project Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizes the information to avoid duplication of issue in future work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>• As needed or directed by Track Manager, may participate in discussions to fully understand the need of the Lessons Learned</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>R/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As needed or directed by Track Manager, may facilitate a meaningful resolution/solution description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As needed or directed by Track Manager, may share the information with other Project Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As needed or directed by Track Manager, may utilize the information to avoid duplication of lesson in future work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Team</td>
<td>• May participate in discussions to fully understand the need of the Lessons Learned</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approves the content for publication and sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24 Appendix A: Project Talking Points

General Dos/Don’ts

- **DO**: Explain acronyms. Those who are not close to the Florida PALM Project or otherwise have less visibility to technology transformation projects may not know what “SSI” means, even though we live and breathe this term every day.
- **DO**: Emphasize our, the collaboration the Project had with State agencies. Florida PALM isn't just an effort by this Project Team or DFS.
- **DO**: Speak positively about Florida PALM and the Project Team (including contractors).
- **DON’T**: Discuss draft strategies.
- **DON’T**: Discuss procurement-related items.
- **DON’T**: Discuss how/when FLAIR will officially sunset. The Project role is to deliver the State a system that can replace FLAIR/CMS—the State will make the decisions about when FLAIR and CMS will be sunset.
- **DON’T**: Say the Project was outsourced. The Project is using a team of State staff with decades of State service and is augmented by experienced support services.
- **Don’t disparage FLAIR or CMS. These systems were cutting-edge when they were released and thousands of State employees still use them every day.**

Why Replace FLAIR/CMS

- The Legislature approved funding to review options for replacing or enhancing FLAIR and CMS. The Study recommended replacement of FLAIR and CMS to meet the State's financial management needs.
- FLAIR, Florida’s current accounting system, was cutting-edge when it was developed... **in the 1970s**. But so were Atari, cordless phones, and the Oldsmobile Cutlass. Our accounting system cannot keep up with today’s complex markets, regulations, and practices.
- FLAIR was built in the 1970s but isn’t supported by modern developers, systems, and upgrades.
- The current accounting system, FLAIR, was implemented in the early 1980s and is no longer the industry standard.
- Agencies have had to develop expensive workarounds to make up for FLAIR’s limitations. As Florida grows, agencies would continue to have to develop and maintain additional agency unique business systems or find other creative solutions.
- FLAIR has been patched and bandaged to try to keep up with state and federal mandates.
- It is becoming more challenging to find and hire talent with the technical skill to work on the system.
- Data fields for accounting entries in FLAIR are size-limited, which limits the capability for accurate accounting and reporting.
- The decades of experience State employees have with FLAIR simply cannot be replaced in the future.
- Today’s new hires are not typically trained on technologies used by legacy systems like FLAIR.

Florida’s Finances

- Florida primarily operates a $90 billion enterprise on a system built in the 1970s.
• Even though Florida has grown to become the third most populous State in the US with an economy larger than most countries, Florida’s financial management system operates on antiquated technologies.

**Different than Project Aspire?**

• Project Aspire was the State’s previous attempt to implement a modern financial management solution. The Florida PALM Project glean best practices and lessons learned from the Aspire Project.
• The State has made a significant investment with years of deliberate planning prior to Florida PALM’s implementation.
• The Florida PALM Project is documenting and standardizing business processes prior to the procurement and implementation of a new system, as this will allow both the State and the selected SSI vendor to be better prepared.
• The Florida PALM Project is leveraging support from consultants who have significant experience designing and building financial management solutions for the public sector before a solution is selected and after the implementation

**Anticipated Florida PALM Benefits (General)**

• Records and documentation are expected to be managed in Florida PALM, making DFS audits smoother and keeping records in one place.
• Florida PALM is anticipated to reduce many of the paper-intensive processes and will help the State become more paperless.
• Florida PALM is expected to provide near real-time updates in the State’s new financial management system, reducing the multiple reconciliations that occur today.
  o Florida PALM may eliminate most, if not all, of the use of departmental and central FLAIR in order to enable the State to have one set of books.
  o The new financial management system is expected to consolidate where our financial data is kept and allow the State to track and maintain its cash balance in one location.
• Florida PALM will help the CFO better meet his/her constitutional obligation by painting a much clearer picture of Florida’s finances, including an enterprise view of cash flow and financial obligations.
• Florida PALM is expected to reduce the State’s risk exposure by harnessing modern financial management technology built on the premises of scalability, flexibility, and maintainability.
• Florida PALM is expected to improve State and agency-specific decision making by capturing a consistent and an expandable set of data housed in a single system.
• Florida PALM is expected to improve the State’s financial management capabilities to enable more accurate oversight of budget and cash demands today and in the future.
• Florida PALM is expected to improve productivity, reduce operational complexity, and increase internal controls by enabling standardization and automation of business processes within and between DFS and agencies.
• Florida PALM is expected to reduce financial reporting production and preparation time.
• Florida PALM is expected to provide more robust reporting functionality and reduce the need to create reports outside of the system (e.g. reports created in Excel).
• Florida PALM is expected to allow the State to maximize interest earnings on the money in state coffers through features like scheduled payments, where agencies can request a “pay on” date.
Florida PALM is expected to have the ability for workflow and approval processes that promote internal controls and safeguarding of State assets.

**Anticipated Florida PALM Benefits (Agency Specific)**

- Agencies should be able to create “what if” analyses based on more robust financial analysis abilities.
- Agencies are expected to have the opportunity to streamline workarounds and interim processes used to compensate for the State accounting system’s limitations.
- Agencies should be able to issue one warrant per vendor instead of issuing several warrants, even if the funds originate from different funding streams.

**Timeline & Process**

- The Project expects to receive many questions about timeline and process because people want to know how and when they should expect to see Florida PALM. The Project should share the most accurate information possible while not releasing any confidential information about the procurement process.
- Currently, the Project is in the Pre-Design, Development, and Implementation Phase, with a focus on planning and preparing for a financial management solution.
- At the end of the procurement activities, the Project intends on selecting a Software and System Integrator and entering the Design, Development, and Implementation Phase.
- The State’s business needs led the development of standard business requirements for the new financial management system.
- Our subject matter experts agree, the vast majority of State employees who participated in Workgroups or Workshops feel confident in the Florida PALM Project and its Team.
- To develop the requirements for Florida PALM, the Project held more than 100 collaborative meetings, with over 500 individuals. These individuals helped develop requirements, which will be used in the procurement of our State’s new financial management system.
- The Project Team worked with consultants, agencies, and leadership to define the Florida-specific requirements needed for the State to adopt Florida PALM.
- Agency input and dedication to the Project is crucial to the success of this project.
- For the first time ever, the Florida PALM Project documented the State’s financial management processes from end to end.
- As a System and Software Integrator (SSI) services are selected, our financial management processes may slightly change depending on the software selected.
- This Project is a business transformation project (transforming the way the State does business) and will be supported by modern technology.

**The FLAIR Study**

- In 2013, the Legislature directed DFS to conduct the FLAIR Study. The Study provided analysis on considerations for either enhancing or replacing FLAIR. The Project has developed a Project Management Plan and strategies based on what will work best for the State.
- The FLAIR Study provided great insight into options for replacing FLAIR.
- The FLAIR Study also made the case for “why” FLAIR and CMS should be replaced.
- The Project incorporated insights from the FLAIR Study into the development of our Project Management Plan and Project Charter, updating both where appropriate based on our State’s current and future needs.
Appendix B: Deliverable Expectations Document (DED) Template

The Deliverable Expectations Document (DED) is a tool used to record the Project requirements for a deliverable and establish clear expectations and acceptance criteria for the deliverable’s scope and content.

Deliverable Authors will use the DED to work with the Project’s Track Manager to identify the acceptance criteria to be used during the deliverable submission review and acceptance process.

The DED communicates to the Owners, Contributors, Reviewers, and Approvers a clear understanding of the approach to develop the deliverables and the acceptable outcome of the collaborative work.

The DED template can be found in the PMO and PMP folder in SharePoint, file name “Appendix B - DED Template”. 
26 Appendix C: Deliverable Review Form

The Deliverable Review Form is a tool used to document whether a deliverable’s scope and content meets the Project’s expectations and acceptance criteria.

Deliverable Authors and Reviewers will use the Deliverable Review Form during submission, round 1 and 2 reviews, and final review. The Form consists of the following sections:

- Deliverable Review Instructions
- Deliverable Summary
- Submission Quality Control Review Checklist
- Deliverable Review Comments

The Deliverable Review Form can be found in the PMO and PMP folder in SharePoint, file name “Appendix C – Deliverable Review Form”.
27 Appendix D: Deliverable Acceptance Form

The Deliverable Acceptance Form is used to formally acknowledge and accept delivery of the work completed for the deliverable. The Contract Manager, Track Manager (if applicable), and Deliverable Owner’s signatures attest to the agreement the deliverable has been completed and no further work should be done.

The Deliverable Acceptance Form can be found in the PMO and PMP folder in SharePoint, file name “Appendix D – Deliverable Acceptance Form”.
28 Appendix E: Master Quality Control Checklist

The Master Quality Control Checklist (MQCC) is the Project’s single file or source that identifies and communicates the expectations for quality inspections across Project Management Plan process areas.

The MQCC can be found in the PMO and PMP folder in SharePoint, file name is “Appendix E – Master Quality Control Checklist”.


29 Appendix F: Definitions

Cost Management - The process of effectively planning and controlling cost. This includes efficient estimation and management of funds for resources such as staff, equipment, hardware, software, facilities, and expenses needed to complete Project activities. Cost Management also considers the effect of Project changes and decisions that would impact the cost of completing the Project.

Budget – Funds appropriated by legislation each Fiscal Year (FY).

Projected – Expenditures anticipated to occur for each month throughout the FY.

Incurred – Expenditures owed, but that have not been paid.

Actual – Expenditures that have been paid.

Schedule Management – Establishes the criteria and approach for developing, monitoring, and controlling the Master Project Schedule.

Master Project Schedule – Tool used to review, plan, and analyze the Project’s progress and critical path typically created in Microsoft (MS) Project. Includes a listing of Project milestones, activities, and deliverables, with work estimates, start and finish dates, resource allocation, task sequencing, and dependencies.

Baseline Schedule – The Project’s approved version of the Master Project Schedule that can only be changed through formal Project Change Request procedures (PCRs).

Project Management Standards – Standards established by the Agency for State Technology (AST) Rule 74-1 ascertaining define the expectation to execute and update the approved project schedule with actual work effort and project progress (tasks, milestones, and deliverables completed) to track Schedule Performance Index (SPI) and CPI.

Schedule Performance Index (SPI) – SPI is a measure of schedule efficiency. An SPI less than 1 indicates less work was completed than planned. An SPI greater than 1 indicates more work was completed than planned.

Cost Performance Index (CPI) – CPI is a measure of cost efficiency of budgeted resources for the work completed. A CPI less than 1 indicates cost overruns for work completed. A CPI greater than 1 indicates cost underruns of performance to date.

Key Project Milestones – Significant events on the Project's roadmap that serve as progress markers.

Milestones – Zero-day duration tasks on the Master Project Schedule.

Critical Path – Longest sequence (path) of activities in the Master Project Schedule, through all the inter-connected tasks, which must be completed for the Project to complete on time.

Quality Management System (QMS) - “The Project Quality Program”. QMS refers to management methods used to enhance quality and productivity on the Project. QMS is a comprehensive
approach that works horizontally across Project tracks and extending backward and forward to include both Contractors, Project Team Members, and agency stakeholders.

Quality Planning (QP) - “The QMS Project QC Plan”. Quality planning will identify the who, what, when, where, and how for quality elements.

Quality Assurance (QA) - “The QMS Prevention Element”. The standards, procedures, and planned systematic activities (ex: training, Project tools, Project support personnel) necessary to ensure that quality standards and procedures are adhered to and that delivered products or services meet contract and quality requirements.

Quality Control (QC) - “The QMS Inspection and Fix Element”. Quality control requires the Project manager(s), Track Managers, and the Project Team to inspect the accomplished work to ensure its alignment with the Project scope and requirements.

Quality of Service Evaluations (QSE) - Service compliance evaluations that are concerned with how well Contractor staff professionalism is being perceived by Project Team Members. This data will be gathered through periodic surveys as well as assessed, measured and, reported by the Project Management Office.

Technical Quality Evaluation (TQE) - Process and standards compliance evaluations that are concerned with technical deliverables. The elements for technical quality are:

1. Project work products (i.e. document deliverables) are reviewed, and quality feedback is provided by the designated group of employees prior to initial delivery to the customer. Approvers must not see Project Team produced work products before they go through a quality-control review.
2. Technology installation deliverables are evaluated per the test strategy and supporting test plan.

Communication Vehicles – Methods that may be used for engaging targeted audiences. (See Appendix 5 of the Pre-DDI Communications Plan)

Content Standards – A set of criteria identified in the Project’s Pre-DDI Communications Plan that should be met during the development and release of Project communications.

External Communication – Outside of the Florida PALM Project (e.g., state agencies) but not intended for the general public


Internal Communication – Inside of the Florida PALM Project, which includes DFS employees and contractors dedicated to the Project

Project Communication – A communication sent on behalf of the Project to its stakeholders or other entities. This does not include communications such as emails or phone calls to agency counterparts as part of a Project Team member’s everyday work.

Public Communication – Intended for the general public.
Acceptance – The acknowledgement that the content is adequate and suitable.

Approval – The Executive Steering Committee’s (ESC) approval of a Major Project Deliverable.

Work products - Documents in any medium, electronic, or hard copy, and MSOffice format such as Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Project, Visio, etc.

Deliverable - Any tangible outcome specified in a contract, statement or scope of work, strategy, or plan document. Deliverables are classified as work products, internal deliverables, technology implementations, events, or qualified and quantified benefits. These may be contractual or non-contractual.

Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) – A document used to record a mutually agreed upon acceptance criteria in addition to or already communicated in the contract document(s).

Events - Training, meetings, knowledge transfer, interviews, or surveys.

Major Project Deliverable - A major Project deliverable is a deliverable on the Project’s critical path. Critical Path is a term used to define a task wherein none of the tasks can be delayed without affecting the final Project end date.

Submission Quality Control (QC) Review – A review to affirm the deliverable meets the Projects minimum acceptance criteria as laid out in the DED, and the quality of such deliverable meets the standards defined in the Submission QC Review Checklist. The deliverable must pass this review in order to start the review process.

Procurement Management - The process of planning, developing strategies, conducting formal and informal procurement activities, negotiating contracts, and managing contracts and vendor relationships through the contract life cycle.

Supply Requisition Purposes - Small purchases or commodity State contract purchases which may include office consumables, computers, equipment, and office furniture or subscription services. These purchases are included in the annual Spend Plan and acquired on a “just in time” basis through the fiscal year as needed.

Support Services Purchases - More complex than supply purchases, each planned as part of Track strategies, scheduled, and executed by the Florida PALM Project Management Office. Support services purchases require the development of a detailed scope of work, evaluation or vendor selection criteria, and the execution of a two-party contract or purchase order contract.

Procurement Planning - Includes annual needs assessment, budget analysis, and general timing for the acquisition and delivery of services and supplies for the operation of the Project throughout each fiscal year. Planning may also consider the effect of Project changes and decisions that would impact the funding and scheduling.

Procurement Authority - The Project Director has the authority to purchase the necessary goods and services to achieve the outcomes of the Project within the defined budget while the Executive Steering Committee has the authority to approve major Project deliverables, which could be procurement documentation or work products produced by a contractor.
Section 287.017, F.S. – States the purchasing categories and thresholds that dictate how formal, informal, or exceptional purchases are made.

DFS Agency Policies and Procedures (AP&P) #02-2 and DFS “Contract Management Life Cycle Guide” - Dictates the agency specific procedures and approval flows.

**Performance Measure** – Evaluated element that indicates whether the Project is likely to reach its intended outcomes and identify an activity’s efficiency and/or effectiveness. These measures should be:
- Measurable (Quantifiable and Qualitative)
- Tracked over time, to see trending

**Status Indicators** – A colored indicator that gives an indication as to whether the measures status is positive or negative. The Project will use the following colors and definitions for its status indicators:
- **Green.** The Project performance area is on track without material issues.
- **Yellow.** The Project performance area faces a challenge or set of challenges that could, if left unmanaged, negatively impact the Project’s outcome. The Project Team should prioritize corrective action.
- **Red.** The Project performance area faces a challenge or set of challenges that threatens its outcome. The Project Team should take corrective action immediately.

Full Time Equivalent (FTE) – A unit that indicates the workload of an employed staff person is 40 hours per week. The Project typically uses this term to differentiate between State and Contractor Team Members.

Contractor – For the purposes of the Pre-DDI phase of the Florida PALM Project, these are individuals or groups providing support services. A list of these services can be found at: http://www.myfloridacfo.com/floridapalm/SupportServices.htm. (Also referred to as consultant.)

Florida PALM Project (Project) – The project with the vision of implementing a statewide financial management system that enforces standardization, acts as a scalable foundation to evolve as business needs change, and positions Florida for future innovation as it adopts true enterprise-wide solution. PALM is an acronym for Planning, Accounting, and Ledger Management. Project State Team – The DFS employees dedicated to the Project.

Project Team – The Project State Team and Contractors dedicated to the Project.

Project Track – Workstreams that are staffed to simultaneously support the mission of the Project.

Risk - A possible event or condition that may impact the Project’s ability to meet stakeholder expectations, or a general uncertainty (either positive or negative) which pertains to the Project. (i.e., “unborn issue”.)

Ad Hoc Risks - Risks identified during events not associated with a formal or planned “risks assessment” event. They are most often discovered and recorded during Project risk status meetings or schedule reviews.
Risk Assessments - Scheduled and formalized events for identifying Project risks.

Issue - Any unresolved situation that most often negatively impacts the Project and typically arise due to unplanned or unexpected events.

Action item - An Action Item is a proactive task identified by the Project Team to address a specific need in order to provide an outcome that is not on the Project schedule or in other risks, issues, or Decision Logs. Action Items should not be extensions or child activities to risk, issues, decisions, and deliverable approvals. Action Items are unique needs created out of discussions that are recorded and need follow up.

Decision - A formal communication of a judgement or management direction on an issue under consideration.

OCM Collaboration Coordinator – Also known as the OCC; the OCM Track Team member responsible for coordinating, tracking, and reporting on the Project's collaboration activities.

Other entities – Entities that do not fall into the other groups, but that may provide helpful information (e.g., Gartner).

Other States – States that have, or are in the process of, developing and implementing a Financial Management (FMS) (e.g., Alabama, Georgia, and New York).

State of Florida agencies – Agencies that work in or support the Florida Accounting Information Resource (FLAIR) and/or the Cash Management System (CMS), or will be affected by the replacement of those systems (e.g., Florida Department of Transportation, Department of Financial Services, and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission).

Universities, cities and public sector entities – Other public entities that have, or are in the process of, developing and implementing a FMS (e.g., the City of Tallahassee, FSU, and UF).

Additional definitions may be found in the Pre-DDI Project Glossary on the Project's website.

Roles and Responsibilities