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| --- | --- | --- |
| Introduction | Process Notes are used to record detailed information about the Activities and Decisions within a process map. | |
| Purpose | In order to capture the information and criteria that is know about each step in the process, this is a loosely structured format which is reader-friendly and provides both summary and detailed process step information. | |
| Procedures for Business Analyst and OwnerReview and Approval | The project Business Analyst drafts Process Notes by recording all information previously collected during the project regarding that activity or decisions. Specific steps for the Business Analyst to develop, review and approve Process Notes are:   1. Draft notes 2. Forward to expert / owner of activity 3. Collect feedback from owner and collaborate to finalize draft 4. Confirm owner approval and signoff 5. Forward current draft to Work Group with 5 business day review period | |
| Procedures for Process Owner and Work GroupReview and Approval | In the following Work Group meeting, the Owner represents their Process Note and any feedback is discussed with the group.   1. Owner collects feedback from group and is responsible to update as agreed. 2. Unresolved negotiations between Owner and Work Group are continued offline as necessary. 3. Revisions are done within 5 business days of meeting date. 4. If negotiations continue between Owner and Work Group past 5 days, the Owner-approved Process Note is considered final draft until outcome is resolved. | |
| Contents | Each entry in the Process Notes describes an Activity or Decision box from this Process Map. Process Notes include all currently known or suggested detail about: | |
|  | * how activity or decision occurs * triggering events * who is involved * systems used * methods of communication used * outputs from possible results | * how often * how long * work aids and tools used (contain decision review criteria including applicable guidelines, procedures, regulations, or policies) |
|  | Draft reflects above factors that may possibly apply. Owners and team members negotiate any changes to all applicable factors during revision period. Activities and decisions are recorded in the notes. | |

| ID | Notes |
| --- | --- |
| **3.1.1** | **Receive County APD**  Triggered by 1.2.4, the OSI CWS/CMS Project Office (PO) receives revised County APD from County via email. |
| **3.1.2** | **Perform Administrative Review of County APD**  PO performs pre-analysis of County APD. Administrative review function validates:   * appropriate and complete submission of County APD and all attachments per documented guidelines. * receipt of all required attachments. |
| **3.1.2a** | **Does County APD pass Administrative Review?**  Decision from 3.1.2  Possible outcomes:  If No go to 3.1.4  If Yes go to 3.1.5 |
| **3.1.4** | **Contact County**  Triggered by 3.1.2a, PO contacts County to notify of Administrative Review results, recommended action or requested clarification. Method of communication is by email.  Possible outcomes of input from County are:  Contact provides clarification to pass Administrative Review  Contact does not provides clarification to pass Administrative Review |
| **3.1.5** | **Send Notification of Receipt of County APD and Administrative Review Status**  Triggered by 3.1.2a, PO sends:   1. Notice of Receipt of County APD, and 2. Administrative Review Status   to County via email. |
| **3.1.3** thru3.1.3.5 | **Determine County APD Reviewers**  See Process Notes for 3.1.3 – Determine County APD Reviewers (CWS and Dual Review)  **Dual Review APDs**  When an APD is checked by the County as Dual Review, CWS/CMS owns the responsibility to perform the County APD Processes. In these rare cases, SAWS takes the role of a SME reviewers. SAWS performs its review concurrent with other review functions; SAWS provides a separate disposition letter that is sent to the County on the same email as the disposition letter from CWS/CMS.  When SAWS has prepared its disposition letter as an Approval, but CWS/CMS has findings, the revised and resubmitted APD is re-reviewed by SAWS before full approval is granted by both projects.  CWS/CMS has responsibility for the following activities in the Dual Review Process:   * Dual Review Process Box 7: Initiate and own the APD Review function * Dual Review Process Box 9: Copy APD to SAWS and notify county of dual approval * Dual Review Process Box 11: Compile dual findings and send to County and SAWS * Dual Review Process Box 14: Review repeated submission; when APD is final, send to SAWS * Dual Review Process Box 15: Receive disposition letter from SAWS * Dual Review Process Box 16: Send disposition letter with SAWS letter attached to County, CDSS and SAWS |
| **3.1.6** | **Update County APD Metrics Log**  PO updates Metrics Log with content based on published guidelines. |
| **3.1.7** | **Contact SME Reviewers**  PO enters APD reviewer names into MTS. If this is a dual approval APD, PO forwards a copy of the APD to SAWS Project Approvals and notifies County of dual approval via email. |
| **3.1.8** | **Reviewers review the County APD**  See *Process Notes: TO BE APD Workflow – Reviewers Review County APD CWS and Dual Review.* |
| **3.1.9** | **Reviewers provide County APD Findings**  Based on results and findings produced in 3.1.8 – 4.3, APD County APD Approvers update Reviewer findings and recommendations into MTS in accordance with published guidelines. |
| **3.1.10** | **Compile and analyze findings**  PO APD Coordinator compiles and analyzes Reviewer / Approver findings to determine if County APD is approved.  1. Compiles findings:   * Collect any reviewer responses from MTS * Transfer all finding or recommendation responses onto new *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document.   Steps to create*County APD Recommendations and Findings* document:   1. Open document template and create a new document for this APD in accordance with published naming conventions. 2. Update the Findings identified in *Results of Review 1 s*ection   2. Analyzes findings   * Analyze responses to determine recommendations on how to proceed. SME review analysis, final recommendation and review are collected and analyzed to determine next step.   Outcomes are either:   1. Approved County APD 2. *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document now includes additional Findings from Repeated Submission which indicate Approval cannot be issued – Findings and Recommendation may need to be discussed with Management. |
| **3.1.18** | **Management reviews recommendations on how to proceed**  PO Management conducts final review after PO APD coordinator has completed the review of all SME findings and made a recommendation on next steps.  Possible outcomes :   1. Recommended Approval 2. Recommended Disapproval: Conduct conference call with county to resolve outstanding issues 3. Other: Escalate to Senior Management for further discussion on determining next steps.   After PO Management Review, APD coordinator completes next steps. |
| **3.1.18a** | **Is County APD Approved?**  Decision triggered by activity in 3.1.18.  Possible outcomes:  If Yes, go to 3.1.10b  If No, *County APD Recommendations and Findings* document has been produced; go to 3.1.18b |
| **3.1.18b** | **Do we Escalate?**  Possible outcomes:  If Yes go to 3.1.15  If no go to 3.1.14 |
| **3.1.15** | **Determine appropriate level for County APD review and resolution**  PO Management makes final decision or escalates to FMM (Senior Management) for issue resolution and determining next steps.  Possible outcomes:  Approve APD, go to 3.1.10b  Disapprove APD, go to 3.1.16 |
| **3.1.14** | **Contact County**  Triggered by 3.1.18b, APD Coordinator contacts County to notify that the County APD is not approved. PO offers recommended action or requests clarification. Possible methods of communication may be conference call, meeting or letter as deemed appropriate.  Possible outcomes of input from County contact are:   * APD is approved: go to 3.1.10b * APD is eligible for re-review: go to 3.1.18 * APD is escalated: go to 3.1.5 * APD is disapproved: go to 3.1.16 |
| **3.1.15a** | **Is County APD Approved?**  Triggered by 3.1.15  Possible outcomes:  If Yes, go to 3.1.10b  If No, go to 3.1.16 |
| **3.1.10b** | **Does County APD require Federal approval?**  Criteria based on review in 3.1.3:   * CDSS ACF Federal Funding Partner (FFP) approval policies, * If ACF Federal Funding Partner approval is required (*swim lane 5.0*)   Possible outcomes:  If Yes go to 3.1.12  If No go to 3.1.17 |
| **3.1.17** | **Prepare and send County APD Approval letter**  PO writes Approval Letter in accordance with published guidelines and forwards it to the County via email or hard copy; leads to 1.2.6  If this is a dual review APD, CWS/CMS Approval letter will include the disposition letter previously issued by SAWS review process. |
| **3.1.12** | **Prepare and send County APD package & transmittal letter**  Triggered by 3.1.10b  PO prepares and sends County APD package and transmittal letter to CWS/CMS Support (CDSS Program). |
| **3.1.16** | **Prepare and send County APD Disapproval Letter**  PO writes Disapproval Letter in accordance with published guidelines. PO creates and entitles “final” version of the approved APD for record-keeping purposes. Letter and final APD are forwarded to the County via email or hard copy.  Leads to 1.2.6  If this is a dual review APD, CWS/CMS Disapproval letter and SAWS disposition letter are both attached to one email along with the final versions of the approved APD for record-keeping purposes. |