|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |
| --- | --- |
| **3.1.7** | **Contact SME Reviewers**  See Process Notes for *County APD Initial Submission (CWS and Dual)* and *County APD Repeated Submission (CWS and Dual)*. |
| 3.1.8 | **Reviewers review the County APD**  Refer to *APD Reviewer Section Analysis Worksheets* for complete detail on the various types of review performed on County APDs.  All APD Reviewers perform content review and document their findings in accordance with published guidelines. These include but are not limited to the following provisions:  **Initial Submission**   1. Reviewer assesses all applicable sections of the County APD and comments are captured in their entirety. The reviewer performs a complete first review and captures all findings and recommendations that may apply to that complete review. 2. Reviewer limits the assessment of County APD to those sections specifically referenced in the review guidelines for that type of review.     **Repeated Submission**   1. Reviewer assesses only the applicable sections of the County APD and comments that were previously recorded. The reviewer performs a limited repeated review and responds only to findings and recommendations that were identified in the previous review. 2. Reviewers perform a complete reassessment of the applicable APD sections if the repeated submission is materially different from the previous content, or if requested by the APD Coordinator. 3. If a Dual Review APD, SAWS re-reviews the repeated submission of APD during the review process.   **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 reviewer. 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 |
|  | **Swimlane 3.0 CWS/CMS Project Office Reviews**   * Program Review * Business Model Informational Review * IT Review * QA Review * Cost Allocation Review * Procurement Review |
| **3.1.8.1** | **Perform a Program Review of the County APD Section 2** |
| **3.1.8.2** | **Perform a Business Model Informational Review of the County APD Section 1,2,3 (Optional – Informed only)** |
| **3.1.8.3** | **Perform an IT Review of the County APD Section 3** |
| **3.1.8.4** | **Perform a QA Review of the County APD all Sections** |
| **3.1.8.6** | **Perform a Cost Allocation Review of the County APD Section 5** |
| **3.1.8.7** | **Perform a Procurement Review of the County APD Section 6** |
|  | **SWIMLANE 4.1**  **CWS/CMS Support (CDSS Program) Reviews**   * Program Review |
| **4.1.1** | **Perform a Program Review of the County APD Section 2 (and Section 7 if New Application Development)** |
|  | **SWIMLANE 4.2**  **CDSS Fiscal Review**   * Cost Allocation Review |
| **4.2.1** | **Perform a Cost Allocation Review of the County APD Section 5** |
|  | **SWIMLANE 4.3**  **CDSS Legal Review**   * Procurement Review |
| **4.3.1** | **Perform a Procurement Review of the County APD Section 6** |
|  | **SWIMLANE 6.1**  **SAWS Project Approval Reviews (dual review APDs only):**   * Project Approval Review |
| **6.3.1** | **Perform a Procurement Review of the County APD all Sections except 3** |
| **3.1.9** | **Reviewers provide County APD Findings**  Based on results and findings produced in 3.1.8 – 4.3, APD County APD Reviewers and Approvers enter Findings And Recommendations into MTS in accordance with published guidelines.  SAWS provides their findings to CWS/CMS via email on dual review APDs. |