DEPARTMENT OF
MANAGEMENT SERVICES

UAT Engagement Plan

For Florida PALM Financials, Payroll, and Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence

Table of Contents

Overview

The Department of Management Services (DMS) is executing a structured, governance-driven user acceptance testing (UAT) program to validate Florida PALM Financials, Payroll, and Data Warehouse / Business Intelligence functionality before implementation. This Engagement Plan documents how DMS is organizing its people, business processes, technology, and data-related testing responsibilities; how end users are being engaged; how testing progress is measured; and how risks and impediments are managed and escalated.

DMS is using a progressive and adaptive engagement model. Functional Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) were engaged first because they possess the process knowledge needed to translate DMS operations into meaningful User Stories, validate expected results, identify errors, and support issue triage. These individuals were responsible for preparing first iterations of test cases and managing expectations for other users based on participation in statewide exposure activities administered by the PALM Project. Broader operational end users were then incorporated to repeat established scenarios, confirm that assigned security roles support job responsibilities, and test whether business processes can be performed reliably by staff who will execute them after go-live. This sequencing supports both system validation and organizational learning. It is important to note that, as it relates to exposure to the PALM system and UAT testing in general, all DMS end users (regardless of their classification as an SME) were granted access to the testing environment(s) and all associated UAT materials and tools from the onset of UAT.

The current testing scope includes 157 applicable Activities represented by 160 unique standard User Stories across the Business Process Groupings included in Florida PALM Project recommendations. DMS' UAT execution monitor reflects 803 standard BPG test executions through the current reporting snapshot, with additional agency-defined testing tracked separately. Sixty-three standard User Stories have recorded at least one satisfactory execution. These metrics are point-in-time measures rather than final readiness determinations; DMS will continue refreshing the underlying source information through the remaining UAT period.

DMS has identified 77 end users in its Role Mapping Worksheet. Seventy-six are currently enabled in the UAT environment, 70 were included in the initial UAT load, and 19 are designated as UAT SMEs. The mapped user population spans central financial functions, the Division of Retirement, State Group Insurance, State Purchasing, Telecommunications, Fleet, and other operational areas. This broad representation allows DMS to validate centralized accounting processes as well as the distributed business activities that create or consume Florida PALM transactions and data.

Agency Business System (ABS) testing is an integral part of the plan. DMS has identified 12 interface connections across three principal systems: MIP (Accounts Receivable System), the Strategic Asset Tracking System (SATS), and Axiom Pro. The interface portfolio includes six inbound and six outbound interfaces supporting accounts receivable, deposits, customer data, Inter/IntraUnit transactions, asset management, voucher and payment extracts, and related downstream processing. DMS is coordinating functional owners, technical contacts, file movement through the Florida PALM Managed File Transfer environment, test data preparation, interface validation, error resolution, reconciliation, and end-user confirmation as part of end-to-end testing.

The Agency Sponsor and DMS Florida PALM governance team monitor testing execution, resource availability, issue resolution, access readiness, and business-system dependencies. The Department will use the remainder of UAT to increase repeat execution, extend participation beyond SMEs, validate cross-functional and interface-dependent processes, disposition errors, and convert testing knowledge into training, procedures, and go-live support. The approach is intended to provide leadership with a transparent view of progress while maintaining a disciplined focus on the work that remains.

User Engagement Approach

DMS engages users according to business responsibility, subject matter knowledge, security needs, and the operational impact of Florida PALM associated with the job functions they perform. The approach is intentionally phased so that complex scenarios are first stabilized by knowledgeable functional resources and then repeated by a broader population of operational users. This reduces avoidable testing errors, improves the quality of feedback, and creates a practical pathway for knowledge transfer from SMEs to the staff who will perform the work in production. Moreover, following successful execution of “happy path” or standardized processes, the approach allows for fringe engagement and the identification and execution of “edge cases” and/or nuance processes specific to DMS-related needs or dependencies.

- Planning and Assignment: Business processes, Activities, User Stories, interfaces, and applicable security roles are identified. SMEs and functional leads (most often at the managerial level) determine who should test each scenario and whether the scenario requires specialized data, interface files, cross-functional coordination, or Florida PALM Project support.
- Expert Validation: SMEs perform initial execution, confirm expected results, document errors, and refine agency-specific instructions. Scenarios that produce unexpected results are routed through the testing error triage process before they are broadly assigned.
- Broader End-User Execution: Operational users repeat validated scenarios using their assigned roles and representative business data. Their participation confirms both functional usability and the adequacy of role mapping, instructions, and support materials.
- Retesting and Readiness Confirmation: Corrected errors and revised processes are retested. DMS monitors successful unique-story coverage, the number of repeat executions, participation by business area, unresolved dependencies, and readiness implications.
- Knowledge Transfer and Systems Transition Guidance: Lessons learned from UAT are incorporated into procedures, training materials, role guidance, reconciliation routines, and go-live support planning.

A core component of DMS’ UAT execution, administration, and documentation involves using OneDrive functionality to source information, collaborate, and build within the context of test case development and execution. For most DMS’ test cases, especially those involving the central accounting functions of the agency, a product has been developed that houses all test cases (composed of prepared, executed, and in progress states), user role information, ancillary data, and reference material. This product serves as the starting and stopping point for all test cases administered and executed by DMS central accounting. All information therein is maintained in real-time with information being continuously synchronized on cooperating servers. The use of this product allows for real-time collaboration and, moreover, the ability to adapt to changing circumstances in ways that do not adversely impact work-in-progress or recorded documentation.

The UAT Coordinator, in coordination with the Project Manager, serves as the central point for execution monitoring, coordination with the Florida PALM Project, and consolidation of testing issues. Business and technical liaisons coordinate functional decisions and ABS dependencies, while the Testing Error Triage Team determines whether an observed result is caused by test data, security, an agency process, an interface, or Florida PALM functionality. Material issues and resource constraints are elevated through the Agency Liaison to the Agency Sponsor, and to other parties if necessary.

Communication is targeted to the needs of each participant group. SMEs receive detailed execution and issue-management guidance; operational users receive scenario-specific instructions, access confirmation, and scheduled support; technical resources receive file, MFT, batch, and error-handling requirements; and executive leadership receives concise progress, risk, and mitigation reporting. DMS will continue adjusting participation and communication as testing moves from initial execution toward repeat testing and operational readiness.

- Assigned users can access the UAT environment with roles aligned to their expected duties.

- Applicable Activities are represented by test scenarios and assigned to knowledgeable resources.
- Test cases, which are based on User Stories pursuant to PALM Project standards, are executed successfully by more than one participant where repeat testing provides additional confidence.
- Errors are documented, categorized, resolved or escalated, and retested.
- ABS interface results can be reconciled from source file through Florida PALM processing and downstream receipt.
- Testing lessons are converted into updated procedures, training content, and go-live support.

Testing Scope

DMS testing covers Florida PALM functionality and the agency-specific operational environment in which that functionality will be used. The scope is based on the Activities identified as applicable in the DMS User Story Inventory, the end-user roles and organizational coverage documented in the Role Mapping Worksheet, the UAT Test Case Execution Monitor, and the ABS interfaces identified in the DMS UAT Test Case Workbook.

People-focused testing validates whether the correct users can access the environment, whether assigned roles support expected job responsibilities, whether separation-of-duties concerns are appropriately managed, and whether users can complete assigned scenarios with the available instructions and support. The current role mapping identifies 77 end users, of whom 76 are enabled and 19 are SMEs. DMS will continue refining assignments as staffing, Florida PALM, and testing needs evolve.

Process testing covers applicable Activities and User Stories across Account Management and Financial Reporting; Accounts Receivable; Asset Accounting and Management; Banking; Budget Management and Cash Control; Contracts Management; Disbursements Management; Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence; Grants Management; Inter/IntraUnit Transactions; Payroll Management; Projects Management; Revenue Accounting; and System Access and Controls. Testing includes both Project-recommended standard Activities and DMS-defined scenarios, which reflect agency operations. It is necessary to test those to understand how the system behaves, ancillary impacts, and agency operations through Forida PALM.

Technology testing includes user access, security roles, interface file generation and receipt, MFT processing, batch and error handling, reports, and dependencies between Florida PALM and agency business systems. DMS has identified 12 interface connections across MIP, SATS, and Axiom Pro. The interface scope includes inbound and outbound processing and requires coordinated validation by business owners, functional testers, technical testers, and end users of the affected systems. Cycle 3 testing involves a full-integration approach that incorporates all upstream and downstream functions, systems, processes, and components necessary to replicate and evaluate business environments as closely aligned to current-state as possible.

Data-focused testing confirms that representative transactions, customers, deposits, receivables, Inter/IntraUnit records, assets, vouchers, payments, ChartFields, and reporting outputs are processed and presented as expected. DMS will use reconciliation and exception review to determine whether errors originate in source data, file construction, security, agency processing, or Florida PALM functionality. Ongoing and continuous review of data will occur throughout the remainder of the testing period, such that any data-related issues are addressed and/or made known prior to go-live.

The scope will remain controlled but adaptive. New scenarios may be added when an error, cross-functional dependency, role issue, or interface result reveals a material condition not fully represented in the original inventory. Conversely, scenarios may be clarified or consolidated when they test the same business outcome. Changes will be documented in the source workbooks so the final report can be refreshed without changing the underlying engagement strategy.

Roles and Responsibilities

DMS uses a layered governance model that separates executive oversight, program coordination, functional ownership, technical execution, access administration, issue triage, and end-user participation. The resources below reflect current teams and positions; named assignments may be updated before final submission if organizational responsibilities change:

Table 1: Agency UAT Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Responsibility	Resources
Agency Sponsor	• Certify readiness to participate in UAT. • Regularly monitor agency UAT progress. • Monitor agency risks, issues, and mitigation plans and communicate them to the Project. • Request, provide and assign appropriate resources as needed, and remove obstacles to successfully complete UAT activities.	Lance Dyal Backup: Eric Thiele
Agency Liaison	• Collaborate closely with UAT Coordinator and provide updates to the Agency Sponsor. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	Evelyn Harrison Backup: Hunter Jones
Business Liaison	• Identify and confirm all agency business processes to be tested. • Confirm the creation of User Stories and updated documentation for processes and procedures. • Ensure that end-to-end testing of agency business processes is conducted. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	Kedra Lewis Backup: Don Hurst
Technical Liaison	• Identify and confirm all agency business systems to be tested. • Confirm agency business systems are ready for full integration testing. • Coordinate agency business system remediation as needed, based on the results of testing. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	Goldie McCloud Backup: David Luke
Project Management Liaison	• Capture and track both Project- and internal agency-driven UAT activities and maintain awareness of progress and due dates. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	Evelyn Harrison Backup: Hunter Jones
Change Management Liaison	• Develop and maintain UAT communication plan • Support the identification and tracking of agency UAT participants. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	Eric Thiele Backup: Sandy Watson
Training Liaison	• Identify and track agency UAT participants. • Support agency hosted UAT sessions with end users. • Coordinate or lead the agency training material development.	Kyndal Rucker Backup: DeAnn Doll

Role	Responsibility	Resources
	• Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	
UAT Coordinator	• Track and confirm testing progress. • Lead the Testing Error Triage Team. • Serve as the primary point of contact with the Florida PALM Project team for reporting progress, discussing testing issues, ensuring coordination of agency efforts with the overall UAT timeline.	Hunter Jones
Testing Error Triage Team	• Meet regularly to review progress and discuss upcoming activities. • Review testing errors to determine resolution or need for escalation.	Technical Lead: Goldie McCloud; Operational Lead: Hunter Jones; functional SMEs; other resources as needed
Subject Matter Experts *(Assigned per Business Process Grouping)*	• Support UAT planning (e.g., user stories/script development, agency-specific materials development). • Participate as first end users in UAT. • Conduct agency hosted UAT session with end users. • Serve as primary point of contact for end user business process, data, and technical questions. • Support agency training material development. • Report testing errors and testing progress to UAT Coordinator. • Support end user understanding during UAT and after go-live. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	19 designated SMEs across Financial Management Services, the Division of Retirement, the Division of State Group Insurance, and other business areas
Security Access Manager	• Perform and track role assignment changes for SMEs and end users during UAT. • Report agency-specific Florida PALM risks and issues to Agency Sponsor and UAT Coordinator and support mitigation strategies or resolutions.	Goldie McCloud Backup: Michael Tribble
Identity Provider Subject Matter Expert	• Add end users to the active directory (or applicable tool) for access to UAT. • Maintain active directory for access throughout UAT (adding new end users or removing end users as needed).	Lead: Goldie McCloud DMS identity and directory-services resources
File Manager	• Serve as the primary point of contact for interface testing. • Access the Florida PALM Managed File Transfer (MFT) site to send and receive files between the agency and Florida PALM.	Goldie McCloud
Batch Error Contact	• Serve as the primary point of contact for batch errors or change in batch process timing.	Goldie McCloud
End Users	• Practice related job processes. • Confirm end user role assignment(s). • Report testing errors and testing progress to SME or UAT Coordinator, as appropriate.	Included in Table 2 below.

User Story Testing Progress

Table 2 presents the current point-in-time testing snapshot. Activity and unique-story counts are derived from the DMS User Story Inventory. Successful unique stories and execution counts are derived from the UAT Test Case Execution Monitor. Agency-defined testing is tracked separately from the standard BPG rows: the monitor reflects 32 additional agency-defined executions and three agency-defined stories with at least one satisfactory result.

Table 2: User Story Testing Progress

Number of Activities	Unique Number of User Stories	Number of Successfully Tested Unique User Stories	Number of Times the User Stories Have Been Tested	Status Comments
Account Management and Financial Reporting (AMFR)				
77	15	15	193	Core journal, ChartField, reporting, reconciliation, period, and fiscal-management scenarios are actively being exercised. Repeat execution is established; remaining work focuses on untested stories, error retest, and broader operational participation.
Accounts Receivable (AR)				
67	24	24	274	AR has broad scenario coverage and the strongest satisfactory unique-story count in the current snapshot. Continued testing will emphasize deposits, customer and item processing, interface-dependent scenarios, and repeat validation by business users.
Asset Accounting and Management (AAM)				
67	22	12	97	Testing covers asset additions, adjustments, transfers, disposals, leases, and inventory-related processes. Interface dependencies require coordinated retest and reconciliation as interface files become available.
Banking (BK)				
23	6	4	32	Banking testing is underway for cash-management, bank-account, deposit, and related reporting processes. Remaining execution should be coordinated with AR and interface scenarios.
Budget Management and Cash Control (BM/CC)				

Number of Activities	Unique Number of User Stories	Number of Successfully Tested Unique User Stories	Number of Times the User Stories Have Been Tested	Status Comments
69	7	6	115	BM/CC has a high number of repeat executions, reflecting extensive practice and exception testing. Additional focus is needed to convert repeat activity into satisfactory unique-story coverage and resolve scenarios producing inadequate outcomes.
Contracts Management (CT)				
2	1	1	1	The applicable Contracts scenario remains to be executed. DMS will assign an appropriate functional participant and complete the scenario within the remaining UAT window.
Disbursements Management (DM)				
127	20	20	162	DM has the largest volume of repeat execution, reflecting the breadth and operational importance of voucher, supplier, encumbrance, payment, and carry-forward processing. Remaining work includes successful coverage of additional unique stories and retesting inadequate outcomes.
Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence (DW/BI)				
15	6	6	25	DW/BI scenarios remain scheduled for focused execution. Testing will validate access, protected/public data roles, queries, reports, and the ability of assigned consumers and authors to obtain needed information.
Grants Management (GM)				
1	1	0	0	The single applicable Grants scenario remains to be executed and will be assigned to the designated functional resource.
Inter/IntraUnit Transactions (IU)				

Number of Activities	Unique Number of User Stories	Number of Successfully Tested Unique User Stories	Number of Times the User Stories Have Been Tested	Status Comments
65	16	9	62	IU testing has produced satisfactory results and will continue across sending, receiving, encumbrance, payroll reclassification, carry-forward, and interface-dependent scenarios. MIP and IRIS dependencies will be monitored.
Payroll Management (PR)				
62	26	9	20	Payroll testing has begun but remains a priority because the inventory contains a comparatively large number of unique stories. DMS will expand execution and confirm role, data, reporting, and position-funding processes.
Projects Management (PM)				
39	10	9	80	Projects testing has meaningful repeat execution and satisfactory coverage. Remaining work focuses on untested stories, resolution of inadequate outcomes, and confirmation of project lifecycle and closeout processes.
Revenue Accounting (RA)				
4	2	2	8	It should be noted that most RA functions are administered using the MIP agency business system, and as such, occur outside of Florida PALM. This agency business system is undergoing its own UAT, integrated with Florida PALM, which impacts the relative figures associated with this table. The two applicable Revenue Accounting scenarios remain to be executed. DMS will confirm ownership and complete testing within the remaining UAT period.

Number of Activities	Unique Number of User Stories	Number of Successfully Tested Unique User Stories	Number of Times the User Stories Have Been Tested	Status Comments
System Access and Controls (SAC)				
5	3	3	3	SAC testing will validate interface error handling, security-related processes, and access controls. Role mapping and access administration activities provide supporting evidence but do not replace scenario execution.

Agency Business System Testing Progress

DMS has identified three principal agency business systems participating in interface testing: MIP (Accounts Receivable System), the Strategic Asset Tracking System (SATS), and Axiom Pro. Together, these systems account for 12 interface connections: six inbound and six outbound. The interfaces support customer, deposit, accounts receivable, Inter/IntraUnit, asset, voucher, and payment information. ABS testing therefore extends beyond confirming file transmission; it must establish that source data are constructed correctly, Florida PALM accepts and processes the file, errors are handled, results are reconciled, and downstream users can perform the related business process.

MIP (Accounts Receivable System)

MIP has eight identified interface connections: ARI002, ARI007, ARI009, ARI011, ARI024, ARI034, IUI002, and IUI003 are represented in the planning data, with the MIP portfolio spanning customer, deposit, accounts receivable, and Inter/IntraUnit processing. Functional and technical coordination is led by the Revenue team and assigned technical resources. Testing includes both inbound files sent to Florida PALM and outbound files consumed by DMS. The IUI interfaces also require consideration of the Division of Retirement IRIS environment and internal file-routing needs.

Strategic Asset Tracking System (SATS)

SATS has four identified asset interfaces: AMI002, AMI004, AMI006, and AMI008. These support transfer and disposal requests, asset additions and adjustments, and physical-inventory extract/load processes. Testing is sequenced because the physical-inventory load depends on successful receipt and validation of the outbound inventory extract. Functional owners and technical contacts will verify file structure, accepted/rejected records, asset results, and operational usability.

Axiom Pro

Axiom Pro uses API031, the outbound voucher and payment extract. Testing will confirm that voucher accounting and payment information needed by source systems, transparency functions, and payment-history processes is produced and received as expected. End-user involvement is targeted to validation of downstream content and business usability rather than creation of the Florida PALM outbound file.

IRIS (Integrated Retirement Information System)

IRIS has ten identified interface connections: API006, API030, API031, API038, API127, API129, ARI007, IUI002, IUI003 and PRI030. IRIS processes include customer, member payments, deposit, accounts receivable and Inter/IntraUnit processing. Functional and technical coordination is led by 22nd Century

Technologies, Inc. and FRS Benefit Payments and Accounting teams. Testing includes both inbound files sent to Florida PALM and outbound files consumed by DMS.

Table 3: Agency Business System Testing Progress

Business System Name	Cycle 3 Status	End User Testing Needed	Status of End User Testing	Planned / Actual Completion Date
MIP (Accounts Receivable System)	In Progress	Y	In Progress	10/31/2026
Strategic Asset Tracking System (SATS)	In Progress	Y	In Progress	10/31/2026
IRIS (Integrated Retirement Information System)	In Progress	Y	Not Started / to begin after UAT refresh	10/31/2026

Current management focus is on maintaining interface test data, ensuring files are available in the correct MFT path and naming convention, coordinating dependencies with Florida PALM, validating error handling, and obtaining business-owner confirmation of processed results. Interface status will be refreshed using the latest Cycle 3 execution statistics before final submission. Agency Business System testing in Cycle Three involves execution of testing scenarios and associated cases/scripts of a nature that is fully integrated, and as such, involves all known upstream and downstream processes and functions. This process includes testing that evaluates and ultimately provides for demonstrable ability to generate any auxiliary forms, templates, and tables necessary to feed ancillary systems and sources from which information is derived or retained in. DMS' UAT engagement plan involves a very broad range of personnel, data, and technical resources in order to ensure a comprehensive review against all requisite acceptance criteria.

End User Testing

DMS has mapped 77 end users across affected organizations; 76 are enabled in UAT, 70 were included in the initial load, and 19 are designated SMEs. Because many users support more than one BPG, the counts below represent mapped participants by BPG and should not be summed as a unique agency total. Planned commitments are scaled to assignment complexity and operational workload. SMEs generally require more time during initial execution and error triage, while broader end users participate in targeted repeat testing and readiness validation.

Table 3: End User Testing by Business Process Grouping

Planned or Actual Number of End Users Performing Testing	Anticipated Time Commitment	End User Organization(s) or Agency Business System	Planned or Actual Dates for End Users to Perform Testing *(Start and End Dates)*
Account Management and Financial Reporting (AMFR)			
49	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2	FMS; Retirement accounting; Planning and Budget; State Group Insurance; other fiscal offices	February-October 2026

Planned or Actual Number of End Users Performing Testing	Anticipated Time Commitment	End User Organization(s) or Agency Business System	Planned or Actual Dates for End Users to Perform Testing *(Start and End Dates)*
	hours per assigned cycle		
Accounts Receivables (AR)			
27	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS Revenue; Retirement accounting; State Group Insurance and other receivable-processing areas	February-October 2026
Asset Accounting and Management (AAM)			
10	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS Asset Management; SATS functional and technical users; asset custodial stakeholders	February-October 2026
Banking (BK)			
15	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS Revenue and cash-management users; Retirement accounting	February-October 2026
Budget Management and Cash Control (BM/CC)			
44	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	Planning and Budget; FMS; Retirement; distributed budget users	February-October 2026
Contracts Management (CT)			
8	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2	State Purchasing, FMS, Retirement, and contract stakeholders	February-October 2026

Planned or Actual Number of End Users Performing Testing	Anticipated Time Commitment	End User Organization(s) or Agency Business System	Planned or Actual Dates for End Users to Perform Testing *(Start and End Dates)*
	hours per assigned cycle		
Disbursements Management (DM)			
56	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS Disbursements; Retirement benefit-payment teams; State Purchasing; distributed voucher users	February-October 2026
Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence (DW/BI)			
67	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	Agencywide financial, payroll, projects, and Information Warehouse consumers/authors	February-October 2026
Grants Management (GM)			
5	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS and designated grant stakeholders	February-October 2026
Inter/IntraUnit Transactions (IU)			
49	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS; Retirement; Planning and Budget; distributed sending/receiving units	February-October 2026
Payroll Management (PR)			
12	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2	FMS Payroll; Human Resources; Retirement; payroll and position-funding stakeholders	February-October 2026

Planned or Actual Number of End Users Performing Testing	Anticipated Time Commitment	End User Organization(s) or Agency Business System	Planned or Actual Dates for End Users to Perform Testing *(Start and End Dates)*
	hours per assigned cycle		
Projects Management (PM)			
6	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	FMS and designated project-management users	February-October 2026
Revenue Accounting (RA)			
12	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	Retirement, State Group Insurance, and revenue-accounting stakeholders	February-October 2026
System Access and Controls (SAC)			
12	SMEs: approximately 2-4 hours/week during active testing; end users: approximately 1-2 hours per assigned cycle	Security, interface-error, access-administration, and functional control stakeholders	February-October 2026

UAT Engagement Risks

DMS is managing UAT as an active operational program. The risks below are not statements that implementation will fail; they identify conditions that could reduce the quality, timeliness, or evidentiary strength of testing if not actively managed. Risks will be reviewed through the agency risk and issue process and updated in monthly reporting.

Risk / Impediment	Description and Potential Impact	Mitigation and Management Response	Status	Executive Monitoring
Operational workload and tester availability	SMEs and end users must perform UAT while maintaining ongoing financial, payroll, retirement, procurement, asset, and	Prioritize high-impact and cross-functional scenarios; use scheduled testing windows; distribute assignments across the mapped user population;	Open - actively managed	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to

Risk / Impediment	Description and Potential Impact	Mitigation and Management Response	Status	Executive Monitoring
	administrative operations. Competing priorities may delay execution or limit repeat testing.	provide SME-supported sessions; escalate unresolved resource constraints to leadership.		Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
Delayed access to process information resulting in uneven coverage across BPGs	The current snapshot shows strong repeat execution in several BPGs but limited or no recorded execution in CT, DW/BI, GM, RA, and SAC. Payroll also has a large inventory relative to current execution. Much of this involves delays in the receipt of information about process steps required to facilitate test case execution.	Use Master Test Case Workbook as an assignment and escalation tool; establish focused testing sessions for low-coverage BPGs; confirm ownership; monitor satisfactory unique-story coverage, not only total execution volume.	Open - priority through remaining UAT	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
Inadequate outcomes and retest demand	A number of scenarios have produced inadequate outcomes. Without timely diagnosis and retest, execution volume may overstate actual validated coverage.	Triage errors by source; document resolution; distinguish agency data/process/security issues from Florida PALM defects; schedule retest; report successful unique-story coverage separately from total executions.	Open - managed through triage	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
ABS and interface dependencies	Interface testing depends on Florida PALM system readiness, test data, Florida PALM processing, MFT availability, outbound files, file naming/path conventions, and downstream consumption. A delay in one component can prevent end-to-end validation.	Maintain interface-level plans and contacts; coordinate file cycles; validate MFT paths and names; reconcile record counts and errors; sequence dependent SATS and IU scenarios; escalate external dependencies promptly.	Open - actively managed	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.

Risk / Impediment	Description and Potential Impact	Mitigation and Management Response	Status	Executive Monitoring
Security role and separation-of-duties alignment	Testing may reveal that assigned roles do not fully support job duties or create conflicts requiring review and mitigation. Role changes can also interrupt testing.	Use the Role Mapping Worksheet as the controlled source; coordinate SAM changes; retest after role updates; document approved conflicts and compensating controls; maintain backup testers where practical.	Open - monitored	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
Data quality and representative test conditions	Incomplete or nonrepresentative data may cause false errors or allow scenarios to pass without demonstrating realistic operational readiness.	Use representative transactions and files; validate prerequisites; reconcile source and output; preserve examples of accepted and rejected records; coordinate data corrections before retest.	Open - monitored	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
Knowledge transfer and user readiness	Successful SME execution does not by itself demonstrate that broader operational users can perform the process after go-live.	Expand repeat testing to operational users; capture lessons in procedures and training; use SMEs as coaches; confirm users can complete scenarios with expected support materials and role assignments.	Open - managed through engagement plan	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
Metric currency and reporting consistency	Testing continues, so static figures can become outdated or inconsistent across workbooks and reports.	Maintain source-controlled workbooks; use a defined data cutoff; refresh Tables 2-4 before submission; reconcile totals and explain agency-defined testing separately; retain traceability to source files.	Open - controlled through reporting process	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.

Risk / Impediment	Description and Potential Impact	Mitigation and Management Response	Status	Executive Monitoring
Bureau of State Payrolls' (BOSP) reporting and payment of contributions to the Division of Retirement for both the FRS and optional retirement plans not being completed timely and/or accurately.	The delay will affect allocations to balance the retirement reports, which will delay posting of contribution data in IRIS. This will result in the delay of fund transfers to Investment Plan member accounts, which may result in loss of earnings. If the employer submitted timely and the delay is on Retirement, the loss of earnings could be assessed to the Division of Retirement. For the pension plan, the trust fund will have a loss of investment earnings, which are needed for benefit payments.	Going through confirming requirements, build an acceptable design, extensive testing. In the process of working through the design with PALM. No work around except using the existing payroll system.	Open - discovery should occur during end-to-end testing	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.
PALM Issue #39 logged by the Florida PALM Team.	Full monthly payroll file with ~500k transactions is creating system performance issues. (API129 FRS Retiree Payment File)	DMS - Retirement is monitoring the issue logged by the Florida PALM team and continue open communication along with assistance in any way possible.	Open - Monitoring	Reviewed through UAT governance; material changes escalated to Agency Sponsor and reflected in monthly reporting.

Conclusion and Next Steps

DMS has established the governance, participant base, testing inventory, execution-monitoring process, and interface-planning structure needed to continue UAT through completion. The current evidence demonstrates meaningful execution and broad organizational participation while also identifying areas requiring concentrated attention. The Department will use the remaining UAT period to increase satisfactory unique-story coverage, execute low-coverage BPGs, retest inadequate outcomes, complete end-to-end ABS testing, validate access and role assignments, and translate testing lessons into operational readiness materials.