



Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval

Department of Technology, SIMM 19D, Revision 10/11/2016

(Embedded PDF instructions describe how to attach files and/or insert repeating sections.)

4.4 General Information

Agency or State Entity Name: California Public Utilities Commission

Organization Code: 8660

Proposal Name: Renewables Portfolio Standard Database Expansion (RPSD) Project

Department of Technology Project Number: 8660-081

4.5 Submittal Information

Contact Information:

Contact First Name: Mallory

Contact Last Name: Albright

Contact Email: Mallory.Albright@cpuc.ca.gov

Contact Phone Number:
(415) 703-1862

Submission Date:

6/09/2021

Submission Type:

☒ New Submission

☐ Updated Submission (Pre-Approval)

☐ Updated Submission (Post-Approval)

☐ Withdraw Submission

Reason: Select...

If "Other," (specify)

....

Sections Updated (For Updated Submissions only, check all that apply)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.4 General Information | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.11.1 Final Requirements Count |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.5 Submittal Information | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.12 Schedule |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6 Primary Solicitation Results | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.12.1 Schedule Summary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6.1 Solicitation Key Action Dates Variance (Primary Solicitation Only) | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.12.2 Reason(s) for Difference |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6.2 Addenda | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.12.3 High Level Integrated Master Schedule and Key Milestones |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6.3 Final Bid Respondents | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.13 Cost Baseline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.6.4 Subcontractor Information | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.13.1 Cost Summary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.7 Ancillary Solicitation Status | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.13.2 Reason(s) for Difference |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.8 Contract Management | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.13.3 Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Summary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.9 Organizational Readiness | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.13.4 Financial Analysis Worksheets (Baseline) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.9.1 Project Organization Chart | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.14 Project Management Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.10 Project Readiness | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.15 Risk Register |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4.11 Requirements Baseline | |

Summary of Changes:

....

Project Approval Executive Transmittal

Attachment: (File Attachment) – RPSD_8660-081_SIMM19G1_Executive_Transmittal.pdf

Condition

1. Due to the anticipated contract

Activity:	Vendor's Offer Due	If "Other," specify: Click here to enter text.
	Statewide Technology Procurement (STP) will conduct the procurement with evaluation assistance from CPUC (Condition stipulated in CDT Approval Letter for Stage 3 Solution Development)	
Condition Category	Procurement	If "Other," (specify)
Condition Sub-Category	Cost	If "Other," specify:
Condition	Project cost is above CPUC Procuring	
Assessment	Transfer	If "Other," specify:
Agency/State Entity Response	CPUC obliged the CDT directive and procurement was managed by State Technology Procurement (STP) with CPUC IT Contract Manager and Energy Division Staff supporting the process.	
Status	Completed	If "Other," specify:

Insert Condition

4.6 Primary Solicitation Results

4.6.1. Solicitation Key Action Dates (Primary Solicitation Only)

Activity:	Release of Solicitation	If "Other," specify:
Actual Start Date:	3/09/2021	
Actual End Date:	Date Picker	
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):		
Activity:	Vendor Questions Due	If "Other," specify: Click here to enter text.
Actual Start Date:	3/18/2021	
Actual End Date:		
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	
Activity:	State responds to written questions	If "Other," specify: Click here to enter text.
Actual Start Date:	3/25/2021	
Actual End Date:		
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	

Activity:	Anticipated Contract Start Date	If “Other,” specify: TBD late June 2021
Actual Start Date:		
Actual End Date:		
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	500 Business Days for the initial contract which covers up-to one year for implementation (Estimated at 10 calendar months for implementation and one calendar text.	
Actual Start Date:	4/05/2021	
Actual End Date:	4/09/2021	
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	
Activity:	Vendor Interviews	If “Other,” specify: Click here to enter text.
Actual Start Date:	4/14/2021	
Actual End Date:	4/15/2021	
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	
Activity:	Negotiations	If “Other,” specify: Click here to enter text.
Actual Start Date:	4/22/2021	
Actual End Date:	4/28/2021	
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	
Activity:	Best and Final Offers Due	If “Other,” specify: Click here to enter text.
Actual Start Date:	5/07/2021	
Actual End Date:		
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	
Activity:	Notification of Award	If “Other,” specify: TBD late June 2021
Actual Start Date:		
Actual End Date:		
Actual Duration (Number of Business Days):	Click here to enter text.	

Insert Respondent**4.6.4 Subcontractor Information**

Subcontractor Name	SB	DVBE	N/A
	mandatory optional for the Contractor to continue to maintain the newly deployed RPSD system.		

Insert Key Action Date Activity**4.6.2 Addenda**

Addenda Number:	.0321-002 Addendum No. 1		
Addenda Category:	Select...	If “Other,” specify:	

Insert Addenda**4.6.3 Final Bid Respondents**

Respondent Name:	TCrest		
Compliant:	Yes		
Non-compliance Category:	Select...	If “Other,” specify:	
Insert Non-compliance Category			
Negotiations Conducted:	No		
Intend to Award:	No		
Protested:	Select...		
Protest Disposition:	Select...		
Contract Number:	...		
Contract Start Date:	Date Picker		
Contract End Date:	Date Picker		
Total Contract Cost:	...		
Respondent Name:	Energy Solutions		
Compliant:	Yes		
Non-compliance Category:	Choose an item.	If “Other,” specify:	
Insert Non-compliance Category			
Negotiations Conducted:	Yes		
Intend to Award:	Yes		
Protested:			
Protest Disposition:	Choose an item.		
Contract Number:	TBD		
Contract Start Date:	TBD		
Contract End Date:	TBD		
Total Base Contract Cost:	630,552.75		

Insert Ancillary Solicitation Status: Completed.

4.8 Contract Management

	Yes	No
1. Has the role of Contract Manager been assigned and has the Contract Manager reviewed and gained an understanding of the scope, activities, tasks and deliverables of the contract? If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished: ...	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the assigned Contract Manager understand the processes for post award contract activities, including contract amendments, contract work authorizations, terms and conditions, and contract escalation/resolution? If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished: ...	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Has a post-award or kickoff meeting between the Contract Manager and state project team members been scheduled to align state and contractor expectations related to contract, budget, invoicing, requirements review, and contractor incentives? If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished: ...Not yet, but it will be done prior to submission of this document to CDT.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Does the Contract Manager understand the Agency/state entity and federal processes, policy, and applicable procedures? If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished: ...	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Does the Contract Manager have a plan to collect and assess contractor and project performance information on a regular basis (i.e., establish meetings with Project Managers, communication techniques)? If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished: ...	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.9 Organizational Readiness

	Yes	No
1. Does the Agency/state entity currently have a mature testing release management process with a repeatable and scalable testing methodology that supports all stages of testing (system, integration, security, performance, interfaces, regression, and user acceptance)? If "No," briefly describe below the testing release management process that will be used to manage, plan, schedule, and control a software build through the different phases and environments, including testing and deploying software releases: Unit Testing, System Testing, and Integration Testing are the Responsibility of Implementation Contractor. CPUC will review test results and validate the tests. CPUC will conduct User Acceptance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Testing (UAT) and review release management process and deliverables.

2. Does the project team have a clear understanding of the lines of business that will be impacted by the project?
If "No," briefly explain below how the Agency/state entity plans to educate the project team to ensure all members have a clear understanding of the goals that the project intends to achieve:
...
☒ ☐
3. Does the Agency/state entity have processes and methodologies in place to support organizational change management (OCM) activities identified in Stage 1, Section 1.12.4 Training and Organizational Change Management?
If "No," briefly describe below how the Agency/state entity will perform OCM activities for this proposal:
...
☒ ☐
4. Does the Agency/state entity have dedicated resources assigned to business process improvement or business process reengineering activities?
If "Yes," specify the areas of business process improvement needed below:
CPUC has IT Business Analysts who work with Business Lead SMEs to document the to-be business processes based on current business processes and desired changes.
☒ ☐

4.9.1 Project Organization Chart

Attachment: (File Attachment) – RPSD_8660-081_Project_Org_Chart_S4PRA.pdf

4.10 Project Readiness

1. Specify the system development methodology that will be used to design and develop the new system:
☐ Agile ☒ Waterfall ☐ Iterative/Incremental ☐ Other, specify: ...

Describe below the Agency/state entity's past project experience using the system development methodology identified. If this methodology has never been used before, describe the training and staff development that will be provided to prepare staff to leverage this methodology.
Waterfall is the standard methodology adopted on many IT projects at CPUC. However, this is the first project which moved through Project Approval Lifecycle (PAL) Process. Multiple other projects are in various stages of the PAL Process. Waterfall follows Requirements validation, System Technical Designs, System & Interfaces Development, Testing, Verification, and Deployment. Upon successful deployment, the new RPSD system will be transitioned to Maintenance & Operations team provided by the Implementation Contractor. CPUC stipulates that at least one RPSD Development team member from the Contractor team will be a member of the Maintenance & Operations team for continuity for at least one year.
- | | Yes | No | N/A |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Has the Agency/state entity received approval of the Evaluation and Selection Report? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Has the Agency/state entity engaged the Office of Technology Services (OTech) for capacity planning and the development of the solution delivery timeline?
If "No" and data center capacity planning and alignment services are needed and the Agency/state entity has not engaged OTech, explain below:
AWS Gov Cloud Services are used for RPSD Expansion Project Infrastructure and application deployment. AWS Resources can be provisioned on demand and the architecture allows for Scalability using Min, Max, and Step parameters for increasing or decreasing Production Servers for web application. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Have resource commitments been obtained for all staff resources identified in Stage 3, Section 3.17 Staffing Allocation?
If "No," explain below:
... | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 5. Does the project staffing plan ensure sufficient staff resources are available to perform project activities while also supporting maintenance and ongoing operations for other Agency/state entity initiatives?
If "No," explain below how sufficient resource levels will be maintained for all project activities: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

- ...
6. Have all identified project leads received formal project management training?
If "No," explain below how the Agency/state entity will educate the project team leads on project management basics:
- ☒ ☐
- ...

4.11 Requirements Baseline

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Has the Agency/state entity modified any mid-level or detailed solution requirements since obtaining approval of the Stage 3 Solution Development? If "Yes":	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the percentage of change in the space provided. Below describe the modification(s), impact(s) to the recommended alternative, and how the requirements align with the business objectives established in the Stage 1 Business Analysis: 	Percentage of Change ...%		
...			
2. Has the requirements traceability been updated to accurately reflect any modification(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.11.1 Final Requirements Count

Total Functional Requirements:	414
Total Non-Functional Requirements:	71
Total Project/Transition Requirements:	6
Requirements Grand Total	491

4.12 Schedule

4.12.1 Schedule Summary

	Estimated Date	Final Baseline Date	Difference
Project Planning Start Date	5/21/2018	5/21/2018	0
Project Planning End Date	11/26/2019	6/24/2021	1 year 7 months calendar time, or 378 business days approx.
Project Start Date	11/26/2019	6/29/2021	1 year 7 months calendar time, or 381 business days approx.
Project End Date	8/07/2020	5/18/2022	1 year 9 months calendar time, or 450 business days approx.

4.12.2 Reason(s) for Difference

1. Project Planning End Date: Got delayed due to Project Planning (S2AA approval process, S3SD planning and approval, and S4PRA Process) taking longer than original estimates at the of S2AA initial submission. Dates were not changed later prior to S2AA approval. Also, time for approval process was not incorporated into the initial schedule. 2. Project Start Date: Got delayed due to delays in the planning and approval process; estimated Project Start Date at the time of S2AA Submission time no longer holds good. 3. Project End Date: Added an allowance for implementation and raised implementation duration from the original estimate of about 8.5 months to about 10.5 months (In both cases excludes about a month of Transition time to M&O Team post deployment). Please note that the project is deliverables based and the contractor may finish the project sooner or later than S4PRA estimates. The M&O will be activated upon successful full deployment of the new RPSD System and successful transition to M&O team. Project transition to M&O and Project closure will be completed by 6/21/2022.

4.12.3 High Level Integrated Master Schedule and Key Milestones

Attachment: (File Attachment) – RPSD_8660-081_Project_Master_Schedule_revised_v3.mpp

4.13 Cost Baseline

Insert BCP Summary

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) requests 2.5 permanent positions and \$1,518,000 from the Public Utilities Commission Utilities Reimbursement Account (PUCURA, Fund 0462) to implement Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018 (SB 100). In addition to positions, the requested amount includes \$1,050,000 annually through 2021 for

Average Proposed Operations Cost	\$86,003	\$85,942	(\$61)
Total Project Cost	\$1,204,197	\$1,078,340	(\$125,857)

4.13.2 Reason(s) for Difference**Reason for Total Planning Cost Change:**

1. Project Planning took longer than S2AA estimate which resulted in increase in staff costs and OE&E Costs.
2. PUC personnel costs reduced due to IT Technical staff not participating in the Stage 3 and Stage 4 planning. This is due to the RPS System's chosen platform is not one of the CPUC IT Supported platforms. As a result, IT Management advised that the future maintenance & operations (M&O) for the to-be deployed new RPS system will need to be done by an M&O Contractor.
3. An IT BA was added to the Project during Stage 3 which offset some reduction in PY Costs.
4. S4PRA FAWs were revised with new CalHR Pay Scales released in FY 2020-21. Benefits rate of 56.25% for FY 2020-21 was applied and a provision for 4% annual salary increment was added for future years.
5. Salaries were discounted at 4% per year for prior years using FY 2020-21 pay scales.
6. S4PRA has a provision for IV&V Vendor costs during the Planning Stage whereas S2AA did not include IV&V Vendor for Project Planning stages as it is optional to have IV&V Vendor during Planning stages.

Reason for Total Project Cost change:

1. Implementation Contractor costs increased from \$437,500 to \$519,500.
3. CDT IPOC costs were revised upward from \$32,928 to \$102,900.
4. IV&V Vendor costs changed from \$100,300 to \$112,319 which is split between planning \$41,910 and Project \$70,409.
5. Reduction in CPUC Staff PY & OE&E costs due to reduction in PY from 3.7 PY to 1.82 PY.
(CPUC IT Technical staff will not participate in the implementation phase. Only IT staff who will participate in the Implementation phase are: IT PM, IT BA, and IT Contract Manager. Information Security Office, AWS Account Manager, and IT Specialists (in Helpdesk, Network, ISO, and Server infrastructure) will provide help on demand).

Reason for Average Proposed Operations Cost change:

1. There are savings due to CPUC IT Technical staff not participating in Future Operations. Maintenance & Operations (M&O) Contractor costs were not increased to compensate CPUC IT Technical staff's non-participation. Should costs go up for future M&O, those costs will be covered from Energy Division Budget.
2. The Estimated cost calculation did not include M&O Contractor Costs of \$62,500 per year whereas the Final baseline has the costs listed as \$111,053 for first year, \$67,435 for second year, and \$39,125 for the last year. The Last year calculation which is shown as Avg Cost per year of future operations considered the \$39,125 whereas the Estimate did not consider the \$62,500 due to a template formula or input error. Had the S2AA calculation included the M&O Contractor costs in the total Future Ops Costs when showing avg cost for future operations, the average proposed operations cost would have been \$148,503 instead of the \$86,003 shown above for S2AA Estimated average Proposed Operations Cost.

4.13.3 Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Summary

Budget Request ID	8660-009-BCP-2019-GB
Budget Request Year	2019
Requested Amount	\$1,050,000
Status	Supported

expert consultants. This measure requires CPUC to implement timeframes and maintain ongoing program oversight for multiple elements of California’s greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction efforts.

These funds must be encumbered at the latest by 6/30/2021, otherwise they would lapse.

CPUC would like to encumber the funds for utilization in a) FY 2021-22, FY 2022-23 for the project implementation and initial 1 year maintenance and operations.

The costs for FY2023-24 and FY 2024-35 for mandatory optional maintenance and operations, by the same contractor who implements the new system, will be absorbed by Energy Division.

Link to BCP: https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/1920/FY1920_ORG8660_BCP2729.pdf

4.13.4 Financial Analysis Worksheets (Baseline)

Attachment: RPSD_8660-081_F2-Financial_Analysis_Worksheets_S4PRA_revised.xlsx

4.14 Project Management Planning

Are the following project management plans or project artifacts complete, approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority, and available for Department of Technology review?

Risk Register	Yes	RPSD_8660-081_Risk_Register_S4PRA_20210607.xlsx
Contract Management Plan	Yes	RPS Contract Management Plan Version 2.5 01-28-21 – SIGNED.pdf
Cost Management Plan	Yes	RPSD_8660-081_Cost_Management_Plan_final_20210607
Implementation Management Plan	Yes	RPSD_8660-081_Implementation_Management_Plan_final_20210607.docx
Requirements Management Plan	Yes	RPSD_8660-081_Requirements_Management_Plan_final_20210607.docx
Deliverable Expectation Document (DED)	Yes	Submitted by STP Procurement Officer to CDT PAO.

4.15 Risk Register

Attachment: (File Attachment) – RPSD_8660-081_Risk_Register_S4PRA_20210607.xlsx

Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval – Department of Technology Use Only

Original “New Submission” Date	6/18/2021	
Form Received Date	6/18/2021	
Form Accepted Date	6/18/2021	
Form Status	Completed	
Form Status Date	6/25/2021	
Form Disposition	Approved	If “Other,” specify:
Form Disposition Date	6/25/2021	