



# Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19B.2 (Ver. 3.0.7, 02/28/2022)

## 2.1 General Information

1. **Agency or State Entity Name:** 0890 - Secretary of State

If Agency/State entity is not in the list, enter here with the [organization code](#).

2. **Proposal Name:** California Automated Lobbying And Campaign Contribution and Expenditure Search System (CAL-ACCESS) Replacement System (CARS) Project

3. **Department of Technology Project Number (0000-000):** 0890-054

4. **S2AA Version Number:** Version 1

5. **CDT Billing Case Number:** CS0056881

Don't have a Case Number? [Click here to get one.](#)

## 2.2 Submittal Information

1. **Contact Information**

Contact Name: Harjit Basi

Contact Email: [hbasi@sos.ca.gov](mailto:hbasi@sos.ca.gov)

Contact Phone: 916-704-6860

2. **Submission Type:** Updated Submission (Pre-Approval)

If Withdraw, select Reason: [Choose an item.](#)

If Other, specify reason here: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Sections Changed if an update or resubmission:** (List all the sections that changed.)

[S2AA Section 2.3.4 B](#)

[S2AA Section 2.7.3](#)

[S2AA Section 2.8.1](#)

[S2AA Section 2.8.2](#)

[S2AA Section 2.8.3](#)

Updated attachment #39  
New attachments #53, #54, #55, #56

**Summary of Changes:** (Summarize updates made.)

Please see CDT's comment log for reference.

#56 SOS CARS S2AA CDT 3-4-23 Final Submission Comment Log

**3. Attach Project Approval Executive Transmittal to your email submission.**

Attachment #1 SOS 19G.1-Project-Approval-Exectuive-Transmittal

**4. Attach Procurement Assessment Form to your email submission.**

Attachment #2 B.5-STP-Procurement-Assessment-Form

**5. Conditions from Stage 1 Approval (Enter any conditions from the Stage 1 Business Analysis approval letter issued by CDT or your AIO):**

No conditions were noted in the Stage 1 Business Analysis approval letter issued by the CDT.

## **2.3 Baseline Processes and Systems**

**1. Current Business Environment (Describe the current business environment of which the effort will be understood and assessed in 500 words)**

### **Problem Analysis**

The current CAL-ACCESS system is mission critical for the Secretary of State's Political Reform Division (PRD) and to satisfy provisions of the Political Reform Act (PRA). It is a conglomeration of component applications that were developed at different times using multiple, now-obsolete, coding languages, platforms, and technologies. The current campaign finance and lobbying activity process is a paper/File Transfer Protocol (FTP)/online hybrid model that results in inefficient (often manual) processes, duplicate efforts, sub-optimal data quality, and public disclosure reporting that does not meet the needs of many of the PRD stakeholders.

Several factors make replacing CAL-ACCESS imperative, including:

- The SOS is mandated by legislation to replace it. (SB 1349 Hertzberg, Chapter 845, Statutes of 2016.)
- Program business operations are negatively affected by lack of data integrity.
- Program business operations are at risk due to an old, unsupported information technology platform.
- The PRD and stakeholders have limited information access and reporting capabilities.

The CAL-ACCESS system is used throughout California and by all entities required to submit filings and by those who desire to access data for various reasons. CAL-ACCESS users and

stakeholder groups have identified the following business issues that hinder the ability to submit and access data.

### **Program business operations are negatively affected by system design.**

The PRD and stakeholder operations are hindered by technological limitations. The current system design dictates that the PRD staff must manually enter registration data from filer-submitted paper forms, which is time-consuming and subject to human error. Some of the forms submitted by filers are incomplete, inaccurate, and/or contain non-standardized data, in part because the system lacks data-validation mechanisms and/or is dependent on free-form text fields to capture required data. The time needed to confirm and correct these errors results in delays in compliance and public access to filing information.

### **Program business operations are at risk due to an old, unsupported information technology platform.**

CAL-ACCESS is an old and fragile system. It is increasingly difficult to find staff or contractor support with the necessary skills to sustain and maintain the system's applications. Additionally, the system is not well documented. It cannot be patched or modified to be more robust or feature laden. The system cannot generally be modified to respond to changes in legal requirements or changes to filing processes driven by regulatory or statutory changes, particularly when those changes trigger modifications to the forms used by filers and viewed by the public. On November 30, 2011, CAL-ACCESS became inoperable for four weeks. Recovery from the 2011 outage was complicated by obsolete system architecture, the limited availability of replacement components, and the scarcity of personnel with the necessary technical skills to remedy the problem. The solution that was deployed in response to that emergency allows the system to continue functioning but does little to resolve the underlying issues. The risk of another failure continues to be significant. Currently, the system suffers from regular daily outages, most of which are short in duration but serve as reminders of the system's fragile nature.

### **PRD and stakeholders have limited information access and reporting capabilities.**

The system design does not provide user-friendly, intuitive, and reliable methods for staff and stakeholders to search for and find information, methods that are widely available with more modern technology. Data cannot always be retrieved in a useful manner, and it must often be compiled, analyzed, and parsed. The system lacks basic reports for system and program management. Staff cannot run basic queries and there is limited ability to aggregate and report data in a meaningful way using the automation tools available in CAL-ACCESS.

**Attach** relevant documentation to email submission (i.e., business process, workflow, problem analysis, user/stakeholder list, research findings). If these types of documents are not available, please indicate "Not Available," and explain the reason below:

Attachment #3 CARS External Stakeholder Register

Attachment #4 CARS Internal Stakeholder Register

Attachment #5 PRD Business Processes and Workflows

Attachment #6 Problem Analysis

Not available reason:

**2. Technical Context (Describe the technical environment of which the effort will be understood and assessed in 500 words)**

The current CAL-ACCESS system, which is mission critical, is a conglomeration of component applications that were developed at different times using multiple now-obsolete development languages, platforms, and technologies such as .Net 1.0/1.1/4/C/C++/Java/PowerBuilder and dependency on Windows 2000 server. This makes it increasingly difficult to find staff or vendor support with the necessary technical skills to sustain and maintain the system applications. Additionally, the current system is not well-documented, which makes the provision of support and/or modifications time consuming and extremely risky. The SOS was able to upgrade and maintain the database and is currently using Oracle 11G R2.

The current campaign finance and lobbying activity process is a paper/File Transfer Protocol (FTP)/online hybrid model that results in inefficient (often manual) processes, duplicate efforts, sub-optimal data quality, and public disclosure reporting that does not meet the needs of many of the PRD stakeholders some of which include the Franchise Tax Board, the Fair Political Practices Commission, members of the software vendor community, and the campaign registration and disclosure community.

**Attach** relevant documentation to email submission (i.e., logical system environment diagrams, system interactions, business rules, application flows, stakeholder information, data flow charts). If these types of documents are not available, please indicate "Not Available," and explain the reason below:

Attachment #8 CAL-ACCESS Business Rules

Attachment #9 CAL-ACCESS Business, Data, Application, Technical Architecture 1.0

Attachment #10 CAL-ACCESS Logical Architecture

**3. Data Management (Enter the information to indicate the data owner and custodian of the current system, if applicable.)**

Data Owner Name: Margie Hieter

Data Owner Title: Division Chief

Data Owner Business Program area: Political Reform Division

Data Custodian Name: Michael Merchant

Data Custodian Title: Lobbying Unit Staff Services Analyst

Data Custodian Technical area: Lobbying Registration

Data Custodian Name: [Maia Kocinsky-Kirkham](#)

Data Custodian Title: [Political Reform Staff Service Analyst](#)

Data Custodian Technical area: [Lobbying Disclosure](#)

Data Custodian Name: [Peggy Adams](#)

Data Custodian Title: [Campaign Unit Staff Service Analyst](#)

Data Custodian Technical area: [Campaign Registration](#)

Data Custodian Name: [John Dewey](#)

Data Custodian Title: [Campaign Unit Staff Service Analyst](#)

Data Custodian Technical area: [Campaign Disclosure](#)

Data Custodian Name: [Glen Taylor](#)

Data Custodian Title: [Campaign Unit PTIII](#)

Data Custodian Technical area: [Major Donors](#)

Data Custodian Name: [Gwinith Clara, Regina Geremia](#)

Data Custodian Title: [Political Reform Program Specialist](#)

Data Custodian Technical area: [Compliance](#)

Security - Data Classification and Categorization [Yes](#)

Security - Privacy Threshold & Impact Assessment. [Yes](#)

#### **4. Existing Data Governance and Data**

a) Do you have existing data that must be migrated to your new solution?

**Answer** (Unknown, Yes, No): [Yes](#)

If data migration is required, please rate the quality of the data.

Select data quality rating: [Few issues identified with the existing data.](#)

- b) Does the Agency/state entity have an established data governance body with well-defined roles and responsibilities to support data governance activities?

**Answer** (Unknown, Yes, No): [No](#)

If Yes, include the data governance organization chart as an attachment to your email submission.

No, we do not have an established enterprise data governance body; however, the PRD unit is in the process of establishing their PRD Data Governance Plan. The SOS is in the process of implementing its PRD Data Governance Plan that will formally establish the Data Governance Board, including its goals and objectives and its roles and responsibilities. In the meantime, there is a process in place to call the Board members together on an ad hoc basis, if needed, to address any data concerns that arise during project activities.

[Attachment #11 Data Governance Org Chart](#)

[Attachment #12 2022.9.12 PRD Business Glossary](#)

- c) Does the Agency/state entity have data governance policies (data policies, data standards, etc.) formally defined, documented, and implemented?

**Answer** (Unknown, Yes, No): [No](#)

If Yes, include the data governance policies as an attachment to your email submission.

- d) Does the Agency/state entity have data security policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented?

**Answer** (Unknown, Yes, No): [Yes](#)

If Yes, attach the existing documented security policies, standards, and controls used to your email submission.

[Attachment #13 Access Control Policy](#)

[Attachment #14 Data Download Policy](#)

[Attachment #15 Data Security Policy](#)

- e) Does the Agency/state entity have user accessibility policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented?

**Answer** (Unknown, Yes, No): [No](#)

If Yes, attach the existing documented policies, accessibility governance plan, and standards used to the email submission.

## 5. Security Categorization Impact Table

Consult the [SIMM 5305-A Information Security Program Management Standard - Security Categorization Impact Table](#).

**Attach** a table (in PDF) that categorizes and classifies the agency/state entity's information assets related to this effort (e.g., paper and electronic records, automated files, databases requiring appropriate protection from unauthorized use, access, disclosure, modification, loss, or deletion). Each information asset for which the agency/state entity has ownership responsibility shall be inventoried and identified.

[Attachment #16 Cars Security Categorization Impact Table V1.3](#)

## 6. Security Categorization Impact Table Summary

**Consult** the [SIMM 5305-A Information Security Program Management Standard - Security Categorization Impact Table](#) to provide potential impact levels of the following areas:

Confidentiality: [Medium](#)

Integrity: [High](#)

Availability: [High](#)

## 7. Technical Complexity Score: **3.3**

(Attach a [SIMM Section 45 Appendix C](#) with Business and Technical Complexity sections completed to the email submission.)

[Attachment #17 SIMM Section 45 Appendix C 2022 1221](#)

# 2.4 Requirements and Outcomes

At this time in the project planning process, requirements and outcomes should be documented and indicative of how the Agency/State Entity envisions the final solution. This shall be accomplished either in the form of mid-level requirements (predictive methodology)/business capabilities or representative epics and user stories (adaptive methodology) that will become part of the product backlog. The requirements or representative epics and user stories must tie back to the Objectives detailed in the Stage 1 Business Analysis. Regardless of which tool/method is used, an understanding of the following, at a minimum, must be clearly articulated:

- Functional requirements
- Expected user experience(s)
- Expected system outcome
- Expected business operations (e.g., How do you envision operations in the future?)
- Alignment to the project's objectives identified in Stage 1
- Product ownership (e.g., Who owns these requirements?); and
- Verification of need(s) fulfillment (e.g., How will success be measured?)

*Tip: If providing requirements, the recommended range of requirements is between 50 and 100.*

**Attach** Requirements and/or Outcomes narratives, mid-level requirements, and/or epics/user stories to submission email.

[Attachment #18 B\\_3\\_Stage\\_2\\_Midlevel\\_Solution\\_Requirements\\_Draft v1.0](#)

## 2.5 Assumptions and Constraints

The CARS Project Go Forward Strategy (Version 1.0; dated August 2, 2022) identified and accepted the following key assumptions. Any changes to the assumptions may impact the CARS Project outcome.

**Assumption & Description/Potential Impact:**

Assumption	Description/Potential Impact
The project will develop and manage to a realistic schedule and budget based on estimation methodologies that can be supported with estimation methodologies based on best practices.	<p>If the project does not develop and manage to a realistic schedule or budget, the project risks significant milestone completion delays and/or cost overruns during the project lifecycle.</p> <p>This schedule and budget will include activities and funding for project planning and contractor staff procurement (including project management services support and prime vendor), project DD&amp;I (design, development, and implementation), and one full fiscal year of maintenance and operations.</p>
All team members will provide timely review and feedback of project documents and vendor deliverables.	The SOS as an organization must understand that the CARS Project is a high priority for the SOS executive office and therefore ensure its activities take precedence over other ongoing operations activities. Doing this will minimize the risk of chronic delay of deliverable approval.
The SOS will assign fully allocated and dedicated resources to the CARS Project planning and execution effort.	Based on lessons learned from the previous iteration of the CARS Project, the SOS knows that not having staff in the right amount, fully dedicated to the project planning effort, or with the appropriate skill set will jeopardize the forward progress of the project, resulting in project milestone delays and quality issues.
The SOS CARS Assistant Project Director will be fully allocated at the start of the project.	The SOS has learned that the lack of a dedicated project management team from the outset of the project planning effort can result in lack of proper scheduling delays in both identifying necessary project staff and allocating work to them. This ultimately can result in delays completing critical project milestones (such as the PAL Stages).
The CARS Project resource gaps and skill deficiencies will be addressed via staff redirection, contracted resources, and staff training.	To avoid chronic lack of needed resources (especially those with the required skill sets), the SOS has committed to ensuring that any resource gap that is identified will be handled by timely redirection of state staff, acquisition of contracted



	resources, or ensuring the staff receive the necessary training and support.
An effective governance structure will be established and in place prior to the start of CARS Project Planning to enable effective status reporting, escalation, and decision making between SOS decision makers, the CDT, and vendors.	Establishing an effective governance structure early in the planning phase that is adhered to by the project team will ensure that the entire project team is aware of the governance processes early in the lifecycle of the project, will ensure timely and accurate status and risk/issue reporting, and will lessen the team's confusion about the proper way to escalate an issue.
The SOS will provide the CDT access to key project artifacts and resources, as denoted in the signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).	Providing the CDT timely access to project artifacts and staff resources will empower the CDT to provide SOS with the most effective project guidance and oversight as specified in the MOU.
The SOS will at all times consider the guidance and recommendations provided by the CDT to achieve a positive project outcome.	The SOS and the CDT will meet regularly, and the CDT will provide guidance and recommendations if it believes it is needed to ensure a positive project outcome. The SOS and the CDT will work together to resolve or effectively mitigate any and all risks and issues identified by the CDT.
Planning and activities needed to ensure the continued functioning and availability of the CAL-ACCESS system is outside the scope of the CARS Project. The CAL-ACCESS business continuity planning will be handled through normal SOS technical operational processes and procedures.	Specifying to all project stakeholders that CAL-ACCESS business continuity (including disaster recovery) effort is outside the scope of the CARS Project will keep the project team focused on the current project goal which is to obtain a replacement solution.
To the degree possible, the CARS Project will reuse the prior CARS Project's artifacts such as data cleansing tools, data processes, and business requirements, per the independent assessment recommendations and the CDT advisory review.	The SOS is committed to ensuring that any work product created in the prior iteration of CARS is fully re-evaluated in light of the current project and re-used as much as possible. The risk run if this is not done is unnecessary rework that will imperil the timely completion of scheduled milestones.

**Constraint and Description/Potential Impact:**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Description/Potential Impact</b>
The project recognizes key SOS business events such as the June Primary and November Elections, and PRD's filing deadlines as constraints on project resources. These events may extend completion of certain project activities.	Key SOS business activities such as elections and filing deadlines are mandatory activities for the SOS. Factoring these activities into the project schedule will better allow the schedule to remain realistic and attainable.
CARS requires legislative approval for additional funding on an annual basis.	Because project funding requires annual legislative approval, the project must remain aware of both budget and project approval due dates and must also proactively plan to

	<p>accomplish the required documentation in advance of the submission due date.</p> <p>Furthermore, because annual funding is reliant on demonstrated project progress, the project must strive to accomplish the necessary milestones within schedule and budget.</p>
<p>By engaging the CDT for both Project Approvals and Oversight Services and Statewide Technology Procurement Services, the SOS understands that it will follow the State Administrative Manual (SAM), State Information Management Manual (SIMM), and State Contract Manual (SCM) policies that govern the CDT's work. Given the additional review time necessary for this engagement, the pace of completion of certain activities may be impacted.</p>	<p>The SOS understands the agreement that the CDT engagement may impact the pace of project activities, but also understands that this review time is expected and can be planned for. If additional review time is required by the CDT, it's impact will be managed as the SOS understands that the CDT's goal is to enhance the project outcomes.</p>

*TIP: Copy and paste to add Assumptions/Constraints with Descriptions/Impacts as needed.*

## 2.6 Dependencies

Dependencies are elements or relationships in a project reliant on something else occurring before the function, service, interface, task, or action can begin or continue.

**Dependency Element:** Data readiness activities are completed prior to prime vendor being onboarded.

**Dependency Description:** To ensure the prime vendor, once onboarded, can proceed quickly and efficiently with the data mapping, conversion, and migration related activities. The data needs to be cleansed and loaded into a staging environment that is ready for the prime vendor. Any substantial delay in completing these activities risks possible delay to completion of these project milestones.

**Dependency Element:** Timely project approval from the CDT and funding approval from the Department of Finance.

**Dependency Description:** The SOS is dependent on both timely project approval from the CDT and timely funding approval from the DOF in order for the continued planning effort (including prime vendor procurement activities) and the design, development, and implementation of the solution to replace the SOS' legacy application. This funding includes costs for the various consulting services that are critical to supporting the legacy system replacement effort.

**Dependency Element:** Regulatory changes mandated during the project timeframe may impact the targeted CARS implementation date.

**Dependency Description:** The CARS solution design depends on decisions about regulatory change that is not in the control of the SOS. Any change mandated that affects the business requirements and business rules may require additional time and cost to accommodate.

*TIP: Copy and paste to add Dependency Elements and Descriptions as needed.*

## 2.7 Market Research

Market Research ([CDT Market Research Guidelines](#)) determines whether products or services available in the marketplace can meet the business needs identified in this proposal. Market Research can also determine whether commercial practices regarding customizing/modifying products or tailoring services are available, or even necessary, to meet the business needs and objectives of the business.

Before undertaking a Market Research approach. Contact your PAO Manager to schedule a collaborative review to review planning to date and discuss the procurement approach.

- 1. Project Management Methodology:** Hybrid
- 2. Procurement approach recommended:** Standard Procurement
- 3. Market Research Approach**

Provide a concise narrative description of the approach used to perform market research.

### **Market Research Methods and Activities**

The CARS Project established a Market Research Plan outlining the goals, objectives, approach, and the plan for conducting market research for implementing the CAL-ACCESS Replacement System. The market research objectives were to identify potential solutions, implementation options, available vendors, rough order of magnitude cost and timeline schedule to design, develop and implement the replacement system. In addition, a goal of market research was to seek stakeholder input and identify areas that may benefit from innovation. The SOS CARS Project conducted market research to identify solutions that could meet CARS' and its stakeholders' needs, requirements, and goals of the replacement system.

CARS' multipronged Market Research approach consisted of tasks and activities to obtain relevant information for alternatives analysis and implementation options for the procurement approach. The following activities were performed for the CARS Market Research:

- Outreach to both internal and external SOS stakeholders
- Research providers in the campaign finance disclosure and tracking market segment in California
- Research other similar providers out of state
- Conduct research with other States
- Conduct a targeted review of the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) solutions
- Conduct focus group sessions with other California State Agencies
- Conduct a Request for Information (RFI) and hold a Vendor Day session including a questions and answers session with the prime vendors and software solution providers

- Interview Gartner Research Division for available alternatives
- Research findings from 2021 Elyon CARS Assessment Reports for Custom Development

Market Research under each of these methods was completed on a flow basis. It provided information on replacement system available alternatives, feasible options, cost projections and timeline estimate that support CARS Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis (S2AA). For details of the CARS market research activities performed, results, and findings, refer to the attached CARS Market Research Report.

**Attach** Market Research artifacts to the email submission.

Attachment #19 CARS Market Research Report

## 2.8 Viable Alternative Solutions

The CDT expects Agencies/state entities to conduct a thorough analysis of all feasible alternatives that will meet the proposal's objectives and requirements. Agencies/state entities should provide at minimum the three (3) most viable solutions, one (1) of which could be leveraging and/or enhancing the existing solution (if applicable).

### 1. Viable Alternative Solution #1

**Name:** Custom Development

**Description:** In this alternative, SOS would engage an external prime vendor to design, develop, test, and implement a custom, data driven CAL-ACCESS replacement system for campaign and lobbying entities to meet the filing requirements of the Political Reform Act (PRA) more efficiently; improve data quality; expand public access to data; allow for system modifications and improvements to respond to statutory and regulatory changes; allow other system modifications to improve filer efficiency and public access to data; and improve the ability of the SOS, the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) and the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) to fulfill the mandated duties. The custom developed replacement system would enable external stakeholders to enter filings data to meet both the Campaign Finance and Lobbyist activity disclosure requirements. This alternative would implement a custom application running in a Cloud infrastructure. Additionally, it would provide SOS the ability to customize the solution as needed and respond to changes timely in the Campaign Finance and Lobbyist Reporting laws. Finally, it would include data conversion and storage of existing and new filings.

**Why is this a viable solution?** Please explain:

The CARS project performed Market Research with other States, the FEC, the CAL-ACCESS stakeholders, other California State Agencies, and vendors in the marketplace. The project also released a RFI to the potential vendor community. Responses received from the vendor community reflected that approximately 40% of the respondents proposed a custom development model and/or identified themselves as being custom solution development providers.

Approximately 57% of the states surveyed developed custom solutions or in the process, supported by a vendor or in-house information technology staff. CARS Project Market Research

also observed that the FEC, large states, and states with complex requirements like SOS chose to develop a custom solution. This alternative approach provides the desired result for California, potentially offering the following advantages:

- Custom developed system meeting the required system complexity
- Ability to choose solution architecture, design, technology stack and implementation platform
- Availability of resources knowledgeable in the chosen technology
- Ownership of the system and intellectual rights to the solution source code
- Development delivered incrementally (Agile) or in phases
- Solution custom explicitly built to SOS' needs and requirements
- Ability for SOS to own and maintain the solution source code
- Ability for SOS to control and manage the priority of all future enhancements

This approach would allow the prime vendor to develop a custom-built solution that meets the CAL-ACCESS replacement system requirements.

Potential disadvantages of this Alternative are as follows:

- Time to design, develop and implement a custom solution can be longer
- Time to procure a Prime Vendor could be longer with development of a complete Request For Proposal
- A Custom solution could require additional testing to validate that the system and the environment meet the performance requirements

## Approach

Increase staff – new or existing capabilities: **Yes**

Modify the existing business process or create a new business process: **Yes**

Reduce the services or level of services provided: **No**

Utilize new or increased contracted services: **Yes**

Enhance the existing IT system: **No**

Modify Statute/Policy/Regulations: **No**

Please Specify: **This alternative does not require modification to statute or policy.**

Create a new IT system: **Yes**

Other: **No Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)**

## Architecture Information

Business Function(s)/Process(es): **The data driven CAL-ACCESS replacement system should allow campaign and lobbying entities to meet the filing requirements of the PRA more efficiently; improve data quality; expand public access to data; allow for system modifications and improvements to respond to statutory and regulatory changes; allow other system**

modifications to improve filer efficiency and public access to data; and improve the ability of the SOS, the FPPC and the FTB to fulfill mandated duties. The replacement systems should include, at a minimum, the features and capabilities described below:

## **Database**

The system must include a database of sufficient capacity and performance to support approximately:

- Registration data for more than 125,000 state and local recipient committees and 45,000 other state and local campaign filers (including Candidates, Officeholders, General Purpose Political Action Committees, Major Donors, Independent Expenditure Committees, and Slate-Mailer Organizations)
- 20 years of regular campaign reports and special campaign reports from state-level campaign filers
- Registration data for approximately 20,000 lobbying entities (e.g., lobbyists, placement agents, lobbying firms, lobbyist employers, and individuals attempting to directly influence government)  
20 years of lobbying activity reports from state-level filers.

The system design should be readily scalable to accommodate an annual growth rate of 10% in campaign and lobbying registrations and reporting activity and scalable to accommodate the incorporation of local campaign reporting.

The system should include functionality to permit the archival of the old campaign and lobbying reports from the system, with the capability to search, locate, and retrieve individual filing entities and their associated reports from the archive.

Finally, the system should be flexible enough to readily accommodate the definition of new filer types, new reporting requirements for existing filers, and new data elements within existing reports and registrations.

## **Online Filing Application**

The system must include an online filing application/functionality for registering campaign and lobbying entities and for entering and submitting campaign and lobbying disclosure reports.

The system should include functionality to permit new users to establish accounts for accessing the system without the intervention of SOS staff. The system should also permit users to define and register new campaign or lobbying filer entities and modify the registration data for existing entities. New registrations and some changes to registration data must be held in a pending file until they can be reviewed and approved by SOS staff for compliance with the law. Finally, the primary “owners” of a filer account will be able to designate other system users who may access the account and establish permissions to view, edit, or affirm filing data for those users.

The system must include functionality to permit users to enter the reportable campaign and lobbying transactions for regular and special disclosure reports, with the capability to save unfinished reports and resume entry later. The system must also support multiple, simultaneous reports in process for a single filer.

The system should include functionality to feature an interview-based interface (similar to an approach made popular by tax filing applications) to guide filers in registering new entities and reporting for those entities. Users must also be able to validate a filing prior to submission and, if non-fatal errors are found, the option to either (a) correct the filing prior to submission or (b) submit the filing as-is, then amend the filing at a later date.

The system should include functionality to automatically notify users of events such as filing errors, past-due filings, and fine assessments. In addition, users should be able to configure their preferences for notification, such as email or text message.

The system should include a PCI compliant functionality to allow users to pay registration fees and fine assessments electronically.

Finally, filers should have the functionality capable of exporting filings in PDF format, as well as to export transactions and other data in an electronic format for use by another system.

### **Third-Party Systems**

Campaign and lobbying filers who use a third-party system to capture and track their data should have the functional capability to upload disclosure reports from their systems into the new system once they have established a filer account in the system. The system should have the functionality to support such uploads in a Java Script Object Notation (JSON) or similar modern open-source interchange format to be established with the existing user community. In addition, the system should have the functionality to validate all incoming filings and provide the filer with immediate notice of any validation errors within a file.

The system should have the functionality to include an environment and process for testing and evaluating the compatibility of all filings generated by a third-party system with the established formats.

### **Enforcement**

The system should have the functionality to automatically notify filers of required regular reports that have not been submitted by the filing deadline, at which point the report is considered late.

The system should have the functionality to assess fines for late filings automatically. In addition, the system should have the functionality to automatically notify the filer whenever a fine has been assessed and generate follow-up collection notices for delinquent fines. SOS staff must have the ability to:

- View the current and historic registration and reporting data for a filer, including the history of communications with that filer
- View any filing, including the validation errors associated with the filing
- View and correct any fine or fee assessment
- View a history of fees, fines, and payments for a filer

### **Other SOS Functions**

The system must have the functionality to assess registration fees for lobbying entities automatically and must automatically assess an annual fee for ongoing campaign committees

and new committees upon notice to SOS of qualification (i.e., exceeding the established threshold for contributions or expenditures). In addition, the system must include the functionality for accounting capabilities to track and report fine and fee assessments and payments and to receive and account for all payments received at SOS.

The system must generate the Lobbyist Directory, as well as a log of all changes to lobbying registration within a specified period.

The system must have the functionality to also track Lobbyist and Placement Agent participation in statutorily required ethics training courses. It should automatically revoke the registration of those filers who do not participate in the required training by the deadline.

SOS staff should be able to generate correspondence to filers based on pre-defined templates and automatically save an image of the correspondence to the filer's record. Further, SOS staff should be able to attach to a filer's record an image of any correspondence received from that filer.

The system should have the functionality to include a variety of pre-defined reports about filers and their filing data, as well as system statistics about filer registration and filing activity. Additionally, SOS users should be able to create and save custom reports.

### **Public Disclosure Website**

The system must have the functionality to include a public website for users to research, view, and export campaign and lobbying disclosure data. In addition, it must allow users to search for specific filers using a variety of criteria.

Once a filer is located in the system, the user should be able to view the filer's current registration data and historic changes to that data. Users must also have the capability to view a record of all reports submitted by that filer, a record of all fines and penalties assessed against a filer, and the ability to view the complete data of any report submitted. For amended reports, users should also be able to view the initially submitted version and all amended versions of the filing.

Users should also be able to create custom reports of transaction data for a filer during a period specified by the user. Further, users should be able to filter and sort the reported transactions and export the results in an electronic format suitable for further analysis.

The system should have the functionality to allow users to generate special campaign reports, such as:

- Contributions or expenditures for a particular election contest or ballot measure
- Payments made to slate mailer organizations related to a particular candidate or measure, filterable by support or opposition
- Independent expenditures made in support or opposition of a particular candidate or measure, filterable by support or opposition.

The system should have the functionality to allow users to generate special lobbying activity reports, such as:

- Lobbying spending by an industry/trade group over a user-specified period



- Lobbying spending for a specific bill or agency action over a user-specified period
- Top 10 lobbying firms by campaign contributions or lobbying expenditures over a user-specified period

*TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add business processes with the same application, system, or component; COTS/Cloud Technology or custom solution; runtime environment; system interfaces, data center location; and security.*

### **Conceptual Architecture**

Attach a copy of the conceptual architecture to your email submission.

[Attachment #20 CARS Project System Components and Logical Architecture](#)

### **COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology or Custom: Custom**

Name/Primary Technology: [Cloud hosted](#)

*TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add system software information if the application, system, or component uses additional system software.*

### **Explain Existing System Interfaces:**

Below are the existing CAL-ACCESS System Interfaces. See [Attachment #20 Conceptual Architecture](#), for the details of these interfaces.

#### 1) CAL-ACCESS - Electronic Filing System (EFS)

The EFS system provides major filers or vendors filing on their behalf, with the mechanism to submit the required PRA forms electronically directly into the CAL-ACCESS database. The EFS system accepts and validates electronic filings from Cal-Online and directly from vendors.

#### 2) Power Search

Power Search is a search engine which accesses raw data of state-level campaign contributions ranging from 2001 to the present as reported to the CAL-ACCESS. Power Search is used to search for contributions to candidates and ballot measures and contributions from individuals, businesses, and other campaign committees. Power Search relies on the CAL-ACCESS raw data.

#### 3) Independent Expenditure Search

Independent Expenditures Search provides data on campaign spending that are not direct contributions to state candidates or statewide ballot measure committees. Independent Expenditures Search relies on the CAL-ACCESS raw data.

**Explain New System Interfaces:** [None envisioned](#)

**Data Center Location of the To-be Solution:** [Other](#)

If Other, specify: [Cloud](#)

### **Security**

**Access**

Public: [Yes](#)

Internal State Staff: [Yes](#)

External State Staff: [Yes](#)

Other: [No](#) Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Type of Information** (Select Yes or No for each to identify the type of information that requires protection. See the SAM Section 5305.5 for more information.)

Personal: [Yes](#)

Health: [No](#)

Tax: [No](#)

Financial: [Yes](#)

Legal: [No](#)

Confidential: [No](#)

Other: [Yes](#) Specify: [Photos](#)

**Protective Measures** (Select Yes or No to identify the protective measures used to protect information.)

Technical Security: [Yes](#)

Physical Security: [Yes](#)

Backup and Recovery: [Yes](#)

Identity Authorization and Authentication: [Yes](#)

Other, specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Total Viable Alternative #1 Solution Cost** (copy from FAW – Executive Cost Summary tab, cells E7 through E11):

Planning Costs: [\\$17,242,743](#)

One-Time (Project) Costs: [\\$61,622,257](#)

Total Future Ops. IT Staff OE&E Costs: [\\$27,029,980](#)

Total Proposed Cost: [\\$105,894,980](#)

Annual Future Ops. Costs (M&O): [\\$13,590,444](#)

## 2. Viable Alternative Solution #2

**Name:** [Modified Off the Shelf \(MOTS\) solution or accelerators based.](#)

**Description:** In this alternative, SOS would engage an external prime vendor to design, develop, test and develop a solution with Off the Shelf (MOTS) components or accelerators to develop a data driven CAL-ACCESS replacement system for campaign and lobbying entities to meet the filing requirements of the PRA more efficiently; improve data quality; expand public access to data; allow for system modifications and improvements to respond to statutory and regulatory changes; allow other system modifications to improve filer efficiency and public access to data; and improve the ability of the SOS, the FPPC and the FTB to fulfill mandated duties.

The prime vendor would develop the CAL-ACCESS replacement system by modifying off the shelf or MOTS system components, functions, or software accelerators for their solution development. In this alternative, the prime vendor could implement a mixture of off-the-shelf applications and custom components running in a Cloud infrastructure. Additionally, it would allow the prime vendor to configure and use existing application components to develop the solution.

**Why is this a viable solution?** Please explain:

The CARS RFI responses reflected that approximately 60% of respondents proposed using a mix of modified off the shelf or MOTS solution components and/or accelerators. Roughly 43% of the States surveyed during the CARS Market Research use vendor-developed systems with a mixture of accelerators and modified off the shelf system components. This approach would allow the prime vendor to meet complex system requirements by leveraging system components or accelerators for development. Many of the prime vendors could provide system development by utilizing accelerators such as tools to provide the replacement system solution.

This alternative solution works for California, offering the following advantages:

- A solution modified to fit CARS needs, meeting SOS business requirements
- Low code/no code (LCNC) development tools potentially allow less experienced developers to build and test applications quickly
- Potentially less time to deliver a solution
- Potentially lower development costs
- Rapid application development from the re-use of existing software components or libraries
- Ability for SOS to own and maintain the modified code that the vendor developed

This approach would allow the prime vendor to leverage existing off the shelf products and modify them to meet the SOS needs and CARS requirements.

This Alternatives has the following potential disadvantages:

- A MOTS require modifications to meet CARS business requirements, complex business rules and filing activities
- New releases of the MOTS components may require SOS to change or upgrade their solution software version to support the MOTS changes
- PRD may be dependent on the vendor for changes to the MOTS components or accelerators

## **Approach**

Increase staff – new or existing capabilities: Yes

Modify the existing business process or create a new business process: [Yes](#)

Reduce the services or level of services provided: [No](#)

Utilize new or increased contracted services: [Yes](#)

Enhance the existing IT system: [No](#)

Modify Statute/Policy/Regulations: [No](#)

Please Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Create a new IT system: [Yes](#)

Other: [No](#) Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

## Architecture Information

**Business Function(s)/Process(es):** [The Business Function or processes for this alternative are the same as Alternative 1 above.](#)

*TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add business processes with the same application, system, or component; COTS/Cloud Technology or custom solution; runtime environment; system interfaces, data center location; and security.*

## Conceptual Architecture

Attach a copy of the conceptual architecture to your email submission.

**COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology or Custom:** [COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology](#)

Name/Primary Technology: [To be decided based on the off the shelf solution used](#)

*TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add system software information if the application, system, or component uses additional system software.*

**Explain Existing System Interfaces:** [The existing system interfaces required to be supported by this alternative would be the same as in Alternative 1 above.](#)

**Explain New System Interfaces:** [None expected](#)

**Data Center Location of the To-be Solution:** [Other](#)

If Other, specify: [Cloud hosted](#)

## Security

### Access:

Public: [Yes](#)

Internal State Staff: [Yes](#)

External State Staff: [Yes](#)

Other: [No](#) Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Type of Information** (Select Yes or No for each to identify the type of information that requires protection. See the SAM Section 5305.5 for more information.)

Personal: [Yes](#)

Health: [No](#)

Tax: [No](#)

Financial: [Yes](#)

Legal: [No](#)

Confidential: [No](#)

Other: [Yes](#) Specify: [Photos](#)

**Protective Measures** (Select Yes or No to identify the protective measures used to protect information.)

Technical Security: [Yes](#)

Physical Security: [Yes](#)

Backup and Recovery: [Yes](#)

Identity Authorization and Authentication: [Yes](#)

Other, specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Total Viable Alternative #2 Solution Cost** (copy from FAW – Summary tab, cell AL33):

Total Proposed Cost: [\\$101,338,398](#)

### 3. Viable Alternative Solution #3

**Name:** [Not applicable](#)

**Description:**

SOS did not have a third viable alternative because of the following reasons:

- No Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) product exists that meet all of the SOS' needs and CARS requirements.
- Complexity levels for the CARS solution have been adjudged as large and complex. SOS' current staffing is insufficient for an inhouse design, development, testing and implementation of the end-to-end CARS solution.

**Why is this a viable solution?** Please explain:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Approach**

Increase staff – new or existing capabilities: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Modify the existing business process or create a new business process: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Reduce the services or level of services provided: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Utilize new or increased contracted services: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Enhance the existing IT system: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Modify Statute/Policy/Regulations: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Please Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

Create a new IT system: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Other: [Choose Yes or No](#). Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

## Architecture Information

**Business Function(s)/Process(es):** [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

*TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add business processes with the same application, system, or component; COTS/Cloud Technology or custom solution; runtime environment; system interfaces, data center location; and security.*

### Conceptual Architecture

Attach a copy of the conceptual architecture to your email submission.

**COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology or Custom:** [Choose an item](#).

Name/Primary Technology: [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

*TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add system software information if the application, system, or component uses additional system software.*

**Explain Existing System Interfaces:** [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

**Explain New System Interfaces:** [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

**Data Center Location of the To-be Solution:** [Choose an item](#).

If Other, specify: [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

## Security

### Access:

Public: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Internal State Staff: [Choose Yes or No](#).

External State Staff: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Other: [Choose Yes or No](#). Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text](#).

**Type of Information** (Select Yes or No for each to identify the type of information that requires protection. See the SAM Section 5305.5 for more information.)

Personal: [Choose Yes or No](#).

Health: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Tax: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Financial: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Legal: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Confidential: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Other: [Choose Yes or No.](#) Specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Protective Measures** (Select Yes or No to identify the protective measures used to protect information.)

Technical Security: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Physical Security: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Backup and Recovery: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Identity Authorization and Authentication: [Choose Yes or No.](#)

Other, specify: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Total Viable Alternative #3 Solution Cost** (copy from FAW – Summary tab, cell AL50):

Total Proposed Cost: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

## 2.9 Project Organization

Project planning includes the process of identifying how and when specific labor skill sets are needed to ensure that the proposed project has sufficient staff with the appropriate knowledge and experience by the time the project moves into execution. All staff identified in the following sections should be included in the Financial Analysis Worksheet to be completed in Section 2.12.

### 1. Project Organization Chart:

**Attach** the Project Organization Chart to your email submission.

[Attachment #21 SOS CARS Org Chart- All Staff](#)

### 2. Is the department running this project as a matrixed or projectized organization?

[Projectized](#)

In each of the following sections, provide a concise description of the approach to staffing the proposed project including contingencies for business/program, IT, or administrative areas to maintain ongoing operations in conjunction with the proposed project.

#### 1. Administrative

[Executive leadership – Executive Leadership on the project will be provided by the Deputy Secretary of State – Chief Operations Officer \(COO\) and the Deputy Secretary of State](#)

(Deputy SOS). The COO and the Deputy SOS will serve as the Executive Sponsor and Executive Co-Sponsor of the project. The Executive Sponsor will chair the Executive Steering Committee (ESC), and the Executive Co-Sponsor will chair it in his absence. The COO and Deputy Secretary have management responsibility for the primary business program(s) affected by this proposal as well as for information technology. The COO and Deputy Secretary will provide resources and strategic direction with an enterprise view and will be expected to resolve/mediate issues that cannot be handled at lower levels in the project team. If necessary, the Secretary of State will be engaged to provide guidance and decision making on matters of high risk and sensitivity to the SOS organization.

Previous large information technology (IT) projects at the SOS have also employed an ESC composed of executive leadership, affected business area representatives, and IT representatives. The CARS Project will also utilize this ESC model as an additional means of communication, decision-making, and priority setting. The ESC will meet regularly over the course of the planning and execution phases of the project. The Project Charter, the Governance Plan, the Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, and other associated project planning documents will specifically spell out the expectations and commitment for the ESC, and the other leadership roles in the project.

Acquisition Support – The CARS Project will leverage both the SOS Contract Services Unit of the Management Services Division and the CDT's Statewide Technology Procurement (STP) unit to provide guidance and assistance during the prime vendor procurement phase and other ancillary procurements (e.g., IV&V services, OCM services, etc.). Both the Contract Services Unit and the STP have experienced contract staff who specialize in IT vendor contracting and procurement. They played a key role in the development and release of a Request for Information (RFI) as one of several market research activities of this project. Both teams have supported the development and execution of Requests for Proposals (RFPs), as well as other solicitation documents, and composed the resulting contracts for many the SOS' IT projects, including four large system integration projects of similar size and complexity. The planned CARS Project procurement and implementation schedule anticipates the current and planned allocation of these key resources across the various functions they perform within the agency. Key CARS Project activities and deliverables are planned so as not to conflict with planned implementation of other significant projects being undertaken by the SOS. The CARS project will include a resource management plan that will address future conflicts should they occur.

Other key internal and external stakeholders, such as SOS Fiscal or the FPPC, campaign filers, data consumers, etc. will be kept informed through regular communication and outreach that will be detailed in the Project Charter and Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Plan during the planning process. These entities will also be included at some level in the market research and alternatives analysis activities as some alternatives may have a significant impact on their business operations that will need to be considered before a solution approach is determined.

## **2. Business Program**

The overwhelming majority of the business staff effort necessary to complete this project will come from the PRD. The PRD is the sole business unit responsible for processing,



maintaining, and disseminating campaign finance and lobbying activity filings made by committees and lobbying entities.

The primary business area will be represented at the senior level by the PRD Division Chief. This person shall also serve on the ESC. The PRD Division Chief is the business owner and is ultimately responsible for business functionality of the solution. As such, the PRD Division Chief will be responsible for providing the necessary subject matter experts to develop and validate business requirements that will result in an acceptable solution. The current PRD Division Chief (Acting), Margie Hieter, comes in with significant experience in successfully implementing statewide business/technology efforts that involved real changes in the way diverse groups of stakeholders performed their functions. Using high levels of communication and coordination, Ms. Hieter has assisted with past projects throughout the state. Ms. Hieter currently also serves as the agency's primary liaison with the FPPC, one of the CARS Project's key external stakeholders.

The midlevel of business area management will be represented by the PRD Assistant Division Chief. This manager will be responsible for the day-to-day guidance of the business program team during the procurement and execution phases of the project. The Assistant Division Chief will have primary responsibility for allocating resources (subject matter and technical) to meet the needs of the project while maintaining PRD's services to the public. The current PRD Assistant Division Chief, Margie Hieter, brings over 20 years of government experience in the planning and execution of important program initiatives. Margie Hieter has leveraged her communication, collaboration, and negotiating skills to successfully complete large projects ranging from urban redevelopment to facility construction / expansion to the implementation of public service programs. Margie is also a certified Project Management Professional.

To the extent that the chosen solution will accept online fine and fee payments, it will be necessary to involve select staff from the SOS Fiscal Section and the Information Security Officer (ISO) to validate payment formats and security protocols.

Management from both the SOS Fiscal and the ISO have been involved in the development of this proposal and are aware that there will be some need for involvement of staff for specific tasks during project execution, primarily during requirements gathering and testing. In addition, the SOS currently has a weekly Division Chiefs meeting that also includes a representative from the executive office. Through this forum, agency priorities can be continually evaluated, and resource allocation decisions can be made. This project is regularly reported on during the Division Chiefs meeting.

### **3. Information Technology**

The planning for a new solution procurement and the subsequent support of the implementation and maintenance of a new system requires a team of highly skilled technical staff with expertise in several IT domains. Regardless of the platform chosen, the technical team will be required to interact with the legacy system's infrastructure and data as well as review and provide IT-related feedback on all proposed solution alternatives. The technical team will also be a critical partner who will assist the planning vendor with the technical aspects of the solicitation document development, and the team will also provide its expertise during the vendor bid evaluation activities. Once the prime vendor is onboard, the technical

team will work closely with them on a myriad of activities related to the technical design, development, and implementation of the system.

The senior level of IT management will be represented by the Chief Information Officer (CIO), who is a member of the ESC. The CIO will ultimately be responsible for providing sufficient inhouse technical resources to achieve the project objectives as well as for managing any contract staff serving in a technical capacity.

The second level of IT management will consist of the Chief Technology Officer/Deputy CIO. This level of management and its team of IT staff will provide input into all planning activities from an IT perspective, including documentation developed during each PAL stage. This manager will also be responsible for the tactical allocation of resources and technical aspects of the project during the execution phases. This team includes a CARS IT Solutions Manager who will manage resource coordination, scheduling, and oversight of the CARS project for ITD resources both dedicated to the project and for integration with other IT operations.

The project's approach to IT staff for planning and execution support has also includes staff who will provide expertise in several technical areas required by this project:

- Database administration
- Data cleansing and validation
- Data conversion and migration
- System interfaces, both internal and external
- Web development
- Expenditure reporting
- IT budgeting, licensing, and asset management
- Data analytics

Both the independent assessment and the CDT's recommendations identified the need to clean and prepare the CAL-ACCESS data prior to implementation of a new system. The SOS has put together a Data Analytics team to work on complex application data, identify challenges and develop solutions, and bring technical expertise to ensure the quality and accuracy of CAL-ACCESS data. Major tasks planned as part of the data analytics effort include work on query development and optimization, analysis of data and formulation of methods for new or revised data processing systems, data research and analysis to respond to public inquiries, development of a reconciliation and verification strategy to ensure data integrity, data research and analysis to respond to public inquiries, development of data diagrams, data inventory, and long-term data analytics support to provide data transparency for various enterprise applications. The work focused on creating, processing, designing, and presenting data will assist the CARS Project team make informed decisions and implement the vision of the new system architecture.

The Data Analytics team are also responsible for analyzing and understanding the details of over 40 FPPC forms and their corresponding data that will be supported by the new solution. They are responsible for understanding an end-to-end view of each form and the associated data mapping, which will be critical during the design phase. They will be the technical SMEs for the FPPC forms, assisting the project during system implementation and maintaining and managing the forms during M&O.

## 4. Testing

### *Unit Testing*

If applicable, the prime vendor will create formal unit test scripts that will be used to execute tests for customized processes and record the test results. Any problems encountered will be tracked through the system defect process, so that defects, corrections, and subsequent retesting will be tracked.

### *System Testing Phase*

The prime vendor will conduct the system testing phase which will be subject to a formal System Test Plan, which will control all phases of the system test such as testing administered by small, medium, and large reporting/data requests and load testing to reflect the expected number of end users. All test results will be formally documented, and any problems encountered will be documented and processed through the system problem correction process. After problems areas are resolved and successfully unit tested, the vendor will conduct system regression testing to ensure the problem has been fully corrected in the larger systemwide context.

### *Integration Testing Phase*

The prime vendor will conduct this testing phase which will be supported by a formal Integration Test Plan. This testing will be executed to ensure that all the components of the solution work together as required, including external interface partner testing. All test results will be formally documented, and any problems will be documented and forwarded through the system problem correction process. After problems are corrected and successfully unit tested, system regression testing will be done to ensure the problem has been corrected in the application environment context.

### *User Acceptance Testing Phase*

The SOS will conduct User Acceptance Testing, which is the final phase of solution testing prior to go live. A formal User Acceptance Test Plan will be developed, which will include end-to-end solution functionality testing based on formal UAT test scripts, which will also include external interface partner testing, security testing, performance testing, and ADA compliance testing. The User Acceptance Test Plan will describe the scope, test scripts, and processes and expected results of the user acceptance testing. All test results will be formally documented in a User Acceptance Test Report. This information within this report will be used as part of the project's "go/no go" criteria whose purpose is to indicate whether the system is ready for implementation.

As problems are encountered and corrected, the new software version(s) will be subject to the testing described above, including user testing by the SOS' subject matter expert team.

## 5. Data Conversion/Migration

The CARS Project activities will include not only a robust data conversion and migration component but also a thorough data cleansing and validation effort in preparation for the data conversion and migration activities.

During the planning phase, the planning support services contractor will both formally plan and then perform the legacy data cleansing and validation activities, which includes migrating the cleansed data to a staging environment. This effort will be overseen by experienced ITD staff familiar with data cleansing and validation.

The system integration vendor will both assess the current and future data models and develop a formal Data Conversion and Migration Plan. The vendor will then be responsible for executing the entire data conversion and migration effort. The ITD team and the PRD business SMEs will provide support for this effort by assisting the vendor with understanding the data and the developing and testing of data conversion and migration rules.

The project has planned its resources to ensure the necessary legacy data experts (both PRD and ITD staff) are available during the appropriate project phases to assist with the conversion and migration to the new solution.

## **6. Training**

The SOS has undertaken several significant and high-profile information technology system development projects in recent years which it expects to leverage and adapt for the CARS Project. One example is the implementation of the federal Help America Vote Act (HAVA) requirements, which includes the implementation of a statewide voter registration database. In planning, designing, and implementing the statewide voter registration database (VoteCal), the SOS met regularly with stakeholders such as Common Cause, League of Women Voters, and many others. The SOS established a Business Process Committee with California counties to ensure VoteCal integrated county election management systems into a seamless statewide voter registration system. The County Business Process Committee and the SOS continue to meet on a regular basis to discuss any issues, risks, and future changes including regulatory or technical.

The SOS also implemented an online voter registration system that was considered by some a model system. Implementation of this system necessitated close coordination with county elections officials who are on the “front lines” of voter registration activities as well as statewide stakeholders and accessibility experts.

As part of AB1461, the SOS and DMV implemented automatic voter registration for eligible voters who apply for or renew a driver license or identification card or change their address with the DMV. The DMV and SOS successfully deployed the New Motor Voter program and continue to meet on a regular basis to discuss any future changes. The SOS processes approximately 300,000 new and updated voter registrations per month from DMV.

Each of these efforts required continuous communication with the Legislature, stakeholders, the public, and counties through formal and informal communications.

The Secretary of State also implemented the California Business Connect (CBC) project successfully and modernized the way California does business with the Secretary of State. Benefits of the new system include electronic processing of Business Entity (BE) filings and Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) filings with automated crosschecking and data validation. The automation of these processes has allowed the Secretary of State to maintain and

improve on the agency's goal of five business day turnaround for business filings. The new online system also provides an automated means for the agency to preserve and manage the vital business records of the State. This project included monthly external stakeholder meetings, meetings with other state agencies with which electronic data is now exchanged, and training programs for both internal and external users of the new system.

These SOS IT projects and initiatives have involved significant amounts of both training and organizational change management (OCM). The plan is for the CARS Project to leverage the aspects of the training and OCM methodologies that our project management staff has found effective during these past efforts. These methodologies will be tailored to meet the requirements of the project and the expectations of the CAL-ACCESS external stakeholders. The CARS Project will also acquire a OCM lead to support the SOS team with its OCM efforts.

It is anticipated that the prime vendor will provide a plan for solution training to a designated number of SOS staff, both PRD and ITD, and other selected solution users. Such training will be provided at a location within California, preferably within the greater Sacramento area.

The SOS will also be conducting stakeholder and public education during all phases of the project to enhance participation and ownership in the project. The SOS anticipates conducting additional education for customers and stakeholders once the system is implemented and may require the prime vendor to provide training sessions and detailed user handbooks for the public.

The project anticipates moving the PRD campaign finance and lobbying activity reporting processes from the current paper/FTP/online hybrid model to one that is primarily online. As a result, most of the current PRD processes will be required to change, including the current PRD staff duties.

All the current manual filing processes are expected to change when the new system is implemented. As the new model is anticipated to be almost completely online, the processing of paper streams will be eliminated. The business process for PRD staff side will then change from a matching and reviewing effort to one that uses system generated exception reports to identify filings that need staff attention. Some automation of the correspondence is also expected, though staff will still likely have a manual correspondence process for exceptions. Upfront system data validation should reduce the error rate and keep exceptions to a minimum. From the filers' side, internal processes may need change depending on the interfaces selected to submit filings electronically. For example, the existing process of creating a large text flat file that is uploaded to the SOS' servers via FTP may become an .xml file that is uploaded through the SOS website. Even though these types of changes were common themes in the initial stakeholder outreach, the PRD realizes that such changes will have a significant effect on the filer community. The project's prime vendor contract and both the Training and OCM plans will, by necessity, include a substantial education and outreach component to meet the needs of the filer communities the various data consumers and advocacy groups.

Finally, while the project is adequately staffed with dedicated project resources from both the PRD and the ITD to fully participate in the project's planning and executions activities, the project team will continuously work with the PRD and the ITD to identify any potential business disruption and customer impacts which might result from this proposal's planning and

execution effort, and it will ensure the necessary resources and processes are in place to mitigate any disruption of day-to-day business services.

## 7. Organizational Change Management

As stated in Section 6 Training, current manual filing processes are expected to change when the new system is implemented, and this will have a significant effect on the filer community as well as the business process for PRD staff.

Project success is partially dependent on clear, accurate, timely, and appropriate information communicated in an effective and professional manner. The Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Plan incorporates communication best practices and methods and aligns with recommendations outlined in Project Management Institute's Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK), Prosci's ADKAR OCM framework; California Department of Technology's California Project Management Framework (CA-PMF) and California Change Management Framework (CA-CMF) guidelines. The Plan also incorporates lessons learned and input from CARS project stakeholders and the experience and expertise of CARS project team members and SOS staff.

A principled approach to communicating and implementing change fosters openness and trust which ultimately improves the project's chances of success. The approach, methodology, and methods used will build Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, and Ability and Reinforce continued adoption of the project and planned changes. (*Reference: Prosci's ADKAR model/framework*)

**Awareness** (of the project goals/objectives, timeline, progress/status, actions/activities, and decisions)

**Desire** to support the project and related changes, engage in meetings and activities, and take actions needed

**Knowledge** (of the system look, use, and benefits; and changes to policy, procedures, processes, organizational structure, and technology)

**Ability** (to use the new system, business processes, protocols, and technology)

**Reinforcement** (feedback on actions taken during the project and reinforcement messages that convey the level of adoption and realization of desired outcomes, changes, and benefits)

The Organizational Change Management (OCM) Consultants will possess extensive experience in applying communications and stakeholder engagement best practices on similar State of California and other technology, process, and other business transformation projects. The OCM Consultants will review the SOS Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Plan and stakeholder engagement and communications activities.

The Consultants will work with the SOS Training and Outreach Team (TOT) to support stakeholder communications activities. The change manager is expected to play a key role to ensure change initiatives meet objectives by increasing employee adoption and usage. This person will focus on the people side of change, including business processes, systems and technology, job roles and organizational structure. These activities are essential to ensuring the

implementation efforts will sufficiently cover the business needs of the program, as well as properly communicate the transition between the “As-Is” and “To-Be” states.

They will develop and maintain the OCM Plan and ensure that it is followed and approved by the Project Director. The OCM Plan will provide strategy for managing the impact of change during the implementation of the new system. This resource will report to the Project Director and will work with the Business Analyst, and PRD Staff to organize and manage change management activities throughout the project. They will advise designated SOS Project team members on OCM issues that arise during the project and provide an ongoing assessment of the OCM approach, communication, deliverables, and work products, etc. to help ensure that OCM activities are designed and executed in a manner that meets the SOS’ requirements and is consistent with the OCM Plan. These assessments will include appropriate findings and recommendations.

## **8. Resource Capacity/Skills/Knowledge for Stage 3 Solution Development**

This narrative should include the experience level and quantity of procurement, contract management, and budget staff who will be responsible for the Stage 3 Solution Development.

Below are identified the experience level and quantity of procurement, contract management and budget staff who will support all activities associated with Stage 3 Solution Development (S3SD).

### Business, Technical, and Procurement Staff

The CARS Project will be leveraging the expertise of key staff from the SOS’ PRD and ITD to provide guidance and feedback on the planning vendor’s effort to develop the prime vendor solicitation document.

- The ITD team has many years of experience both supporting the legacy CAL-ACCESS as well as working on earlier attempts to replace the legacy system. Additionally, they have years of experience supporting all aspects of other SOS IT project’s, such as the CBC Project and VoteCal Project. The team has deep expertise in the CAL-ACCESS legacy system’s technical architecture as well as a detailed understanding of the legacy data and the steps needed to prepare it for conversion and migration to the new solution.
- As described above SOS PRD brings an experienced program team to the analysis and planning of this project. All key staff have had prior experience in the development of business cases, requirements development, and assistance with the solicitation document review. The PRD subject matter expert team have many years of experience in its political reform policy field and has a deep knowledge of the business rules that the new solution must accommodate. They also are knowledgeable of the various types of system users and their business needs. They too have a deep understanding of the legacy data and can support the ITD and prime vendor to ensure it is accurately mapped to the new solution prior to conversion and migration.

The SOS’ Management Services Division (MSD-Contracts) will facilitate all ancillary procurements needed during project planning and execution phases and will also assist the CDT’s STP with review of the prime vendor solicitation document and bidder evaluation

materials. The MSD includes an experienced procurement team to assist the Stage 3 activities, including:

- Shannon Kauffman, who has more than 21 years' experience in the procurement field, and
- Raquelle Lassetter, who has more than 16 years' experience in the procurement field.

The MSD-Contracts procurement team has many years of experience with prior projects' IT solution solicitation efforts, and they are experienced using the procurement approach chosen identified above. Additionally, they have years of experience working with CDT STP using its prime vendor solicitation documents and are familiar with protest types and use of Public Contract Code (PCC) 6611.

#### Planning Vendor Procurement Staff

To assist with all aspects of the prime vendor acquisition, the project has hired planning support services vendor Aptakrit. The vendor's tasks and deliverables not only include the S2AA's mid-level requirements and market research/alternatives analysis activities, but also development of both draft and final versions of the prime vendor solicitation document, including development of an Evaluation and Scoring Document and training to SOS staff who will participate in the selection process.

The key contractor staff hired to undertake these procurement related activities include:

- Anand Deshmukh, PMP, has more than 23 years' experience on State of California information technology and private projects in a management role over multidisciplinary teams, applying project management principles, and tools including most recently, CA-PMF and PAL. More than 15 years representing the State of California, leading Project Management activities for the State's information technology implementations.
- Ralph Petty, PMP, has more than 20 years' experience, including experience providing support to state project team members in developing requirements for proposal development efforts. Ralph worked with business and technical teams to develop and mature requirements, a project timeline, and a Statement of Work.
- Koteswara Uppala has a total of 16 years of experience with data conversion, data quality, migration utilizing ETL tools and technologies.
- Hamid Khan has over 17 years' experience managing process re-engineering life cycle by performing current state analysis, creating "As Is" and "To Be" process flows diagrams and description documents. Hamid's experience includes system analysis and design to define the problems, identify causes, specify solutions, and identify requirements for system acquisition efforts.
- William Curry has written various books on the subject matter, for implementing public procurement best practices for federal, state, and local government agencies. This includes policies, procedures, and contract templates to incorporate best public procurement practices. Mr. Curry has provided procurement management, development, evaluation, and training services to several government agencies. During Stage 3, William will distinctly and directly contribute to the development of the draft, version 2, version 3, and the final solicitation deliverables. He will also be distinctly responsible for supporting the Evaluation Document and Training deliverable activities.



## Contract Management & Deliverable Management

The key staff that the CARS Project is leveraging for the contract management activities include two individuals from the SOS' enterprise project management office:

- John Bryce, who has more than 20 years' experience at the SOS, including XX years working the PMO assisting IT development and implementation efforts.
- Keith Norris has several years' experience working in IT projects including performing deliverable management activities for SOS IT projects.

## Budget Staff

The SOS brings an experienced fiscal team to the analysis and planning of this project. All key fiscal staff have had prior experience with SOS IT solution planning and development efforts, including IT project BCP/SFL development, IT project cost expenditure tracking, quarterly reports to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, FAW's development, etc.

## Project Management Office

The SOS Project Management Office is composed of many experienced IT staff, each of whom have years of experience in IT project management, including IT vendor solicitations. Their expertise will be leveraged to ensure the solicitation document and evaluation process aligns with project management industry standards and best practices.

## Project Governance

The project's governance framework, specifically the ESC, has decision making authority that includes procurement related decision making (in addition to project decision making). All procurement related matters will be brought before them prior to initiating a procurement or entering into an agreement.

## 2.10 Project Planning

### 1. Project Management Risk Assessment

Updated Project Management Risk Score: 1.1

**Attach** Updated PM Risk Assessment to your email submission. [SIMM Section 45A](#)

Attachment #22 SIMM 45 Appendix A 2022 1222

### 2. Project Charter

Is your project charter approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority and available for the Department of Technology to review? **Choose:** 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Not Applicable.' If 'No' or 'Not Applicable,' provide the artifact status in the space provided.

[Project Charter \(Approved\):](#) Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**Attach** a copy of the Project Charter to your email submission.

[Attachment #23 CARS Project Charter V1-2](#)

### 3. Project Plans

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

**Choose:** 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Not Applicable.' If 'No' or 'Not Applicable,' provide the artifact status in the space provided.

**Note:** For Low to medium complexity and cost projects, discuss with your PAO manager the option of submitting a Master Project Management Plan in place of individual plans.

[Attachment #24 CARS Scope Management Plan \(Approved\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #25 CARS Communication Management Plan \(Approved\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #26 CARS Schedule Management Plan \(Approved\)](#) : Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #27 CARS Procurement Management Plan \(Approved\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #28 CARS Requirements Management Plan \(Approved\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Stakeholder Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: Communication and Stakeholder plans are combined.

[Attachment #29 CARS Governance Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #30 CARS Contract Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #31 CARS Resource Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #32 CARS Change Control Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #33 CARS Change Request Template](#)

[Attachment #34 CARS Risk Management Plan \(Draft + Risk Log\)](#): Yes

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

[Attachment #35 CARS Issue Submission Form](#)

[Attachment #36 CARS Risk Register & Issue Log](#)

[Attachment #37 CARS Risk Submission Form](#)

[Issue and Action Item Management Plan \(Draft + Issue Log\): Yes](#)

Status: Risk and Issue plans are combined.

[Attachment #38 CARS Cost Management Plan \(Approved if planning BCP approved\): Yes](#)

Status: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

#### 4. Project Roadmap (High-Level)

**Attach** a high-level Project Roadmap showing remainder of planning phase and transition into execution phase to the email submission.

[Attachment #39 High-Level Project Roadmap V2](#)

- a) Planning Start Date: [7/1/2022](#)
- b) Estimated Planning End Date: [2/29/2024](#)
- c) Estimated Project Start Date: [3/1/2024](#)
- d) Estimated Project End Date: [10/31/2026](#)

## 2.11 Data Cleansing, Conversion, and Migration

**If in Section 2.3 (above) the answer to the question “Do you have existing data that must be migrated to your new solution?” was marked “Yes,” please complete this section.**

The California Department of Technology recommends having a Data Consultant start data cleansing, conversion, and migration activities as soon as possible.

Identify the status of each of the following data activities. If “Not Applicable” is chosen, explain why the activity is not applicable or if “Not Started” is chosen, explain when the activity will start and its anticipated duration:

1. **Current Environment Analysis:** [Completed](#)
2. **Data Migration Plan:** [In Progress](#)
3. **Data Profiling:** [In Progress](#)
4. **Data Cleansing and Correction:** [In Progress](#)
5. **Data Quality Assessment:** [In Progress](#)
6. **Data Quality Business Rules:** [In Progress](#)
7. **Data Dictionaries:** [Completed](#)
8. **Data Conversion/Migration Requirements:** [In Progress](#)

## 2.12 Financial Analysis Worksheets

Attach [F.2 Financial Analysis Worksheet\(s\)](#) to the email submission.

Attachment #40 F.2-FAW CARS S2AA 02102023

**End of agency/state entity document.**

**Please ensure ADA compliance before submitting this document to CDT.**

**When ready, submit Stage 2 and all attachments in an email to [ProjectOversight@state.ca.gov](mailto:ProjectOversight@state.ca.gov).**

**Department of Technology Use Only**

**Original "New Submission" Date:** 2/15/2023

**Form Received Date:** 3/16/2023

**Form Accepted Date:** 3/16/2023

**Form Status:** Completed

**Form Status Date:** 5/12/2023

**Form Disposition:** Approved

**Form Disposition Date:** 5/12/2023