



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

1.1 General Information

Agency or State Entity Name:	Public Utilities Commission (PUC)
Organization Code:	8660
Proposal Name:	TUFFS replacement
Proposal Description:	The PUC proposes to replace its Telecommunications User Fee Filing System (TUFFS) to change the methodology for collecting approximately \$800 million annually in Public Purpose Program (PPP) funds and the Commission's User Fee from telecommunications carriers to simplify the process at both ends.
When do you want to start this project?	1/3/2022
Department of Technology Project Number:	8660-094

1.2 Submittal Information

Contact Information:	
Contact First Name	Contact Last Name
Mike	Bonner
Contact Email	Contact Phone Number
Michael.Bonner@cpuc.ca.gov	916-823-4790
Submission Date:	7/21/2021
Version Number:	1.1

Project Approval Executive Transmittal

Attachment:

1.3 Business Sponsorship

Executive Sponsors

Title	First Name	Last Name	Business Program Area
Communications Director	Robert	Osborn	Communications Division
Executive Director	Rachel	Peterson	Executive Office

Select + to add additional Executive Sponsors

Business Owners

Title	First Name	Last Name	Business Program Area
Program and Project Supervisor	Felix	Robles	Communications Division
Branch Manager	Risa	Hernandez	Communications Division
Communications Director	Robert	Osborn	Communications Division

Select + to add additional Business Owners

Program Background and Context

The Commission must address the need for a sustainable and cost-effective method to fund the state's six Universal Service Public Purpose Programs (PPPs); the California High-Cost Fund (CHCF)-A and CHCF-B, California Advanced Services Fund, California Teleconnect Fund, Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program and *LifeLine* programs, plus the Commission's User Fee. The current funding mechanism for these programs and the User Fee is based on a percentage surcharge applied to intrastate telecommunications service revenue and is not sustainable due to the continuing decline of the intrastate revenue billing base being reported by service providers. From Calendar Year 2012 through CY 2020, carriers' total reported intrastate billing base decreased from \$15.6 billion to \$6.4 billion, causing—in the case of some programs—the need to increase surcharge percentages to recover funding, even if a program's total



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

budget has remained consistent. CPUC rulemaking (R.)21-03-002 is updating the current fund collection methodology to levying surcharges based on a single, monthly per-access line (or equivalent) charge, which would stabilize fund collection and funds reserves. The CPUC also seeks to align the frequency of user fee remittance with the surcharge change and levy it monthly.

Currently, intrastate surcharge revenue and resulting funds payment are reported monthly by authorized carriers into the Commission’s proprietary Telecommunications User Fee Filing System (TUFFS). Upon having monthly data entered by the carrier’s designated representative/contact into TUFFS, carriers are directed to make separate payments through the TUFFS portal for each of the six programs, and, additionally, a payment into the User Fee account each calendar quarter. Payments for each program, plus the User Fee (quarterly), are then aggregated and placed into the respective program accounts. The Fiscal Services group (Administrative Services Division) is responsible for maintaining these accounts and communicating with Communications Division regarding account issues. Transactions and funds deposits are facilitated by automatic clearing house (ACH) transfer/Union Bank and uploaded into the existing TUFFS system daily.

This change to a flat surcharge fee structure and increasing user fee remittance frequency would provide a straightforward and flexible structure for service providers to collect and remit funds to support the PPPs and User Fee. By implementing a per access-line (or equivalent) charge, the new system would aggregate the carriers’ monthly, single surcharge payments allocated to each program fund and the User Fee on a weighted basis (to be administered by the Fiscal Services group in consultation with Communications Division) and would minimize the volume of entry errors made by carriers that are currently required to separately make payments to each individual program and User fee fund. This fund allocation process would be very similar to the method followed by Fiscal Services in allocating Mobile Telephony Service funds remitted by the Board of Equalization during calendar years 2016-2018.

This project will require the system to allow administering the existing reporting and collection process prior to the transition date to support auditing requirements, as well as administering the new reporting and collection process from the transition date forward. Additionally, the project may have to allow flexibility for the handling of the surcharges for the DDTP and user fees, which both require legislative changes to align with the new surcharge/ user fee structure.

1.4 Stakeholders

Key Stakeholders

Org. Name	Name	
Fiscal Services group (CPUC Administrative Services Division)	Betty Lee	
Internal or External?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal <input type="checkbox"/> External	
When is the Stakeholder impacted?		
Input to Business Process	During the Business Process	Output of the Business Process
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

How are Stakeholders impacted?		
<p>This will create a new process between the reporting/payment end and the Commission end and result in less work caused to correct reporting errors. Currently, TUFFS requires reporting carriers to enter intrastate revenue into the portal and based on that figure directs them to remit seven separate payments into individual program “buckets”. The new process will require a carrier to make one entry based on the count of served access lines (or equivalent) multiplied by an annually determined single end-user surcharge. TUFFS will then direct the carrier to make one payment into the system. Program and User Fee payment amounts will then be allocated by Fiscal Services in consultation with Communications Division (CD). The allocation will be based on an internal, annually determined fund disbursement mechanism calculated by CD and set by the Commission. Program and User Fee payments will be disbursed monthly by Fiscal in coordination with Union Bank, who maintains the funds and respective balances. This will result in Fiscal Services and CD staff responding to a substantial decrease in TUFFS payment research inquiries, collection adjustments to offset, debit, or credit misapplied fund payments, and refund requests. This will also reduce staff collection inquiries directly with carriers. Fiscal Services staff will continue to review daily uploaded file data comparing surcharge receipts reported by Union Bank against TUFFS data to ensure fund balance integrity. The new system implementation will result in a decreased workload caused by a lower incidence of carrier entry errors and resulting fund balance offsets and refund requests.</p>		
How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?		
<p>Fiscal Services will be included in any review of new procedures and processes associated with the new system, including reporting and payment interface and its visual screen appearance. This means that Fiscal Services should be fully involved in system testing as a reflection of the daily TUFFS system tasks described above, carrier reporting instruction design, and advising on needs for the system/portal interface design.</p>		
Org. Name	Name	
Information Technology Group	David Haro, Amanda Hult	
Internal or External?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal <input type="checkbox"/> External	
When is the Stakeholder impacted?		
Input to Business Process	During the Business Process	Output of the Business Process
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
How are Stakeholders impacted?		
<p>IT receives daily files from Union Bank containing carrier payment data to upload into TUFFS, and will be involved in this interface with Union Bank.</p>		
How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?		
<p>Will participate in system design programming, and maintenance and operation.</p>		
Org. Name	Name	
Union Bank/First Data	Virginia Cortez. Email address: Virginia.Cortez@unionbank.com	
Internal or External?	<input type="checkbox"/> Internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> External	
When is the Stakeholder impacted?		
Input to Business Process	During the Business Process	Output of the Business Process
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
How are Stakeholders impacted?		
<p>Union Bank and First Data will need to coordinate data and payment issues with the Fiscal Services and IT groups, and CD should be included in this discussion as well.</p>		
How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?		
<p>Union Bank and First Data will need to help design and test a new interface for carriers to report and remit payments, with input from CD and Fiscal Services as necessary.</p>		
Org. Name	Name	



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

Telecommunications carriers. Approximately 1,000 reporting carriers are impacted	Telecommunications Carriers	
Internal or External?	<input type="checkbox"/> Internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> External	
When is the Stakeholder impacted?		
Input to Business Process	During the Business Process	Output of the Business Process
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
How are Stakeholders impacted?		
<p>Carriers report surcharge revenue monthly and User Fee revenue quarterly, and make resulting payment. Currently, they are required to make monthly entries into seven fields each for both prepaid and non-prepaid revenue (14 total). The new system will require one entry, with one corresponding payment field, simplifying the entire process. The new system will require carriers to implement customer billing programming changes which may take six to nine months, and provide customer notification of the surcharge collection proces and methodology. Voice over Internet Protocol carriers may be required to pay User Fees subject to the outcome of this Rulemaking. Even with a simplified system, carriers will require CPUC staff training/direction re: the changes involved in per access line (or equivalent) reporting and remittance.</p>		
How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?		
<p>Carriers generally support this proposal. The Commission encourages all carriers to provide input and data during the process of gathering information to develop system design requiements, including portal testing to ensure system effectiveness and developing an instruction document that outlines the reporting and payment transition. This may be best administered by selecting a group of representattives from carriers who are amenable to this transition and willing to provide input.</p>		
<i>Select + to add additional Stakeholders</i>		

1.5 Business Program

Org. Name	Name		
Communications Division	Various staff who will be assigned to TUFFS administration		
When is the unit impacted?			
Input to the Business Process	During the Business Process	Output of the Business Process	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
How is the business program unit impacted?			
<p>Staff will use the system daily to access and review accounts for payments and respond to payment inquiries. Staff will access accounts to compile data such as payment history or to use such data to contact delinquent carriers regarding payment arrangements. We anticipate a significant reduction in carrier entry errors and resulting customer services inquiries, payment adjustments, and refunds. Such review of these issues is usually done in coordination with Fiscal Services staff and when necessary, Union Bank.</p>			
How will the business program participate in the project?			
<p>CD will participate in gathering data consistent with the need for establishing all system requirements and in communicating with all stakeholders including a substantial number of carriers. Also, CD Staff—as the carriers’ point of contact— will both train carriers and act as a reference source to field carrier inquiries about the new system as well as the reporting process and procedures. Staff will also participate in testing and design aspects of the project. CD will also encourage a collaboration between the Program Claims Management System and this project to see if we can harmonize data associated with the PCMS and the new TUFFS.</p>			
<i>Select + to add additional Business Programs</i>			

1.6 Business Alignment

Business Driver(s)			
Financial Benefit			
Increased Revenue	Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Cost Recovery
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

Mandate(s)			
State		Federal	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Improvement			
Better Services to Citizens	Efficiencies to Program Operations	Improved Health and/or Human Safety	Technology Refresh
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Security			
Improved Information Security	Improved Business Continuity	Improved Technology Recovery	Technology End of Life
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Strategic Business Alignment			
Strategic Plan Last Updated?		Date Picker	
Strategic Business Goal		Alignment	
CPUC Strategic Directive (SD)-04 (Supporting and Empowering Consumers), part 4 “Administer the efficient and fair collection of surcharges and fees that support public purpose programs and to equitably expand services to those who are underserved”.		TUFFS requires an update to its reporting and collection system to implement a more efficient surcharge and user fee collection process while ensuring adequate collection of funds for state-mandated PPPs and the User Fee. This will likely include system changes needed to fund broadband facilities for underserved end users.	
Strategic Business Goal		Alignment	
SD-01 (Mission) “Protecting the interests of consumers and ratepayers”.		Implementation of the single end-user surcharge ensures that funding is collected equitably without considering the customer/end user’s technology (e.g. wireless versus wireline versus VoIP, which is currently an inequitable process as wireline customers bear a higher burden in supporting programs).	
Strategic Business Goal		Alignment	
SD-08 (Administration) part 4 “Maximize efficiency and effectiveness of the agency where possible” and part 6 “Use modern technology to help CPUC employees perform their jobs effectively.”		TUFFS was implemented in May 2010 and a technology update at this time is appropriate in light of the fact that proposed changes will simplify the reporting and fund remitting process while reducing entry error and the resulting research process. Proposed changes by adopting an annually updated fund allocation process administered by Fiscal Services will contribute to sustaining fund reserve needs by eliminating the more frequent need to write Resolutions to increase individual program remittance rates.	
<i>Select + to add additional Business Goals and Alignment</i>			
Executive Summary of the Business Problem or Opportunity			
Historically decreasing collections for state-mandated Universal Service PPPs and User Fee due to the industry-wide decline in telecommunications carrier intrastate revenue reporting and remittance is causing financial instability amongst the Commission’s programs. This trend is compromising the programs’ ability to adequately support programs. A new funding methodology based on a single month per-access line (or equivalent) charge would mitigate the problem by improving fund stability and by ensuring future fund security and reserves. Similar changes are being done in several state jurisdictions for their respective Universal Service programs. Approval of this project is consistent with the Governor’s Executive Order N-73-20, promoting affordable and reliable broadband networks through California to			



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

accelerate continuous improvements in economic and workforce development, infrastructure, public safety, education, economy, and an engaged citizenry. Resulting actions will lead to a need for broadband infrastructure funding through the Commission’s programs, and the need to collect this funding through the reporting and payment mechanisms facilitated by the TUFFS system.

Business Problem or Opportunity and Objectives Table

Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
1	The Oracle Technology used to develop the current TUFFs application has been deprecated by Oracle. Premier Support ends August 2022 and Extended Support ends August 2025 at which point State and CPUC security policies require those applications to be removed from the CPUC Network.
Objective ID	1.1
Objectives	Replace the Oracle Technology with a technology that will continue to be supported following August 2025.
Metric	Support Availability
Baseline	End of support 8/2025
Target	Support to at least 2031
Measurement Method	Support Availability
<i>Select + to add additional Objectives</i>	
2	The existing TUFFs application support consumes a high level of ITSD resources resulting in delays implementing changes and updates.
Objective ID	2.1
Objectives	Reduce the time required to implement changes to business rules.
Metric	Time to implement business rule changes.
Baseline	Current TUFFs business rule change average ticket resolution time = 16 weeks
Target	50% reduction - target business rule change average ticket resolution time = 8 weeks
Measurement Method	Average duration of support ticket for each change.
Objective ID	2.2
Objectives	Allow program staff to be able to post updated data (e.g. related to audit findings) and change their password , etc., without requiring ITSD support tickets.
Metric	Number of support tickets.
Baseline	Current number of annual TUFFs data support tickets = 80
Target	50% reduction – target # of annual TUFFs support tickets = 40
Measurement Method	Number of annual data support tickets opened.
<i>Select + to add additional Objectives</i>	
3	New business rules and interface changes are required to support revisions to the surcharge and fee structures for revenue collection.
Objective ID	3.1
Objectives	Reduce the number of “buckets” into which carriers report. The existing metric requires payment into seven “buckets”.
Metric	Carrier monthly reporting buckets
Baseline	7
Target	1
Measurement Method	Number of user fee payment reporting buckets on Carrier Interface.
Objective ID	3.2
Objectives	Maintain pre-surcharge transition carrier account transaction/payment data going back seven years as required by the CPUC retention policy.
Metric	Carrier reporting history records



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

Baseline	100% or historic data in current Oracle based TUFFs system
Target	100% of data for seven years in the new TUFFs system on launch
Measurement Method	System Reports – verification that new system captures seven years of historic data from the old system
Objective ID	3.3
Objectives	Allow audit required adjustments and billing recalculations for seven years of historical data utilizing business rules in place at the time revenue was originally reported.
Metric	Adjusted billing statement accuracy
Baseline	0%
Target	100% of historic data is adjustable during the seven year retention period and calculates adjustment billing amounts, penalties, and interest based on historical business rules applicable during the reporting adjustment period.
Measurement Method	Test cases
<i>Select + to add additional Objectives</i>	
4	New revenue distribution processes, interfaces, and tracking reports are required to support revisions to the surcharge and fee structures.
Objective ID	4.1
Objectives	Support allocation of revenues and adjustments to PPP funds.
Metric	Revenue and adjustments match PPP fund allocations monthly.
Baseline	0%
Target	100% revenue and adjustments match to PPP fund allocation every month.
Measurement Method	System reports.
<i>Select + to add additional Objectives</i>	
5	Payment verification and refund tracking is a manual, staff time intensive process.
Objective ID	5.1
Objectives	Reduce the staff contacts spent researching and reporting status of Payments and Refunds to fee filers.
Metric	Fiscal Services and CD Staff contacts from carriers spent on refunds and adjustment requests
Baseline	360 contacts annually.
Target	50% reduction to 180 contacts annually within one year of system implementation.
Measurement Method	Tracked in staff logs.
<i>Select + to add additional Objectives</i>	
6	Current system requires frequent manual adjustments and doesn't maintain audit logs of changes.
Objective ID	6.1
Objectives	Reduce the number of carrier-originated TUFFs adjustments.
Metric	Annual count of adjustments.
Baseline	240 annual adjustments
Target	60 annual adjustments within one year of system implementation.
Measurement Method	System reports.
Objective ID	6.2
Objectives	Maintain an audit log for all changes and adjustments for both carrier entries as well as business rules updates.
Metric	Audit log coverage.
Baseline	0% coverage
Target	100% coverage



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

Measurement Method	System reports and test cases
<i>Select + to add additional Objectives</i>	
7	The current system does not generate an isolated list of nonreporting/nonpaying carriers for monthly reporting periods, resulting in a large number of nonreporting/nonpaying carriers.
Objective ID	7.1
Objectives	Enable system reporting capability to generate reports showing nonreporting/nonpaying carriers, resulting in a direct primary contact notification from that report
Metric	Measure the reduction in nonreporting carriers month over month over one year
Baseline	Currently approximately 80 monthly nonreporters
Target	50% reduction to 40 or less monthly nonreporters within one year of system implementation.
Measurement Method	Monthly system report.

Select + to add additional Objectives

ITSD Select + to add additional Problems

Project Approval Lifecycle Completion and Project Execution Capacity Assessment

1. Does the proposal development or project execution anticipate sharing resources (state staff, vendors, consultants or financial) with other priorities within the Agency/state entity (projects, PALs, or programmatic/technology workload)?

Yes No Clear

2. Does the Agency/ state entity anticipate this proposal will result in the creation of new business processes or changes to existing business processes?

No New Processes Existing Processes Both New and Existing Clear

1.7 Project Management

Project Management Risk Score: 1.1

Attach completed Statewide Information Management Manual (SIMM) Section 45 Appendix A: Include the completed SIMM 45 Appendix A as an attachment to your email submission.

Existing Data Governance and Data

1. Does the Agency/state entity have an established data governance body with well-defined roles and responsibilities to support data governance activities? If an existing data governance org chart is used, please attach.	<input type="radio"/> Unknown <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear	If applicable, include the data governance org chart as an attachment to your email submission.
2. Does the Agency/state entity have data governance policies (data policies, data standards, etc.) formally defined, documented, and implemented? If yes, please attach the existing data governance plan, policies or IT standards used.	<input type="radio"/> Unknown <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear	If applicable, include the data governance policies as an attachment to your email submission.



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

<p>3. Does the Agency/state entity have data security policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented? If yes, please attach the existing documented security policies, standards, and controls used.</p>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Unknown <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear	<p>If applicable, include the documented security policies, standards, and controls as an attachment to your email submission.</p>
<p>4. Does the Agency/state entity have user accessibility policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented? If yes, please attach the existing documented policies, accessibility governance plan, and standards used, or provide additional information below.</p>	<input type="radio"/> Unknown <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear	<p>If applicable, include the documented accessibility policies, standards, and controls as an attachment to your email submission.</p>
<p>5. Do you have existing data that you are going to want to access in your new solution?</p>	<input type="radio"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear	<p>If applicable, include the data migration plan as an attachment to your email submission.</p>
<p>6. If data migration is required, please rate the quality of the data.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	

1.8 Criticality Assessment

Business Criticality

<p>Legislative Mandates:</p>	<p>N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Bill Number(s)/Code(s):</p>	<p>SB 4 (Gonzalez) currently in progress proposes to make amendments to the DDTP statute. It would remove the percentage surcharge cap and instead put a \$100,000,000 per year surcharge cap on the program. It is not yet known whether this bill will move forward.</p>	
<p>Language that includes system relevant requirements:</p>		
<p>Business Complexity Score</p>	<p>Business Complexity = 2.4 Technical Complexity = 2.8</p>	<p>Include the completed SIMM 45 Appendix C as an attachment to your email submission.</p>

Noncompliance Issues

Indicate if your current operations include noncompliance issues and provide a narrative explaining the how the business process is noncompliant.

Programmatic Regulations	HIPPA/CJIS/FTI/PII/PCI	Security	ADA	Other	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>1. What is the proposed project start date?</p>	<p>1/3/2022</p>
<p>2. Is this proposal anticipated to have high public visibility?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

If "Yes," please identify the dynamics of the anticipated high visibility below:

3. If there is an existing Privacy Information Assessment, include as an attachment to your email submission.

4. Does this proposal affect business program staff located in multiple geographic locations? Yes No Clear

If "Yes," provide an overview of the geographic dynamics below and enter the specific information in the space provided.

Communications Division Staff Teleworking throughout the State.

City	State	Number of Locations	Approximate Number of Staff

Select + to add Locations

1.9 Funding

1. Does the Agency/state entity anticipate requesting additional resources through a budget action to complete the project approval lifecycle? Yes No Clear

2. Will the state possibly incur a financial sanction or penalty if this proposal is not implemented? If yes, please identify the financial impact to the state below: Yes No Clear

Note that due to declining intrastate revenue and resulting lower PPP funds and User Fee receipts being reported by carriers, this would adversely affect the Commission's ability to support such programs.

3. Has the funding source(s) been identified for this proposal? Yes No Clear

FUNDING SOURCE		FUND AVAILABILITY DATE
General Fund	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date Picker
Special Fund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7/1/2020
Federal Fund	<input type="checkbox"/>	7/1/2020
Reimbursement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date Picker
Bond Fund	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date Picker
Other Fund	<input type="checkbox"/>	7/1/2021
If "Other Fund" is checked, specify the funding:	Budget Change Proposal (pending)	

1.10 Reportability Assessment

1. Does the Agency/state entity's IT activity meet the definition of an IT Project found in the State administrative Manual (SAM) Section 4819.2? If "No," this initiative is not an IT project and is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Yes No Clear

2. Does the activity meet the definition of Maintenance or Operations found in SAM Section 4819.2? If "Yes," this initiative is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Please report this workload on the Agency Portfolio Report. And provide an explanation below. Yes No Clear



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

<p>3. Has the project/effort been previously approved and considered an ongoing IT activity identified in SAM Section 4819.2, 4819.40?</p> <p>If “Yes,” this initiative is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Please report this workload on the Agency Portfolio Report.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>4. Is the project directly associated with any of the following as defined by SAM Section 4812.32?</p> <p>Single-function process-control systems; analog data collection devices, or telemetry systems; telecommunications equipment used exclusively for voice communications; Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) phone systems; acquisition of printers, scanners, and copiers.</p> <p>If “Yes,” this initiative is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Please report this workload on the Agency Portfolio Report.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>5. Is the primary objective of the project to acquire desktop and mobile computing commodities as defined by SAM Section 4819.34, 4989?</p> <p>If “Yes,” this initiative is a non-reportable project. Approval of the Project Approval Lifecycle is delegated to the head of the state entity. Submit a copy of the completed, approved Stage 1 Business Analysis to the CDT and track the initiative on the Agency Portfolio Report.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>6. Does the project meet all the criteria for Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) Software and Cloud Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) delegation as defined in SAM 4819.34, 4989.2 and SIMM 22?</p> <p>If “Yes,” this initiative is a non-reportable project. Approval of the Project Approval Lifecycle is delegated to the head of the state entity; however, submit an approved SIMM Section 22 form to CDT.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>7. Will the project require a Budget Action to be completed?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>8. Is it anticipated that the project will exceed the delegated cost threshold assigned by CDT as identified in SIMM 10?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>9. Are there any previously imposed conditions place on the state entity or this project by the CDT (e.g., Corrective Action Plan)?</p> <p>If “Yes,” provide the details regarding the conditions below.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>
<p>10. Is the system specifically mandated by legislation?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Clear</p>

Department of Technology Use Only

Original “New Submission” Date 6/30/2021

Form Received Date 7/21/2021

Form Accepted Date 7/21/2021

Form Status Completed



Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

Form Status Date	8/2/2021
Form Disposition	Approved If "Other," specify:
Form Disposition Date	8/2/2021