Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Agency or State Entity Name:	
Social Services, Department of	
Organization Code:	
5180	
Proposal Name:	
Facility Management System	
Department of Technology Project Number:	5180-213

2.2 Preliminary Submittal Information

Contact Information:	
Contact First Name:	**Contact Last Name:**
Sanjeev	Gorhe
Contact Email:	**Contact Phone:**
Sanjeev.gorhe@dss.ca.gov	916-205-2620
Preliminary Submission Date:	**Preliminary Assessment Transmittal**:
2/8/2018	(Include transmittal as an attachment to your email submission.)

2.3 Stage 2 Preliminary Assessment

2.3.1 Impact Assessment

	Yes	No
1. Has the Agency/state entity identified and committed subject matter experts from all business sponsors and key stakeholders?	☒	☐
2. Are all current baseline systems that will be impacted by this proposal documented and current (e.g., data classification and data exchange agreements, privacy impact assessments, design documents, data flow diagram, data dictionary, application code, architecture descriptions)?	☒	☐
3. Does the Agency/state entity anticipate needing support from the California Department of Technology (CDT) Statewide Technology Procurement to conduct market research for this proposal (Market Survey, Request for Information)?	☐	☒
4. Does the Agency/state entity anticipate submitting a budget request to support the procurement activities of this proposal?	☒	☐
5. Could this proposal involve the development and/or purchase of systems to support activities included in Financial Information System for California (FI$CAL) (e.g., financial accounting, asset management, human resources, procurement/ordering, inventory management, facilities management)?	☒	☐
6. Does the Agency/state entity have a designated Chief Architect or Enterprise Architect to lead the development of baseline and alternative solutions architecture descriptions?	☒	☐
7. Will the Agency/state entity's Information Security Officer be involved in the development and review of any security related requirements?	☒	☐
8. Does the Agency/state entity anticipate performing a business-based procurement to have vendors propose a solution?	☒	☐

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

2.3.2 Business Complexity Assessment

Business Complexity:	2.2	Business Complexity Zone:	☐ High	☒ Medium	☐ Low

2.4 Submittal Information

Contact Information:

Contact First Name:	**Contact Last Name:**
Sanjeev	Gorhe
Contact Email:	**Contact Phone:**
Sanjeev.gorhe@dss.ca.gov	916-205-2620
Submission Date:	**Project Approval Executive Transmittal**:
Click here to enter a date.	(Include transmittal as an attachment to your email submission.)

Submission Type:

☐ **New Submission**
☒ **Updated Submission (Pre-Approval)**
☐ **Updated Submission (Post-Approval)**
☐ Withdraw Submission
Reason: Select...Select...
If "Other," specify:

Sections Updated (For Updated Submissions Only) – (check all that apply)

- ☐ 2.1 General Information
- ☐ 2.2 Preliminary Submittal Information
- ☐ 2.3 Stage 2 Preliminary Assessment
  - ☐ 2.3.1 Impact Assessment
  - ☐ 2.3.2 Business Complexity Assessment
- ☐ 2.4 Submittal Information
- ☐ 2.5 Baseline Processes and Systems
  - ☐ 2.5.1 Description
  - ☐ 2.5.2 Business Process Workflow
  - ☐ 2.5.3 Current Architecture Information
  - ☐ 2.5.4 Current Architecture Diagram
  - ☐ 2.5.5 Security Categorization Impact Table
- ☒ 2.6 Mid-Level Solution Requirements
- ☒ 2.7 Assumptions and Constraints
- ☐ 2.8 Dependencies
- ☐ 2.9 Market Research
  - ☐ 2.9.1 Market Research Methodologies/Timeframes
  - ☐ 2.9.2 Results of Market Research
- ☐ 2.10 Alternative Solutions
  - ☐ 2.10.1 Solution Type)
    - ☐ Recommended
    - ☐ Alternative
  - ☐ 2.10.2 Name
  - ☐ 2.10.3 Description
  - ☐ 2.10.4 Benefit Analysis
  - ☐ 2.10.5 Assumptions and Constraints
  - ☐ 2.10.6 Implementation Approach
  - ☐ 2.10.7 Architecture Information
- ☐ 2.11 Recommended Solution
  - ☐ 2.11.1 Rationale for Selection
  - ☐ 2.11.2 Technical/Initial IT Project Oversight Framework Complexity Assessment
  - ☐ 2.11.3 Procurement and Staffing Strategy
  - ☐ 2.11.4 Enterprise Architecture Alignment
  - ☐ 2.11.5 Project Phases
  - ☐ 2.11.6 High Level Proposed Project Schedule
  - ☐ 2.11.7 Cost Summary
- ☐ 2.12 Staffing Plan
  - ☐ 2.12.1 Administrative
  - ☐ 2.12.2 Business Program
  - ☐ 2.12.3 Information Technology (IT)
  - ☐ 2.12.4 Testing
  - ☐ 2.12.5 Data Conversion/Migration
  - ☒ 2.12.6 Training and Organizational Change Management
  - ☒ 2.12.7 Resource Capacity/Skills/Knowledge for Stage 3 Solution Development
  - ☐ 2.12.8 Project Management
    - ☐ 2.12.8.1 Project Management Maturity Assessment
    - ☐ 2.12.8.2 Project Management Planning
  - ☐ 2.12.9 Organization Charts
- ☐ 2.13 Data Conversion/Migration
- ☒ 2.14 Financial Analysis Worksheets

Summary of Changes:

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Per feedback received from CDT we added more mid-level requirements and another assumption. Changes were also made to the Organizational Change Management Section and the FAWS.

Project Approval Executive Transmittal:	Attach transmittal to email submission.

Condition(s) from Previous Stage(s):	
Condition #	……..
Condition Category	Select...
Other, specify	……..
Condition Sub-category	Select...
Other, specify	……..
Condition	
Assessment	Select...
Other, specify	……..
Agency/state Entity Response	
Status	Select...
Other, specify	……..

Select + to add conditions

2.5 Baseline Processes and Systems

2.5.1 Description

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) staff need a modern system that will allow them to access all information needed to perform their jobs at any location. CCLD staff currently must come into the office to access key pieces of information needed in the field because they cannot access it remotely. CCLD also requires a system that contains a robust analytic component to provide reporting that will identify the necessary resources to ensure that enough are available to protect the Health and Safety of California's most vulnerable citizens. The systems currently in use require staff to perform manual processes because of the system design. The new system will provide staff with reports that quickly and easily identify all necessary information.

CDSS currently uses two legacy systems to conduct CCLD business processes. The Field Automation System (FAS) which is developed on IBM notes and the Licensing Information System (LIS) is a Natural/ADABAS platform. These two legacy systems were created over 20 years ago and have far exceeded their original capacity to support further adaptation.

Current CCLD practice is to enter facility and payment information into LIS once a licensee application has been received. Payment must also be entered into the FAS and then the statewide accounting system (FI$Cal).) FAS takes 24 hours to reflect the facility, requiring staff to wait to conduct an inspection. Most of the paper forms that are sent with the application are not entered into the system but are filed in a folder at the local regional office.

Each Regional Office has its own domino server that stores the FAS data. Each Domino server replicates with the single main server once a day to upload and/or download new information.

All inspections are documented in FAS. Staff must fill out multiple forms for each inspection and manually enter most of the information. FAS includes a reference section that contains the regulations and laws for staff to refer to when citing deficiencies. The FAS system auto populates facility information on a form. The inspection tool which is in FAS is an exhaustive list that a staff member must complete when conducting an annual inspection.

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Recent changes in law requiring more frequent inspections, as well as budget actions to restore the foundation and practice of CCLD, have provided CDSS with additional resources. However, the information systems used by CCLD were built nearly two decades ago to digitize the existing paper processes. Although they were considered cutting edge at the time, the digital universe has completely transformed in the intervening years. The languages in which they are written have not been taught in computer coding for nearly a generation, and efforts to migrate to more modern platforms have met with little success.

2.5.3 Current Architecture Information

		Select + to add system software
System Interfaces		LIS – Licensing Information System
Data Center Location		Agency/state data center operated by Agency/state entity
	Other, specify	
Security	Access (check all that apply)	☐ Public ☒ Internal State Staff ☒ External State Staff ☐ Other, specify:
	Type of Information (check all that apply)	☒ Personal ☐ Health ☐ Tax ☐ Financial ☒ Legal ☒ Confidential ☐ Other, specify: Adjudication
	Hardware	IBM Mainframe
	Operating System	z/OS
	System Software	ADABAS/NATURAL
		Select + to add system software
System Interfaces		LIS – Licensing Information System
Data Center Location		Agency/state data center operated by Agency/state entity
	Other, specify	
Security	Access (check all that apply)	☐ Public ☒ Internal State Staff ☒ External State Staff ☐ Other, specify:
	Type of Information (check all that apply)	☒ Personal ☐ Health ☐ Tax ☐ Financial ☒ Legal ☒ Confidential ☐ Other, specify:
	Protective Measures (check all that apply)	☒ Technical Security ☒ Identity Authorization and Authentication ☒ Physical Security ☒Backup and Recovery ☐ Other, specify:
Data Management	Data Owner	Name: Pam Dickfoss
		Title: Deputy Director – Community Care Licensing Division
		Business Program: California Dept. of Social Services
Data Custodian		Name: Brian Wong
		Title: Deputy Director – Information Systems Division
		Business Program: California Dept. of Social Services

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Select + to add business functions/processes

2.5.4 Current Architecture Diagram

Please see attachment entitled: 2.5.4 Legacy System Workflow

2.5.5 Security Categorization Impact Table

Please see attachment entitled: 2.5.5 FMS Security

SECURITY CATEGORIZATION IMPACT TABLE SUMMARY

SECURITY OBJECTIVE	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Confidentiality	☐	☒	☐
Integrity	☐	☒	☐
Availability	☐	☒	☐

2.6 Mid-Level Solution Requirements

Please see attachment titled 2.6 Mid-Level Solution Requirements

2.7 Assumptions and Constraints

Assumptions/Constraints	Description/Potential Impact
There will be qualified state and contract staff to successfully support the CCLD Facility Management System effort.	The project objectives may not be met, and the progress may be delayed.
Mid-level requirements will address scalability to anticipate any legislative mandates that impact the project.	The solution must be developed in a common and modern format to allow for CCLD's ever-changing business needs.
CCLD Programs will be able to provide field staff on a time limited basis to help with testing and quality assurance.	Without users to test the services as they are developed, the system may not function as expected.
CCLD will modify business practices to ensure that the services provided are effective when modification of a service is not possible.	CCLD knows that it is buying a completed product and not a custom solution. In this regard, some changes to business procedures may be necessary to ensure the services provided are useable in the most effective manner.
An allowance for tools (e.g., Agile Tracking Management Tool, GitHub, Slack, and Enterprise Project Servers) will be included in the project costs.	The project costs regarding these needs would be estimates and exact budgetary numbers may not be fully represented.

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

2.8 Dependencies

Element	Description
Data Migration Dependency	In order for the CCLD Facility Management System to function as needed, the data from the legacy systems must be ready to migrate into it so that CCLD staff can use it.
Agile Process Support	State control agency ability to support best practices and monitor/report on the performance and financials of agile IT projects ensure that the project is run as efficiently as possible.
Risk Management and Risk Mitigation	Alignment of risk management practices and risk mitigation strategies with agile methodologies to ensure all risks and issues are properly mitigated.
Roles and Responsibilities	Clear definition of roles and responsibilities among all facets of the project with supporting measures to maintain accountability.
Staff Qualifications	There must be qualified state and contract staff to successfully support the CCLD Facility Management System Project .
Contract Language/requirements and execution.	Detailed business architecture, rules extraction and business requirements to elicit clear functional scope and boundaries to ensure project stays on time and budget.
Integration/APIs	CCLD Facility Management solution must communicate with existing Interactive Voice Response and other external systems serving CCLD programs.
OCM	CCLD needs an OCM Contractor because of the large OCM effort that will be needed for this project. Staff from all over the state will be using this system and CCLD will need assistance with the OCM.

2.9 Market Research

2.9.1 Market Research Methodologies/Timeframes

Methodologies Used To Perform Market Research (check all that apply)**:**

☒	Request for Information (RFI)	☐	Trade shows
☒	Internet Research	☒	Published Literature
☒	Vendor Forums/Presentation	☐	Leveraged Agreements

☒	Collaboration with other Agencies/state entities or governmental entities	☐	Other, specify:

Time spent conducting market research:	Over 1 Year
Date market research was started:	12/21/2013
Date all market research was completed:	12/10/2019

2.9.2 Results of Market Research

This section provides market research information for the CCLD Facility Management System project.

Market Research Methodologies:

- ✓ Internet research
- ✓ Collaboration with other agencies/state or governmental entities
- ✓ Published literature
- ✓ Vendor Demonstrations
- ✓ Request for Information (RFI)

Research began in December of 2013 and ended December 2019. Market research activities leveraged the outcome of the initial evaluation of the business needs conducted in 2013. The approach to conducting the market research was to gather information from multiple sources, including solutions in use by other parts of our organization and similar workflows developed by other state departments and agencies, as well as those used in other states to conduct similar business activities. Participants were contacted via surveys, by phone, email, or in-person meetings. Information from the literature review was used to identify trending topics. Surveys were state developed and state staff completed the data collection and tracking of input received. The last step of the market research was comprised of releasing a Request for Information (RFI) to IT service providers and vendors. The RFI was released in October 2019 to gather information via the formal survey process.

Third-Party Literature Review

A review of third-party literature was conducted throughout the market research activities as this process has spanned several years. Articles and videos related to future trends, lessons learned, innovations, and other pertinent information were reviewed. Please see below for a list of our top resources.

- Techwire
- GovTech

California Licensing and other State Research

Research included surveying multiple states, including several systems in place or in progress in California. The states surveyed included: Alabama. Georgia, Indiana, Oregon, Maine, and Wisconsin. In addition, market research was also conducted through discussions with other state agencies and departments. We reviewed BreEZe at Consumer Affairs, the Pega System in development by the Department of Public Health, Casebook, and CMIPS II to understand their approach, the system developed or to be developed, and their lessons learned to ensure we do not make unnecessary mistakes in planning, development, and implementation activities.

California's environment is uniquely different from other state Health and Human Services IT

environments, and none of the states have a solution that is robust enough to encompass the complexities of our multi-faceted workflow needs, however, the outreach identified the following:

- Most states have a licensing system of some kind.
- Most of the development was completed using “big bang” approach as the iterative agile approach was not widely used during their development. Most organizations identified that their system does not quite meet their needs in the way they had originally identified to their developers.
- Public portals and easy to use interfaces are high on the list of desirable options.

RFI Responses

The State received fifteen responses for the RFI from the vendor community. CCLD scheduled demonstrations with five of the respondents in December 2019 to validate what was written in the responses meets our needs. The State team reviewed all RFI responses and vendors that meet the listed criteria below were invited for the product demonstration.

- The RFI response must demonstrate clear understanding of CCLD business requirements
- The IT Service Providers/vendors whose product was not demonstrated had been previously reviewed in earlier market research.
- Vendors who provided recommendations for process improvement
- Vendors who provided a data migration strategy
- Exposure to public sector projects of similar size and/or scope was considered

The RFI outcome demonstrated that vendors have developed COTS/MOTS products as well as low code platform-based solutions that can be leveraged to develop a modern Facility Management System. The trend in the digital business environment indicates that web-based application architectures are increasingly decentralized, but components such as email service, mobile offline functionality, analytics, and onsite inspections will require integration of core licensing functionality with invested assets within CDSS. The new Facility Management System core functionality must sustain ongoing evolution, integration, operational challenges and ensure sustainability of the system alongside maintainability of the configuration/code. The vendors prototypes also confirmed that “big-bang” implementation of a new Facility Management System can be avoided and instead vendors demonstrated flexibility to have a phased implementation approach depending upon CCLD program priorities and available budget. Through RFI responses, vendors offered strategies on legacy system data migration/conversion efforts.

The digital transformation of CCLD legacy systems to a modern new technology platform is challenging the State and vendor delivery teams on multiple fronts. The new Facility Management System solution is expected to be a complex solution, better in functionality, faster in operations and lower cost without increasing budgets at the same time the CCLD portfolio is growing and diversifying faster than ever. This requires the application development team to adopt a self-service platform, rapid application development tools, software services that can be readily used to help deliver the solution faster within the allocated budget. This approach requires the State team to focus on developing integration skills and being actively engaged with the Facility Management System vendor development team during solution configuration and testing process. The experience on CDSS’ recent projects such as CECRIS, AARS and Guardian show program/business teams cannot operate alone, they require the guidance of technical professionals with expertise in the chosen product to work in the agile environment with other specialists. Thus, it is required that the State team needs to be engaged with the vendor development team so that

upon completion of the product development life cycle, CDSS can successfully manage day to day operations and system enhancements. The variety of technology platform as service in combination with Software as a Service confirm CDSS should avoid the “build your own platform as Service” custom development approach. There are variety of products available that can offer Platform as a Service in combination with Software as a Service such as Microsoft Dynamics (C#/.NET), Salesforce, ServiceNow and Java Platform Enterprise Edition (Java EE). Through various demonstrations, various COTS/MOTS products also showed promise that can meet CCLD business needs with some level of customization.

Summary

The responses that were submitted to CCLD proved that the current market has a variety of options. The responses all stated that CCLD’s needs can be met but varied widely in price and project duration depending on the type of solution. The solutions presented included COTS, SaaS, PaaS, and other low code platforms.

After laying out the business needs and keeping in mind the major activities involved in each sphere, and possible architectural and financial boundaries, each avenue of market research revealed several constants:

- The reinforcement of the need for greater mobile access, self-service capabilities, real-time data, and robust reporting, stressing the ability to show future licensing tendencies as these would ultimately allow CCLD to shift towards a proactive instead of a reactive approach.

- As enterprise architecture and the very nature of CCLD’s business are ongoing processes, a flexible system must be designed with change in mind.

- CDSS should procure a customizable prebuilt solution that can be implemented quickly and is easily modified to meet CCLD’s constantly changing needs.

2.10 Alternative Solutions

2.10.1 Solution Type

☒ **Recommended**

2.10.2 Name

Purchase Platform as a Service with low code applications

2.10.3 Description

The recommended solution is to purchase a customizable platform with low code applications. This type of solution will provide CCLD with most of the mid-level requirements right out of the box. A small amount of customization will be required to provide the most user friendly and efficient experience in the shortest time frame possible. Our market research showed that this can be completed in a two-year time span or less.

Approach (Check all that apply)**:**	
☒	Increase staff – new or existing capabilities
☒	Modify the existing business process or create a new business process
☐	Reduce the services or level of services provided
☒	Utilize new or increased contracted services
☐	Enhance the existing IT system

☒	Create a new IT system
☒	Perform a business-based procurement to have vendors propose a solution
☐	Other, specify

2.10.4 Benefit Analysis

Benefits/Advantages

Integrates information from a number of ancillary IT databases into a single repository of information on all licensed facilities

Allows the Licensing Program Analyst (LPA) to quickly access key information necessary to effectively and efficiently evaluate a facility.

Provides the LPAs and managers with streamlined processes for determining workload priorities including completion of legislatively mandated inspections.

Provides an ability to create qualitative and quantitative reports necessary to effectively evaluate program performance.

Allows the LPAs access to information necessary to complete their duties when in remote areas eliminating the need to physically copy or upload information in advance of the visits.

Significantly reduces the amount of time needed to configure the IT system to reflect new statutory requirements improving compliance with legislative mandates.

Reduces the cost for maintenance and operations for the existing legacy systems.

Improves data quality of facility information as data is cleansed and normalized

Select + to add benefits/advantages

Disadvantages

- Annual Licensing costs
- CCLD may not own the code and will be reliant on vendor to make major changes to the system.

Select + to add disadvantages

Anticipated Time to Achieve Objectives After Project Go-Live

	Objective Timeframe				
Objective Number	**Within 1 Year**	**2 Years**	**3 Years**	**4 Years**	**Over 4 Years**
1.1	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.2	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.3	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.4	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.5	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
1.6	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.1	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.1	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.2	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Select + to add objectives

Anticipated Time to Achieve Financial Benefits After Project Go-Live

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Financial Benefit	Within 1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	Over 4 Years
Increased Revenues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cost Savings	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cost Avoidance	☒	☐	☒	☐	☐
Cost Recovery	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

2.10.5 Assumptions and Constraints

A configurable solution can be modified to meet CCLD's needs within 2 years of contract execution**.**

CCLD will engage in business process and procedure reengineering to work with the product.

Data Migration effort and new system implementation efforts must be performed concurrently to have a fully functional product available to end users. In doing so, the Department will avoid maintenance of legacy systems.

CCLD is assuming that the chosen system will meet 80% or more of CCLD needs out of the box.

Select + to add assumptions/constraints

2.10.6 Implementation Approach

Identify the type of existing IT system enhancement or new system proposed (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Enhance the current system
- ☐ Develop a new custom solution
- ☐ Purchase a Commercial off-the-Shelf (COTS) system
- ☐ Purchase or obtain a system from another government agency (Transfer)
- ☐ Subscribe to a Software as a Service (SaaS) system
- ☒ Other, specify: Proposal is to use a Platform as a Service (PaaS)

Identify cloud services to be leveraged (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Software as a Service (SaaS) provided by OTech
- ☐ Software as a Service (SaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ Platform as a Service (PaaS) provided by OTech
- ☒ Platform as a Service (PaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) provided by OTech
- ☐ Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ No cloud services will be leveraged by this alternative. Provide a description of why cloud services are not being leveraged:

Identify who will modify the existing system or create the new system (check all that apply)**:**

- ☒ Agency/state entity IT staff
- ☒ A vendor will be contracted
- ☐ Inter-agency agreement will be established with another governmental agency. Specify Agency name(s):

- ☐ Other, specify:

Identify the implementation strategy:

- ☐ All requirements will be addressed in this proposed project in a single implementation.
- ☒ Requirements will be addressed in incremental implementations in this proposed project.
- ☐ Some requirements will be addressed in this proposed project. The remaining requirements will be addressed at a later date.

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Specify the year when the remaining requirements will be addressed:

Identify if the technology for the proposed project will be mission critical and public facing:

☒ The technology implemented for this proposed project will be considered mission critical and public data will be public facing.

2.10.7 Architecture Information

Business Function/Process(es)		Enforcement, Oversight, and Protection of Community Care Facilities and its people served		
Application, System or Component		PaaS		
COTS, MOTS or Custom		Modified off-the-shelf (MOTS)		
Runtime Environment	Cloud Computing Used?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If "Yes," specify:	Platform as a Service (PaaS)
	Server/Device Function	LINUX		
	Hardware	WINDOWS		
	Operating System	LINUX		
	System Software	Java, POSTgreSQL		
		Select + to add system software		
System Interfaces		Caregiver Background Check System, CWS-CARES, Legal Case Tracking System, Administrative Action Reporting System, CCLD Transparency Website, and IVRs		
Data Center Location	Other, specify	Commercial Data Center		
Security	Access (check all that apply)	☒ Public ☒ Internal State Staff ☒ External State Staff ☐ Other, specify:		
	Type of Information (check all that apply)	☒ Personal ☐ Health ☐ Tax ☒ Financial ☒ Legal ☒ Confidential ☐ Other, specify:		
	Protective Measures (check all that apply)	☒ Technical Security ☒ Identity Authorization and Authentication ☒ Physical Security ☒Backup and Recovery ☐ Other, specify:		
Data Management	Data Owner	Name: Pam Dickfoss		
		Title: Deputy Director		
		Business Program: Community Care Licensing Division		
Data Custodian		Name: Brian Wong		
		Title: Deputy Director		
		Business Program: Information Systems Divisions		

Select + to add business functions/processes

2.10.1 Solution Type

☒ **Alternative 2**

2.10.2 Name

Procure a transfer system from another state agency or state

2.10.3 Description

A transfer system would be a system that another state or agency has developed for licensing management systems. Some of these systems were built to track and house information on Children's Residential Facilities in particular. They

may contain functionality similar to what CCLD needs in a facility management system, but there will be a need to modify these systems to meet California's strict guidelines.

Approach (Check all that apply)**:**

☐	Increase staff – new or existing capabilities
☒	Modify the existing business process or create a new business process
☐	Reduce the services or level of services provided
☒	Utilize new or increased contracted services
☐	Enhance the existing IT system
☒	Create a new IT system
☒	Perform a business-based procurement to have vendors propose a solution
☐	Other, specify:

2.10.4 Benefit Analysis

Benefits/Advantages

Eliminates duplication of activities by LPA's

Maximizes the amount of time spent in the field conducting periodic inspections and complaint investigations.

Offsets the need for additional LPAs identified in the 2015 Workload Study to meet the additional statutory mandates.

Creation of an efficient and effective tracking system to ensure that children and adults in need of care are protected from harm.

Select + to add benefits/advantages

Disadvantages

May be forced to change business practices to work with transfer system

Increased general fund use

Some transfer systems CCLD investigated are no longer in use and have been replaced at an additional cost

Select + to add disadvantages

Anticipated Time to Achieve Objectives After Project Go-Live

	Objective Timeframe				
Objective Number	**Within 1 Year**	**2 Years**	**3 Years**	**4 Years**	**Over 4 Years**
1.1.1	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.1.2	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.1.3	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.1.4	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.1.5	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
1.6.6	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
2.1.1	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
3.1.1	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.2.2	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Select + to add objectives

Anticipated Time to Achieve Financial Benefits After Project Go-Live

Financial Benefit	Within 1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	Over 4 Years
Increased Revenues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Cost Savings	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Cost Avoidance	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Cost Recovery	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

2.10.5 Assumptions and Constraints

Functionality in transfer system will meet the needs of CCLD.

System must have been built using open source code or CCLD will need to purchase licenses for base system and may be required to hire same company to complete the system.

Select + to add assumptions/constraints

2.10.6 Implementation Approach

Identify the type of existing IT system enhancement or new system proposed (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Enhance the current system
- ☐ Develop a new custom solution
- ☐ Purchase a Commercial off-the-Shelf (COTS) system
- ☒ Purchase or obtain a system from another government agency (Transfer)
- ☐ Subscribe to a Software as a Service (SaaS) system
- ☐ Other, specify:

Identify cloud services to be leveraged (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Software as a Service (SaaS) provided by OTech
- ☒ Software as a Service (SaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ Platform as a Service (PaaS) provided by OTech
- ☒ Platform as a Service (PaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) provided by OTech
- ☐ Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ No cloud services will be leveraged by this alternative. Provide a description of why cloud services are not being leveraged:

Identify who will modify the existing system or create the new system (check all that apply)**:**

- ☒ Agency/state entity IT staff
- ☒ A vendor will be contracted
- ☐ Inter-agency agreement will be established with another governmental agency. Specify Agency name(s):
- ☐ Other, specify:

Identify the implementation strategy:

- ☐ All requirements will be addressed in this proposed project in a single implementation.
- ☒ Requirements will be addressed in incremental implementations in this proposed project.
- ☐ Some requirements will be addressed in this proposed project. The remaining requirements will be addressed at a later date.
  Specify the year when the remaining requirements will be addressed:

Identify if the technology for the proposed project will be mission critical and public facing:

- ☒ The technology implemented for this proposed project will be considered mission critical and public data will be public facing.

2.10.7 Architecture Information

Business Function/Process(es)	Enforcement, Oversight, and Protection of Community Care Facilities and its people served
Application, System or Component	Web development framework, API framework, JS Framework and

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

		Database		
COTS, MOTS or Custom		Custom application		
Name/Primary:				
Runtime Environment	Cloud Computing Used?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If "Yes," specify:	Software as a Service (SaaS)
	Server/Device Function	Puma web server		
	Hardware	WINDOWS		
	Operating System	LINUX		
	System Software	Ruby, Rails, Java and PostgreSQL DB		
Select + to add system software				
System Interfaces		DOJ, CDPH, CDE, CAN, SLMS		
Data Center Location Other, specify		Commercial data center		
Security	Access (check all that apply)	☒ Public ☒ Internal State Staff ☒ External State Staff ☐ Other, specify:		
	Type of Information (check all that apply)	☒ Personal ☐ Health ☐ Tax ☐ Financial ☒ Legal ☒ Confidential ☐ Other, specify:		
	Protective Measures (check all that apply)	☐ Technical Security ☐ Identity Authorization and Authentication ☐ Physical Security ☐Backup and Recovery ☐ Other, specify:		
Data Management	Data Owner	Name: Pam Dickfoss		
		Title: Deputy Director		
		Business Program: Community Care Licensing Division		
Data Custodian		Name: Brian Wong		
		Title: Deputy Director		
		Business Program: Information Systems Division		

Select + to add business functions/processes

2.10.1 Solution Type

☒ **Alternative 3**

2.10.2 Name

Develop a complete facility management system in house

2.10.3 Description

ISD will develop a complete system to meet the needs of CCLD. This system would replace both legacy systems and be developed from the ground up.

Approach (Check all that apply)**:**

☒	Increase staff – new or existing capabilities
☒	Modify the existing business process or create a new business process
☐	Reduce the services or level of services provided
☒	Utilize new or increased contracted services
☐	Enhance the existing IT system
☒	Create a new IT system
☐	Perform a business-based procurement to have vendors propose a solution
☐	Other, specify:

2.10.4 Benefit Analysis

Benefits/Advantages

The Division would own the system
Customized specifically for CCLD
Select + to add benefits/advantages

Disadvantages

- Delay of 3+ years for functionality to be fully developed
- Increased use of General Fund because CCLD will need to hire new developers to create the system
- Due to new system development duration, the legacy systems may crash before replacement is complete.

Select + to add disadvantages

Anticipated Time to Achieve Objectives After Project Go-Live

	Objective Timeframe				
Objective Number	**Within 1 Year**	**2 Years**	**3 Years**	**4 Years**	**Over 4 Years**
Enter No.1.1.1.1.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
1.21.2	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
1.31.3	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
1.41.4	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
1.51.5	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
1.61.6	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
2.12.1	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.13.1	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
3.23.2	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Select + to add objectives

Anticipated Time to Achieve Financial Benefits After Project Go-Live

Financial Benefit	Within 1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	Over 4 Years
Increased Revenues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Cost Savings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Cost Avoidance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Cost Recovery	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

2.10.5 Assumptions and Constraints

CDSS Information Systems Division's subject familiarity should prove an easy transfer of knowledge for new program development.

Any and all business functionality and software development additions would require significant changes to project scope, thereby affecting areas such as vendor contracts, funding, product deliverables, etc.
Vendor will not be needed as ISD staff will have knowledge to update system.

Development will take longer because all code will need to be written from scratch.

2.10.6 Implementation Approach

Identify the type of existing IT system enhancement or new system proposed (check all that apply)**:**

☐ Enhance the current system
☒ Develop a new custom solution

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

- ☐ Purchase a Commercial off-the-Shelf (COTS) system
- ☐ Purchase or obtain a system from another government agency (Transfer)
- ☐ Subscribe to a Software as a Service (SaaS) system
- ☐ Other, specify:

Identify cloud services to be leveraged (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Software as a Service (SaaS) provided by OTech
- ☐ Software as a Service (SaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ Platform as a Service (PaaS) provided by OTech
- ☐ Platform as a Service (PaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☐ Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) provided by OTech
- ☐ Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) provided by commercial vendor
- ☒ No cloud services will be leveraged by this alternative. Provide a description of why cloud services are not being leveraged:

Identify who will modify the existing system or create the new system (check all that apply)**:**

- ☒ Agency/state entity IT staff
- ☐ A vendor will be contracted
- ☐ Inter-agency agreement will be established with another governmental agency. Specify Agency name(s):
- ☐ Other, specify:

Identify the implementation strategy:

- ☐ All requirements will be addressed in this proposed project in a single implementation.
- ☒ Requirements will be addressed in incremental implementations in this proposed project.
- ☐ Some requirements will be addressed in this proposed project. The remaining requirements will be addressed at a later date.
  Specify the year when the remaining requirements will be addressed:

Identify if the technology for the proposed project will be mission critical and public facing:

- ☒ The technology implemented for this proposed project will be considered mission critical and public facing.

2.10.7 Architecture Information

Business Function/Process(es)		Enforcement, Oversight, and Protection of Community Care Facilities and its people served		
Application, System or Component		Web development framework, API framework, JS Framework and Database		
COTS, MOTS or Custom		Custom application		
Name/Primary Technology:				
Runtime Environment	Cloud Computing Used?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If "Yes," specify:	Platform as a Service (PaaS)
	Server/Device Function	Puma web server		
	Hardware	WINDOWS		
	Operating System	LINUX		
	System Software	Ruby, Rails, Java, and Postgres SQL DB		
		Select + to add system software		
System Interfaces		DOJ, CDPH, CDE, CAN, SLMS		
Data Center Location Other, specify		Select...Commercial data center		
Security	Access	☐ Public ☒ Internal State Staff ☒ External State Staff		

	(check all that apply)	☐ Other, specify:
	Type of Information (check all that apply)	☒ Personal ☐ Health ☐ Tax ☒ Financial ☒ Legal ☒ Confidential ☐ Other, specify:
	Protective Measures (check all that apply)	☒ Technical Security ☒ Identity Authorization and Authentication ☒ Physical Security ☒Backup and Recovery ☐ Other, specify:
Data Management	Data Owner	Name: Pam Dickfoss
		Title: Deputy Director
		Business Program: Community Care Licensing
Data Custodian		Name: Brian Wong
		Title Deputy Director
		Business Program: Information Systems Division

Select + to add business functions/processes

2.11 Recommended Solution

2.11.1 Rationale for Selection

After the alternatives in Section 2.10 were identified and analyzed, it was apparent that the best solution is to purchase a Platform as a Service solution.

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluating the summarized information results in the following general conclusions specific to each criterion:

Time: Based on the projected timelines for each alternative, Alternative 1 (**Recommended**) is expected to require significantly less time to complete overall. The customizable solution will need minor modifications to work for CCLD's users and the projected timeline of 24 months is a shorter timeline than what would be projected for a custom build.

Costs: Based on projected costs for each alternative, Alternative 1 is expected to be cost neutral once fully developed. The money spent on yearly licenses is expected to be less than what CCLD currently spends on licenses and vendors to keep our current legacy systems up and running. Resources being requested for the project are limited term and will be replaced by redirected state staff after system is implemented. Cost neutrality will be achieved by eliminating mainframe maintenance cost, minimizing customization cost by eliminating contract staff, and redirecting existing ISD staff. Per the Request for Information that was released Fall 2019 CCLD can expect to pay on-going licensing costs in the $1-2 million range. Currently, CCLD averages over $2 million between specialized vendors, licenses, and O-Tech hosting fees. Given these numbers, CCLD can break even due to the decreased annual costs.

CDSS anticipates increased efficiencies through the new system's enhanced automation features. In addition to existing CCLD users (approx. 1500) CCLD will add approximately 70,000 licensees as users as well as public users to submit new applications, pay fees, and update facility information. Licensee and public use will decrease the time and cost required for processing and monitoring licensed facilities. CCLD has collected data based on consistency checks which are automatic tests performed to determine if the data has an internal conflict. Per consistency check responses on the current system, 85% percent of CCLD's licensing staff have had to input duplicate facility visits and job task information due to downtime while in the field. The new system will provide state staff the ability for a modern mobility application that will dramatically decrease downtime.

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Risk: Based on project risks for each alternative, the risks associated with Alternative 1 are known and well understood. CCLD spends millions of dollars each year to maintain the mainframe infrastructure to support the legacy systems. The probability of the aging legacy systems failing in the short term is gaining speed each passing day as CCLD is finding it more and more difficult to recruit State and vendor staff with outdated programming and database technology experience. This risk is real, immediate, and irreversible. Based on the other options considered, CCLD believes this is the appropriate choice for the time being.

In conclusion, Alternative 1 was identified as the recommended solution due to higher number of system improvements to meet the user's needs. These improvements come with a shorter implementation timeframe and lower risk on both the business needs and the existing technology.

2.11.2 Technical/Initial CA-PMM Complexity Assessment

Complexity		Complexity Zone	
Technical Complexity Score:	2.02	☐ Zone I	Low Criticality/Risk
		☒ Zone II/III	Medium Criticality/Risk
		☐ Zone IV	High Criticality/Risk

2.11.3 Procurement and Staffing Strategy

Activity

Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V)

Responsible (check all that apply)	When Needed (check all that apply)	Cost Estimate Verification (check all that apply)		
☒ Agency/state entity staff ☐ STP staff ☐ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☐ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☒ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☐ Stage 3 Solution Development ☒ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☒ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☒ Market research conducted (MR) ☒ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☒ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☐ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity

Procurement Vehicle	Request for Offer/Master Service Agreement (RFO/MSA)	Contract Type	Fixed Price (FP)
If "Other," specify:		If "Other," specify:	

Agile Coach

Responsible	When Needed	Cost Estimate	

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

(check all that apply)	(check all that apply)	**Verification** (check all that apply)		
☒ Agency/state entity staff ☐ STP staff ☐ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☐ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☒ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☒ Stage 3 Solution Development ☐ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☐ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☐ Market research conducted (MR) ☐ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☐ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☒ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity			
Procurement Vehicle	Other	**Contract Type**	
If "Other," specify:		If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.

Project Oversight

Responsible (check all that apply)	**When Needed** (check all that apply)	**Cost Estimate Verification** (check all that apply)		
☒ Agency/state entity staff ☐ STP staff ☒ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☐ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☐ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☐ Stage 3 Solution Development ☐ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☒ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☐ Market research conducted (MR) ☒ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☐ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☐ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity			
Procurement Vehicle		**Contract Type**	
If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.	If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.

Organizational Change Management

Responsible (check all that apply)	**When Needed** (check all that apply)	**Cost Estimate Verification**		

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

		(check all that apply)		
☒ Agency/state entity staff ☐ STP staff ☐ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☐ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☒ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☐ Stage 3 Solution Development ☐ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☒ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☒ Market research conducted (MR) ☐ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☐ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☐ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity			
Procurement Vehicle	Request for Offer/Master Service Agreement (RFO/MSA)	**Contract Type**	Fixed Price (FP)
If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.	If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.

Data Planning and Cleansing

Responsible (check all that apply)	**When Needed** (check all that apply)	**Cost Estimate Verification** (check all that apply)		
☒ Agency/state entity staff ☐ STP staff ☐ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☐ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☒ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☐ Stage 3 Solution Development ☒ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☐ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☒ Market research conducted (MR) ☐ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☐ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☐ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity			
Procurement Vehicle	Request for Offer/Master Service Agreement (RFO/MSA)	**Contract Type**	Fixed Price (FP)
If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.	If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

System Integration

Responsible (check all that apply)	When Needed (check all that apply)	Cost Estimate Verification (check all that apply)		
☐ Agency/state entity staff ☐ STP staff ☐ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☐ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☒ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☐ Stage 3 Solution Development ☐ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☒ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☐ Market research conducted (MR) ☐ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☐ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☒ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity

Procurement Vehicle	Request for Offer/Master Service Agreement (RFO/MSA)	**Contract Type**	Fixed Price (FP)
If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.	If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.

Facility Management System

Responsible (check all that apply)	When Needed (check all that apply)	Cost Estimate Verification (check all that apply)		
☒ Agency/state entity staff ☒ STP staff ☒ CDT Project Approvals and Oversight staff ☒ CA-PMO staff ☐ DGS staff ☒ Vendor ☐ Other, specify:	☒ Stage 3 Solution Development ☒ Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval ☐ After project is approved (after Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval)	☒ Market research conducted (MR) ☐ Cost estimate provided (CE) ☐ CDT CE ☐ DGS CE ☐ Request for Information (RFI) conducted ☐ Comparable vendor services have been used on previous contracts (CV) ☐ Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA)		

Complete Only if Vendor Responsible for Activity

Procurement Vehicle		**Contract Type**	

If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.	If "Other," specify:	Click here to enter text.

Select + to add activities

	Yes	No
Will any of the activities identified above result in a competitive or non-competitive solicitation that will be over the Agency/state entity's DGS delegated purchasing authority?	☒	☐

2.11.4 Enterprise Architecture Alignment

The new solution will be a customizable solution type stored in the cloud. The services are designed in such a way to use APIs to connect to other software/systems.

Information Technology Capability Table

Information Technology Capability	Existing Enterprise Capability to be Leveraged	New Enterprise Capability Needed
Public or Internal Portal/Website	☐	☒
Public or Internal Mobile Application	☐	☒
Enterprise Service Bus	☐	☒
Identity and Access Management	☐	☒
Enterprise Content Management (including document scanning and eForms capabilities)	☐	☒
Business Intelligence and Data Warehousing	☐	☒
Master Data Management	☐	☒
Big Data Analytics	☐	☒

2.11.5 Project Phases

Phase 1- Project Development

Description	Phase Deliverable
CCLD staff will define the vision and objectives, conduct business analysis, alternatives analysis, solution development, and generate solicitation documents for the Facility Management System.	In this phase deliverable, CCLD will have established the purpose of the project, the needs of the users, prioritized the project scope, completed PAL Process, and procurement document(s) approved. CDSS will conduct data planning and conversion into a storage container throughout this phase.

Phase 2- Procurement

Description	Phase Deliverable
CCLD staff will release procurement documents for each solicitation as required.	In this phase, CCLD will have signed contracts with each vendor.

Phase 3- Plan and Analyze with Vendor

Description	Phase Deliverable
Vendor and CCLD staff will work to initiate, plan, estimate the requirements of current legacy systems processess that will be used for the new soltuion.	In this phase, the vendor and CCLD staff will approve the user stories and create task that will establish the timeline for each subsequent iterative. Organizational Change Management will start with this phase and continue through Maintenance and Operations.

Phase 4- Design, Build, Test - (this phase will be repeated for each epic until they are complete)

Description	Phase Deliverable
Configuration of services to meet the needs for each deliverable.	During this phase the vendor and CCLD staff will work in sprints to configure and test the services that meet the deliverables.

Phase 5- Data Migration

Description	Phase Deliverable
Data migration from staging environment into new system	In this phase the vendor will be charged with taking the data from the staging container and converting it to the appropriate format and migratinf it into the new system.

Phase 6- Implementation to sandbox - (this phase will be repeated for each epic until they are complete)

Description	Phase Deliverable
Implementation of services into sandbox	During this phase the vendor and CCLD will release completed componets into a desginated sandbox. Testers will have access to this sandbox to conduct UAT as each componet gets added to the sandbox.

Phase 7- Go Live

Description	Phase Deliverable
All Services are moved into a Production Environment	UAT for entire product. Train the Trainer Sessions. Knowledge Transfer to Dept staff on how to update the system and provide level 1 and 2 responses to help requests. User Training Product release to all staff state-wide.

Phase 8- Stabilization

Description	Phase Deliverable
This phase starts after roll-out and lasts for 90 days. During this phase The Service Provider will fix any major defects that are discovered after roll-out.	List of major Defects to be fixed.

Select + to add project phases

2.11.6 High Level Proposed Project Schedule

Proposed Project Planning Start Date:	7/1/2019	**Proposed Project Planning End Date:**	6/30/2020
Proposed Project Start Date:	1/11/2021	**Proposed Project End Date:**	12/31/2022

Activity Name	Start Date	End Date
Stage 2 Alternative Analysis Development	07/01/2019	3/31/2020
FMS Solicitation Development	12/15/2019	6/3/2020
Stage 2 Approval	02/02/2020	5/1/2020
Agile Coordinator RFO Creation	02/21/2020	4/28/2020
Agile Coordinator RFO Internal Approvals	05/04/2020	6/30/2020
Organizational Change Management RFO Development	03/02/2020	5/30/2020

Agile Coordinator RFO Release	07/15/2020	7/15/2020
FMS Draft Solicitation Package Review	6/4/2020	6/19/2020
OCM RFO Internal Approval	6/1/2020	6/15/2020
FMS Draft Solicitation Release	7/1/2020	7/17/2020
Agile Coordinator RFO Responses Due	7/29/2020	7/29/2020
Agile Coordinator RFO Evaluation	8/5/2020	8/7/2020
Award Agile Contractor Contract	8/17/2020	8/17/2020
Agile Coordinator Contractor Implemented	9/1/2020	9/1/2020
FMS Draft Solicitation Responses Due	8/17/2020	8/17/2020
Draft FMS Solicitation Review	8/24/2020	9/4/2020
Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval	9/5/2020	12/31/2020
Confidential FMS Discussions with Bidders	9/7/2020	9/11/2020
Last Day to Submit Final FMS Response	9/21/2020	9/21/2020
Final FMS Proposal Evaluation/Review	9/28/2020	10/02/2020
Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval Completion	12/31/2020	12/31/2020
FMS Contract Award	1/11/2021	01/11/2021
OCM Contract Award	10/21/2020	10/21/2020
Data Migration Planning	7/1/2020	12/31/2020
User Research of all licensing functionality	11/2/2020	12/14/2020
Data Mapping and Gap Analysis Review...	12/14/2020	12/31/2020
Facility Inspections	2/1/2021	3/08/2021
Testing of Facility Inspections	3/8/2021	3/12/2021
Configuration of the other services	3/22/2021	9/29/2022
Validation of data migration	7/1/2021	6/30/2022
Uniform Application Testing	3/14/2022	9/29/2022
Go Live	9/30/2022	9/30/2022
Stabilization	10/01/2022	12/31/2022
Project Completion	12/31/2022	12/31/2022
Level 3 Service Desk Support	1/1/2023	6/30/2024

Select + to add activities

2.11.7 Cost Summary

Total Proposed Planning Cost:	$2,982,805
Total Proposed Project Cost:	$39,071,386
Total Proposed Future Operations IT Staff & OE&E Costs (Continuing):	$4,696,664
Total Proposed Annual Future Operations IT Costs (M&O):	$2,509,603

2.12 Staffing Plan

2.12.1 Administrative

Day-to-day management of the Project staff will be the responsibility of the service managers of the team they will be working with. Performance evaluations, performance issues/recognitions, promotions/demotions, and disciplinary actions will be the responsibility of the state staff's respective organizational chain of command. County consultants and other contractors will report to their respective functional managers or designees. Human resource management processes and procedures are detailed in the Statewide Administrative Manual (SAM).
The Department has a Project Management Office that is part of the Information Systems Division. The PMO will provide necessary project support using existing staff. In addition to this, each of the Divisions involved in this project have areas that specialize in procurement and budget activities.

2.12.2 Business Program

We have staff in CCLD to work in coordination with each program office for this project. This coordination will include some Organizational Change Management tasks as well as to ensure that vendors have access to subject matter experts on an as-needed basis. Based on the approval of this unit, the effect on resources needed to continue as-is business operations should be minimal. We anticipate that we may ask for testing and quality assurance from persons in the field and we aim to keep the duration of these instances as short as possible while ensuring the system developments are fully tested in a user environment.

Business team staff have limited experience creating procurement and Project Approval Lifecycle documents for smaller projects.

2.12.3 Information Technology (IT)

Our current IT resources are not able to keep up with the changes and requests to the legacy systems due to the age of the data systems and the lack of expertise in the programming languages used to create them. To complete the required work, we have hired multiple vendors. Ongoing maintenance and enhancements to meet mandated changes comes at a very high cost.

One of the major driving forces for adopting the new solution is that a lot of changes can be completed by program and ISD staff. The system will be highly customizable and program staff will be able to complete the changes themselves with little or no help from ISD staff. Implementing the solution is greatly dependent on the data migration project which will migrate the legacy data into the new solution. Training of ISD and program staff will be necessary to support the new solution in the long run.

2.12.4 Testing

CDSS Program and ISD staff will conduct the testing throughout the configuration process as well as end to end testing when the vendor has provided the entire solution.

2.12.5 Data Conversion/Migration

The data will be cleaned, converted, and migrated from legacy systems into the solution. Upon approval of this alternative the Department will work with the Service Provider to ensure data is migrated. This will be accomplished either through a data migration sub-vendor with the new system vendor or another vendor. However, the new system vendor will act as System Integrator to configure the overall solution, and test application changes with migrated data.

2.12.6 Training and Organizational Change Management

CCLD has a Central Training Unit that is currently charged with training users on the current legacy systems. CCLD

will use this unit to train users on the new system. The vendor will share training material templates for its' base services and conduct a 'train the trainer' session for training staff on the services. It is anticipated that training staff will be able to modify these resources and use them to train CCLD Staff.

Organizational Change Management (OCM) has already begun. CCLD management has already been informed of the plan and supplied necessary resources to the project. We are engaging the providers, advocates and other stakeholders and have let them know of other tools they can use to stay informed on the development of the CCLD Facility Management System. Once we get closer to releasing new software, we will use the quarterly newsletters distributed by each program to notify stakeholders of upcoming system changes. We will also use our internal and external facing CCLD websites to update staff and stakeholders as to the status of the CCLD Facility Management System effort and ways they can get involved. CCLD intends to procure an OCM vendor to assist with the process. The vendor will support CCLD until full implementation is achieved. This vendor will plan and send communications to CCLD staff regarding new system and business changes necessary for the system. They will assess policies and procedures to allow CCLD to modify appropriate documentation.

Any business process changes that result from the use of the vendor's services will be made in consultation with the various stakeholders those changes apply to. For example, if there are changes in how a facility or home inspection is documented, CCLD staff will work with the policy unit from each Program to update the Evaluator Manual to include the new process. The Evaluator Manual instructs CCLD staff how to conduct a facility inspection, among many other things.

2.12.7 Resource Capacity/Skills/Knowledge for Stage 3 Solution Development

The Department will leverage current staff and resources with required knowledge and skills to complete the Stage 3.

DSS has an Information Technology (IT) Project Management office and Procurement team that have extensive experience conducting (IT) procurements/projects. The Department has multiple large IT projects that are in various stages of development.

CCLD has experience writing Business Requirements, Business Process Packages, and user stories through its experience working on other large projects. This experience includes, but is not limited to, contributing to a Request for Proposal and conducting Joint Application Development (JAD) sessions to create workflows.

Our CDSS procurement and legal teams have completed numerous other procurements of similar size and know the rule and requirements that pertain to these activities.

2.12.8 Project Management

2.12.8.1 Project Management Risk Assessment

Project Management Risk Score: 3

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

Project Charter	Yes	
Scope Management Plan	No	**Under development and will be ready mid stage 3**
Risk Management Plan	Yes	
Issue and Action Item	Yes	

Management Plan		
Communication Management Plan	Yes	
Schedule Management Plan	No	**Under development and will be ready mid stage 3**
Human Resource Management Plan	Yes	
Staff Management Plan	Yes	
Stakeholder Management Plan	No	**Under development and will be ready mid stage 3**
Governance Plan	Yes	

2.12.9 Organization Charts

Please see attachments for Current, Proposed, and Project Organizational Charts.

2.13 Data Conversion/Migration

Identify the status of each of the following data conversion/migration activities:

Data Conversion/Migration Planning	In Progress	Data Quality Assessment	Not Started
Data Conversion/Migration Requirements	In Progress	Data Quality Business Rules	In Progress
Current Environment Analysis	In Progress	Data Dictionaries	In Progress
Data Profiling	Not Started	Data Cleansing and Correction	Not Started

The vendor for the data migration efforts will work closely with State staff to identify relevant legacy system data to map into the CCLD Facility Management System database.

The initial phase of the development which is the analysis and planning work that must occur prior to moving into project development for the new Facility Management System. This shall include: an assessment of legacy systems, planning for data migration, data profiling, data analysis, cleansing recommendations, a model staging database, and, creating a physical schema. This effort shall include:

- Analyses and documentation of the current legacy systems environments.
- Developing conceptual, logical and physical data models.
- Documenting data migration business requirements including data security and privacy requirements.
- Identifying hardware and software necessary to effectively facilitate data migration activities.
- Developing a data backup and recovery strategy.
- Ensuring knowledge transfer including:
    - training for State staff;
    - preparing training material to document end to end data migration/conversion and cleansing processes; and,
    - a list of processes that the Contractor will use to perform the conversion method.

The State will provide SME's to interpret legacy data as a part of extraction, transformation and loading processes. The data migration vendor is required to develop a detailed roadmap, schedule, and data mapping documents before conversion and migration start. The data normalization is necessary to ensure clean data is migrated to the new system. The data cleansing efforts will occur while the State team is working alongside the data migration vendor team, so we can assist in those efforts and ensure the data for all programs is addressed before completion of this process. Data modeling exercise is expected to provide diagrams to graphically depict the

different data elements and their relationships currently used in the legacy systems. The data modeling is expected to standardize data, increase data sharing benefits, and increase enterprise knowledge that can be leveraged for the actual data migration effort to develop the modern licensing system. It also helps move CCLD toward consistent data standards through the adoption of common standards for data modeling policy, naming, classes, attributes, and data sets.

The Contractor shall:

- Conduct testing to identify conversion issues to ensure accuracy and completeness of the data conversion process in PDM;
- Develop summary/detailed reports on the data migration progress;
- Recommend additional steps for conversion to handle difficult cases and provide procedures and guidelines;
- Refine business requirements by engaging with appropriate stakeholders as needed;
- Appropriately recommend legacy data conversion/migration activities taking into consideration ancillary systems such as: Caregiver Background Check System; Administrator Certification System; Incident/Death Reporting System; Civil Penalties Database; Foster Family Agency Web Application; and, the Legal Care Tracking System.

The Contractor shall document:

- Existing facilities Data to be migrated to Staging areas;
- Historical facilities Data to be migrated to Staging areas;
- Expectations for the Staging area data storage infrastructure;
- Any technology aspects of LIS and FAS environments, staging conversion environment that need to be considered;
- Current systems' data quality issues and their potential impact during the data migration process and ultimately on the business if not addressed before the target system is implemented;
- Data issues present in the current legacy systems and the data population associated with each data error type. This approach enables the CDSS and Facility Management System development Contractor's data cleansing team to determine a proper corrective approach to effectively address data errors; and,
- Recommendations on the data cleansing process and tools.

Upon the development of the new back end system and successful normalization and migration of all data, the API and User Interface will point to the data in the new system, and the legacy systems will be decommissioned. The legacy system staff will be trained to support the chosen service as Tier-1 support.

2.14 Financial Analysis Worksheets

Please see attached FAW:

Original "New Submission" Date	5/4/2020
Form Received Date	5/4/2020
Form Accepted Date	5/4/2020

Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

Form Status	Completed
Form Status Date	5/14/2020
Main Form – Department of Technology Use Only	
Original “New Submission” Date	5/4/2020
Form Received Date	5/4/2020
Form Accepted Date	5/4/2020
Form Status	Completed
Form Status Date	5/14/2020
Form Disposition	Approved
Form Disposition Date	5/14/2020