

Stage 3 Solution Development (Part A)

Department of Technology, SIMM 19C, Revision 9/8/2016

3.4 General Information

Agency or State Entity Name:

Franchise Tax Board

Organization Code:

7730

Proposal Name:

Enterprise Data to Revenue (EDR2) Project

Department of Technology Project Number: 7730-209

3.5 Part A Submittal Information

Contact Information:

Contact First Name:

Chrissy

Contact Email:

Christina.Casale@ftb.ca.gov

Contact Last Name:

Casale

Contact Phone Number:

(916) 845-4116

Part A Submission Date:

5/16/2019

Part A Submission Type:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Submission | <input type="checkbox"/> Updated Submission (Post-Approval) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Updated Submission (Pre-Approval) | <input type="checkbox"/> Withdraw Submission |
| | Reason: Select... |
| | If "Other," specify: |

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.4 General Information | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.7.2 Stage 3 Requirements Count |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.5 Part A Submittal Information | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.7.3 Stage 2 Mid-Level Solution Requirement Changes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6 Procurement Profile | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.7.4 To-Be Business Process Workflow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6.1 Solicitation Identifier | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.8 Statement of Work (SOW) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6.2 Solicitation Method | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.8.1 Completed SOW Sections |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6.3 Procurement Scope Statement | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.8.2 SOW Security Attributes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6.4 Solicitation Contact | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.9 Proposed Procurement Planning and Development Dates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6.5 Anticipated Length of Contract | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.10 Procurement Risk Assessments and Dependencies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.6.6 Anticipated Solicitation Key Action Dates | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.11 Procurement Administrative Compliance Checklist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.7 Stage 3 Solution Requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.12 Solicitation Readiness |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.7.1 Stage 3 Solution Requirements Template | |

Part A Summary of Changes:

Part A Project Approval Executive Transmittal

Condition(s) from Previous Stage(s):

Condition #

Condition Sub-Category

Select...

If "Other," specify:

Condition

Agency/state Entity Response

3.6 Procurement Profile

Primary Ancillary No Procurement

Over Under

If "Other," specify:

See Stage 2 FAW, sheet "Alt 1-Project", cells AM274 + AM 275

If "Other," specify:

Solicitation Number

RFP-FTB-1819-EDR2-01

(916) 431-3257

(916) 628-5661

3.6.5 Anticipated Length of Contract

Optional Years:

Contract End Date:

If "Other," specify:

Number of Business Days:

See RFP, Part 1, Section 2.3. For Optional Years: see RFP, Part 1, Section 5.3.1.

3.6.1 Solicitation Identifier #2

Primary Ancillary No Procurement

Department of General Services (DGS) Delegated Purchasing Authority: Over Under

Solicitation Title: Information Verification and Validation (IV&V)

assess the quality of technical deliverables and prepare detailed reports of findings and recommendations. The IV&V vendor will also perform the check and balance role for project oversight. This request is a one-time, multi-year engagement and the vendor will not provide on-going independent information verification and validation reviews post solution implementation.

3.6.4 Solicitation Contact

Contact First Name:

Contact Email:
Michael.Banuelos@ftb.ca.gov

Contact Phone Number:
(916) 845-6110

Contract End Date: 12/31/2026

Optional Years:

Contract Start Date:

Contract End Date:

3.6.6 Anticipated Solicitation Key Action Dates

Number of Business Days:

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

3.6.1 Solicitation Identifier #3

Primary Ancillary No Procurement

Department of General Services (DGS) Delegated Purchasing Authority: Over Under

Solicitation Title: Independent Security Assessment (ISA)

3.6.2 Solicitation Method

Solicitation Method: Other If "Other," specify: LPA – TBD or Small Business

Solicitation Number

3.6.4 Solicitation Contact

Contact First Name:

Michael

Contact Last Name:

Banuelos

Contact Email:

Michael.Banuelos@ftb.ca.gov

Contact Phone Number:

(916) 845-6110

Contract End Date:

12/31/2026

Optional Years:

Contract Start Date:

Contract End Date:

3.6.6 Anticipated Solicitation Key Action Dates

If "Other," specify:

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Number of Business Days:

3.6.1 Solicitation Identifier #4

Primary Ancillary No Procurement

Department of General Services (DGS) Delegated Purchasing Authority:

Over Under TBD

Solicitation Title: Quality Assurance (QA)

3.6.2 Solicitation Method

Solicitation Method

Other

If "Other," specify: LPA – TBD

Anticipated Amount

TBD

Conducted By

Agency/state entity

Development Status

Not Started

Solicitation Number

TBD

3.6.3 Procurement Scope Statement

The primary purpose of this procurement is to select a qualified vendor to conduct third party independent quality assurance reviews for FTB's EDR2 Project. The vendor will be required to conduct assessments of the project to ensure the EDR2 solution meets certain thresholds of acceptability, ensure the solution adheres to quality control policies, and prepare detailed reports of findings and recommendations. The QA vendor will conduct the quality assurance reviews to assess if the work processes, products, and services

provided by the EDR2 Contractor satisfy the user’s specifications and expectations of the EDR2 solution. This request is a one-time, multi-year engagement and the vendor will not provide on-going independent quality assurance reviews post implementation.

Contract End Date: 12/31/2026

Optional Years:

Contract Start Date:

Contract End Date:

3.6.6 Anticipated Solicitation Key Action Dates

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

Number of Business Days:

TBD

3.7 Stage 3 Solution Requirements

3.7.1 Stage 3 Solution Requirements Template

See RFP, Part 1, Section 4.2

3.7.2 Stage 3 Requirements Count

Total Detailed Functional Requirements:	1,996
Total Detailed Non-Functional Requirements:	165
Total Detailed Project/Transition Requirements:	100
Detailed Requirements Grand Total:	2,261

3.7.3 Stage 2 Mid-Level Solution Requirement Changes

	Yes	No
1. Since approval of the Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis, has the Agency/state entity developed any new solution requirements that were not represented in the mid-level solution requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Since approval of the Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis, has the Agency/state entity modified (changed or deleted) any mid-level solution requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If question 1 or 2 above is “Yes”:	Percentage of Change: 29%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the percentage of change in the space provided Describe below the nature and scope of the change(s), impact(s) to the recommended solution, and how requirements align with the business objectives established in the Stage 1 Business Analysis: 		
During the S2AA, 350 active MLRs were submitted. 51 new MLRs were added and 52 MLRs were inactivated. There are now 349 active MLRs. The nature and scope of the changes were minor and requirements continue to align with the business objectives established in the Stage 1 Business Analysis.		

3.7.4 To-Be Business Process Workflow

3.8 Statement of Work (SOW)

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW

3.8.1 Completed SOW Sections

Completed SOW Section:	14. Deliverable Acceptance/Rejection Process
------------------------	--

information)

Responsible:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Responsible:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

SOW Component Detail:

Details related to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 800-53 controls.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Section 9.

SOW Component Detail:

System Security Plan (SSP) details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Section 7. MRD – TM25.

Completed SOW Section:

18. Disaster Recovery

SOW Component Detail:

Disaster recovery (including business continuity/technology recovery) details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Section 7. MRD – TM4.

Completed SOW Section:

20. Hardware and Software Needs

SOW Component Detail:

System hardware/software needed; price/quantity; physical and performance requirements; etc.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Sections 4 and 5.

Completed SOW Section:

23. System Installation

SOW Component Detail:

Solution installation details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Sections 4 and 5.

Completed SOW Section:

24. System Implementation or Integration

SOW Component Detail:

Solution implementation details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Sections 6 and 7. MRD – TM24.

SOW Component Detail:

Solution integration details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Section 6 and 7. MRD – TM24.

Completed SOW Section:

26. System Testing and Acceptance Procedures

SOW Component Detail:

Details related to solution/testing and acceptance procedures.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Section 7, 8, and 9. MRD – TM18.

Completed SOW Section:

27. Transition of Operation to New Contractor or to State

SOW Component Detail:

Details related to the transition of operations to new contractor or state.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Sections 7, 8, and 16. Exhibit 22-3. MRD – TM4.

Completed SOW Section:

28. Knowledge Transfer and/or Training

SOW Component Detail:

Knowledge transfer and/or training details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW 16. Exhibit 22-3. MRD – TM21.

Completed SOW Section:

29. Maintenance and Operations (M&O)

SOW Component Detail:

Maintenance and operations details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Section 16.

Completed SOW Section:

32. Warranty

SOW Component Detail:

Warranty details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach:

Select or Type...

Solicitation Number:

See RFP, Part 2, Appendix A, SOW, Sections 3, 7, and 17. Appendix A-1, Section 3.

Completed SOW Section:

33. Service Level Agreements (SLAs)

SOW Component Detail:

SLA details.

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach: Select or Type...

Responsible:

Performance Deliverable:

Requirement Number(s):

Methodology/Approach: Select or Type...

Solicitation Number: Not applicable.

3.8.2 SOW Security Attributes

	Yes	No
1. Does the SOW provide details on the information security and privacy controls that are required (based on the NIST 800-53 controls)? See RFP, Part 2, Requirements, DSR2527	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the SOW define how the information security and privacy controls will be procured and implemented? See RFP, Part 2, Requirements, DSR2527	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the SOW include provisions for creating the System Security Plan (SSP)? See RFP, Part 2, Requirements, DSR2527	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.9 Proposed Procurement Planning and Development Dates

Activity	In progress
Start Date	7/03/2017
End Date	6/30/2021
Number of Business Days	992

3.10 Procurement Risk Assessments and Dependencies

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Has the Agency/state entity identified procurement-related external dependencies (e.g., supplier viability, stakeholder/customer legal constraints, ancillary contracts, other state or federal legislation)? If "Yes," describe dependencies below: No external dependencies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Has the Agency/state entity completed the State Contracting Manual Volume 3, Chapter 4, Section 4.B2.13 Risk Criteria Guidelines and incorporated financial protection measures for the primary solicitation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Does the Agency/state entity intend to maintain ownership of any source code developed for this solution? If "Yes," describe below how ownership will be obtained, maintained, and upgraded: The State intends to obtain ownership of the solution source code. Ownership will be obtained and maintained as described in the RFP, Part 2, SOW, Appendix A-1, IT and Contract Special Provisions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Will this transaction be financed? If "Yes," attach the approved State Financial Marketplace Compliance Certification form and agreement below.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.11 Procurement Administrative Compliance Checklist

(Questions may not be all-inclusive)		Yes	No	N/A
1.	Has the Agency/state entity obtained approval from Department of General Services Procurement Division (DGS/PD) or Statewide Technology Procurement Division (STPD) to use an alternative evaluation model other than a 50/50 cost split? If "Yes," attach approval below. Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If "Yes" or "No," below provide a brief description of the evaluation criteria proposed: FTB requested the use of a value-effective evaluation methodology weighted at 70% for the Bid Requirements (i.e. scored solution requirements) and 30% for Cost, out of the 1,000 total points available. Final Proposals will be evaluated using a combination of mandatory pass/fail and numerically scored criteria; excluding preferences and incentives, this evaluation methodology translates to 700 points available for the Non-Cost portion, and 300 points available for the Cost portion for this RFP solicitation.</p>				
2.	Has the Agency/state entity received signed confidentiality statements from all project participants (internal and external)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.	Has the Agency/state entity received signed conflict of interest statements from all project participants (internal and external)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4.	Has the Agency/state entity obtained an exemption from the Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) participation requirements and/or the DVBE participation incentive through an approved DVBE Waiver? If "Yes," attach the waiver below:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If "No," provide a brief explanation below: For the EDR² Project Request for Proposal (RFP), FTB has elected to include a Mandatory DVBE Participation Program requirement of three percent (3%). The Bidder's response must include a minimum DVBE participation goal of 3% of the Bidder's net proposal price with one (1) or more DVBE. In addition, an incentive will be given to all Bidders who exceed the 3% DVBE mandatory participation. For Contract award evaluation purposes only, the State shall apply the incentive amount based on the amount of DVBE participation obtained above the three percent (3%) requirement in accordance with the evaluation methodology described in RFP Section 7, Evaluation.</p>				
5.	Does the Agency/state entity's solution requirements ensure compliance with the Information Technology Accessibility Policy (SAM Section 4833)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6.	Has the Agency/state entity completed and received approval of the SIMM Section 71 Certification of Compliance with IT Policies? If "Yes," attach the approved certification below. Attachment: The SIMM Section 71 Certification of Compliance with IT Policies will be completed and submitted after the procurement solicitation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	Has the Agency/state entity completed and received approval of a personal services contracts justification (Government Code Section 19130)? If "Yes," attach the approved justification below. Attached	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Will the Agency/state entity's solicitation ensure compliance with productive use requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.12 Solicitation Readiness

		Yes	No	N/A
1.	Has the Agency/state entity started development of a Bidder's Library?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	What evaluation methodology was selected for the primary solicitation? Explain the rationale for selection below:	Value Effective		
<p>As stated in the State Contracting Manual, Volume 3, sections 2.B1.5 and 4.D6.0, a value effective evaluation methodology is required for all IT goods and services transactions valued at more than \$1,000,000, unless the procurement is straight-forward and requirements are known, detailed, and clear such that the evaluation and selection can be based on lowest net cost meeting</p>				

all other bid specifications. However, the EDR² Project is a large-scale system integration project that will require a complex, formal competitive IT procurement, which is valued to be well in excess of \$1,000,000. A value effective evaluation methodology allows the State to consider other critical factors which are of considerable value to FTB other than cost alone.

3. Has the Agency/state entity started development of the evaluation (and selection) criteria for the primary solicitation?
4. Has the Agency/state entity started development of the cost worksheets as part of the evaluation for the solicitation?
5. Has the Agency/state entity started development of the bidder and key staff qualifications as part of the evaluation for the solicitation?
- If "N/A," briefly explain below why bidder and key staff qualifications will not be included in the evaluation for the solicitation:
6. Has the Agency/state entity started development of the bidder and key staff references as part of the evaluation for the solicitation?
- If "N/A," briefly explain below why bidder and key staff references will not be included in the evaluation for the solicitation:

Stage 3 Solution Development (Part A) – Department of Technology Use Only

Original "New Submission" Date	5/16/2019
Form Received Date	5/16/2019
Form Accepted Date	5/16/2019
Form Status	Completed
Form Status Date	8/15/2019