

Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19 D.2 (Rev. 3.0.8, 2/28/2022)

4.1 General Information

1. Agency or State Entity Name: 0840 - Controller, State

If Agency/State entity not in the list, enter here with the organization code.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- 2. Proposal Name: Unclaimed Property Management System Replacement (UPMSR)
- 3. Department of Technology Project Number (0000-000): 0840-091
- 4. S4PRA Version Number: Version 1
- 5. CDT Billing Case Number: CS0001833

Don't have a Case Number? Click here to get one.

4.2 Submittal Information

1. Contact Information

Contact Name: Todd Boltjes

Contact Email: tboltjes@sco.ca.gov

Contact Phone: (916) 445-8245

2. Submission Type: New Submission

If Withdraw, select Reason: Choose an item.

If Other, specify reason here: Click or tap here to enter text.

Sections Changed if an updated or resubmission (List all the sections that have changed.)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Summary of Changes (Summarize updates made.)

Click or tap here to enter text.

- 3. Attach **Project Approval Executive Transmittal** to your email submission.
- 4. Attach Final <u>Procurement Assessment Form</u> to your email submission.
- **5. Conditions from Stage 3 Approval** (Enter any conditions from the Stage 3 Solution Analysis approval letter issued by CDT):

SCO should be aware of budget actions and CDT timelines as shown in State Administrative Manual (SAM) Section 4819.42 and State Information Management Manual (SIMM) Section 05A. As the UPMSR Project moves forward through the PAL planning process, the SCO should be familiar with the reporting criteria in SAM Section 4819.37. If one or more of the criteria no longer applies or the S3SA information changes substantially, the SCO would be required to submit a revised S3SA, with updated approval signatures, to the CDT using the SIMM Section G, Executive Transmittal.

4.3 Contract Management

The Contract Manager must be a State Employee and should not be the Project Manager. Please complete the questions below in reference to the **primary solicitation**.

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

1. Contract Management Plan (Approved): Yes

Status: Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Has the role of Contract Manager been assigned, and has the Contract Manager reviewed and gained an understanding of the scope, activities, tasks, and deliverables of the contract? Yes

If "No," briefly explain below why both have not been accomplished:

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Does the assigned Contract Manager understand the processes for post-award contract activities, including contract amendments, contract work authorizations, terms and conditions, and contract escalation/resolution? Yes

If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Has a post-award kickoff meeting between the Contract Manager and state project team members been scheduled to align state and contractor expectations related to contract, budget, invoicing, requirements review, and contractor incentives? Yes

If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Does the Contract Manager understand the Agency/state entity and federal processes, policy, and applicable procedures? Yes

If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Does the Contract Manager have a plan to collect and assess contractor and project performance information on a regular basis (e.g., establish meetings with Project Managers, communication techniques)? Yes

If "No," briefly explain below why this has not been accomplished:

Click or tap here to enter text.

4.4 Organizational Readiness

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

1. Implementation Management Plan (Draft): Yes

Status: Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Does the Agency/state entity currently have a mature release management process with a repeatable and scalable testing methodology that supports all stages of testing (system, integration, security, performance, interfaces, regression, user acceptance, and accessibility)? Yes

If "No," briefly describe below the release management process that will be used to manage, plan, schedule, and control a software release through the different phases and environments, including testing and deploying software releases:

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Does the project team have a clear understanding of the areas of business (identified in Stage 1) that will be impacted by the project? Yes

If "No," briefly explain below how the Agency/state entity plans to educate the project team to ensure all members have a clear understanding of the impacted business areas by the project:

4. Does the Agency/state entity have processes and methodologies in place to support Organizational Change Management (OCM) activities identified in Stage 2, Section 2.9 Organizational Change Management? Yes

If "No," briefly describe below how the Agency/state entity will perform OCM activities for this proposal:

FYI: The new S2SA template Section 2.9 is Project Organization. The template used by this project has 2.9 as Market Research. The UPMSR Project has OCM defined in Section 2.12.6

5. Does the Agency/state entity have dedicated knowledge transfer resources assigned to business process improvement or business process reengineering activities resulting from the new solution? Yes

If "Yes," specify the areas of business process improvement:

The new solution will transform the core business processes for the Unclaimed Property Division (UPD) from manual, paper-based processes to automated or semi-automated digital/online processes. These changes to the business processes will allow UPD to achieve improvements in productivity, claims processing times, fraud detection and prevention, as well as customer service. UPD has dedicated knowledge transfer resources as part of the OCM team and division management team. The OCM team leads as well as all UPD managers have received extensive PROSCI training to assist with the business process improvement and knowledge transfer initiatives.

If "No," briefly explain below how the Agency/state entity will perform business process improvement or business process reengineering activities resulting from the new solution:

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Attach Updated Project Organization Chart to your email submission.

4.5 **Project Readiness**

1. Select the system development methodology you plan to use to design and develop the new system: Adaptive

Provide a brief description of your methodology and reason for selecting it below:

The selected vendor uses an adaptive/agile development approach.

Describe below the Agency/state entity's past project experience using the system development methodology selected. If this methodology has never been used before, describe the training and staff development that will be provided to prepare staff to utilize this methodology.

Although the Unclaimed Property Division does not have experience with an adaptive system deployment methodology, as the current solution has been in place for over 15 years, the vendor has successfully implemented 34 deployments of this solution using this approach. In addition, key project staff will be assigned training in Agile project management in PATH.

2. Has the Agency/state entity engaged the Office of Technology Services (OTech) for capacity planning and the development of the solution delivery timeline? Not applicable

If "No," and data center capacity planning and alignment services are needed, explain below the reason OTech has not been engaged and what is the alternative plan:

The solution is a COTS, SaaS solution and will not be hosted by the state.

3. Have resource commitments been obtained for all those identified in the Resource Management Plan? Yes

If "No," explain below why commitments have not been obtained and the plan to mitigate this risk:

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Does the Resource Management Plan ensure resources are sufficiently committed to perform project activities if they are <u>also</u> committed to other responsibilities? Yes

If "No," explain below how sufficient resource levels will be maintained for all project activities:

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Have all identified project leads received at a minimum basic project management training? Yes

If "No," explain how the Agency/state entity will educate the project team leads on project management basics:

Click or tap here to enter text.

4.6 **Business Objective Valuation**

- **1. Attach** the Requirements/Backlog Baseline and/or Deliverables Baseline to your email submission.
- 2. Insert your Objectives (ID, Objective, Metric, Baseline, and Target Result) from Stage 1 Section 1.7, along with changes and reason for changes, and assign a percent score value to each. The total of all scores should be 100%.

Objective ID: 1

Objective: Increase the return of properties to the rightful owners by 15% within the first two years after implementation (improved website experience, mobile-friendly site design, SSN auto-matching, split claims capabilities, and decreased processing time).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average number of properties returned one year prior to implementation.

Baseline: Average number of properties returned one year prior to implementation.

Target Result: 15% increase of return of properties to the rightful owners within the first two years.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 2

Objective: Within the first year after implementation, increase the number of documents submitted electronically by holders to 75% of total submitted holder documents. Page **5** of **14** Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average number of holder documents submitted electronically one year prior to implementation.

Baseline: Average number of holder documents submitted electronically one year prior to implementation.

Target Result: 75% increase in the total number of holder documents submitted electronically within one year.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 3

Objective: Increase the number of UPD staff who can work remotely by 20% within the first year after implementation (remote access design, secure access portals, remote management tools).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average number of UPD staff working remotely one year prior to implementation.

Baseline: Average number of UPD staff working remotely one year prior to implementation.

Target Result: 20% increase in the number of UPD staff who can work remotely within the first year.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 4

Objective: Within the first year after implementation, increase the number of documents submitted electronically by claimants to 30% of total submitted documents.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average number of documents submitted electronically one year prior to implementation.

Baseline: Average number of documents submitted electronically one year prior to implementation.

Target Result: 30% increase the number of documents submitted electronically by claimants within the first year.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 5

Objective: Increase holder reporting compliance by 20% within the first three years after implementation (CRM, interconnected connected databases, etc.).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average holder reporting compliance in the three years preceding implementation.

Baseline: Average holder reporting compliance in the three years preceding implementation.

Target Result: 20% increase in holder reporting compliance within the first three years.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 6

Objective: Reduce manual claim processing time to 125 days within the first two years after implementation.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average time for manual claim processing in the two years preceding implementation.

Baseline: Average time for manual claim processing in the two years preceding implementation.

Target Result: Within the first two years, reduce manual claim processing time to 125 days.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 7

Objective: Within one year of implementation, increase the number of customer questions handled by automated systems by 10%.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Average number of customer service questions handled by automated systems one year prior to implementation.

Baseline: Average number of customer service questions handled by automated systems one year prior to implementation.

Target Result: 10% increase in the number of customer questions handled by automated systems within one year.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 8

Objective: Launch a minimum of three automated fraud prevention tools within the first year after implementation.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1 Metric: Number of automated fraud protection tools implemented. Baseline: No automated fraud protection tools implemented. Target Result: At least three automated fraud protection tools in use within one year. Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 9

Objective: Within one year of the implementation of the project, launch a system that will allow UPD to auction properties.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Ability to auction properties.

Baseline: Not able to auction properties.

Target Result: Possibility to auction properties within one year.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 10

Objective: Reduce the timeline for system fixes, updates and enhancements by 50% within the first year of implementation.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Time from identified system fix, update, and/or enhancement to full deployment.

Baseline: Average time for identified system fix, update, and/or enhancement to full deployment one year prior to implementation.

Target Result: 50% reduction in the timeline for system fixes, updates and enhancements within one year.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 11

Objective: Upon full system implementation, integrate business process workflows between and within all UPD bureaus.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Evaluation of business process workflow integrations between and within UPD bureaus.

Baseline: Minimal business process workflow integrations between and within UPD bureaus.

Target Result: Integration of business process workflows between and within UPD bureaus upon system implementation.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 12

Objective: Upon full system implementation, eliminate stand-alone databases and spreadsheets required for essential business functions and replace with a secure, integrated system.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Total number of stand-alone databases and spreadsheets as identified in the Bidder's Library.

Baseline: Based on stand-alone databases and spreadsheets as identified in the Bidder's Library.

Target Result: Elimination of the use of stand-alone databases and spreadsheets as identified in the Bidder's Library.

Valuation: 100%

Objective ID: 13

Objective: Upon implementation, implement integrated and automated systems to ensure financial integrity and accurate reconciliation of funds (i.e. securities, cash, partial payments).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No changes from Stage 1

Metric: Number of integrated and automated systems to ensure financial integrity and accurate reconciliation of funds implemented.

Baseline: No integrated and automated systems to ensure financial integrity and accurate reconciliation of funds implemented.

Target Result: Implementation of integrated and automated systems to ensure financial integrity and accurate reconciliation of funds upon system implementation.

Valuation: 100%

4.7 Schedule Baseline

1. Schedule Summary

Project Execution Start Dates

Proposed Project Start Date (from most recently approved schedule/roadmap): 1/23/2024

Baseline Project Start Date: 3/8/2024

Variance: 4.1%

Project End Dates

Proposed Project Finish Date (from most recently approved schedule/roadmap): 12/24/2024

Baseline Project Finish Date: 3/11/2025

Variance: 5.3%

2. Reason(s) for Variances

Provide reasons for any date variances: In May 2023, CDT rescinded their Project Delegation Request, at the request of SCO. And, STP assumed oversight of the Solution Procurement. This change resulted an additional 8.5 weeks to Project Implementation. However, with the decision to not proceed with Negotiations and Best and Final Offer, some of this time was realized back.

3. Master Schedule and Key Milestones

Attach Master Schedule with highlighted Key Milestones to your email submission.

4.8 Cost Baseline

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

1. Cost Management Plan (Approved): Yes

Status: Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Cost Summary

Total Planning Cost (One-Time)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$4,542,097.00

Baseline Cost: \$5,452,207.00

Variance: \$910,110.00

Total Project Cost (One-Time)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$2,650,401.00

Baseline Cost: \$3,232,409.00

Variance: \$582,008.00

Total Future Operations IT Staff and OE&E Cost (Continuing)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$4,961,000.00

Baseline Cost: \$4,739,000.00

Variance: -\$222,000.00

Total Cost

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): 153,498.00

Baseline Cost: \$13,423,615.00

Variance: \$1,270,117.00

Annual Future Operations IT Costs (Annual M&O)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): 14,000.00

Baseline Cost: \$4,001,000.00

Variance: \$487,000.00

TIP: Baseline costs should match the submitted Financial Analysis Worksheet for Stage 4.

3. Reason(s) for Variances

Provide reasons for any cost variances: The State Controller's Office (SCO) requests to realign previously approved funding for the Unclaimed Property Management System Replacement (UPMSR) Project and ongoing maintenance and operations due to project delegation changing over to the California Department of Technology (CDT) and the change in project timeline. The change in the project timeline was due to SCO's request to rescind the procurement delegation authorized by CDT. SCO's limited Information Technology procurement authority and the Department of General Services' limited availability to expedite the procurement resulted in SCO's request for CDT to rescind their Project Delegation Request from April 2022. As of May 2023, CDT Project Approvals and Oversight resumed project oversite while Statewide Technology Procurement assumed oversight on the Solution Procurement.

4. Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Summary

Budget Request ID: 0840-048-BCP-2022-A1

Budget Request Year (0000-00): 2022-23

Requested Amount (specific to the project): **\$323,000 for 2022-23, \$1,183,000 for 2023-24, \$1,647,000 for 2024-25, \$1,685,000 for 2025-26, and \$1,724,000 for 2026-27**

Status: Supported

Budget Bill Language (if supported): n/a

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add BCPs as needed (e.g., Planning and Project related).

5. Financial Analysis Worksheets (Baseline)

Attach Final FAWs to your email submission.

4.9 Primary Solicitation Results

- **1. Attach** the approved Evaluation and Selection Report for the primary solicitation to your email submission.
- 2. Attach the proposed contract resulting from the primary solicitation to your email submission.
- 3. Was one of the viable solutions in Stage 2 selected for final contract award? Yes

If "No", please describe:

Click or tap here to enter text.

- 4. Selected Vendor Name:
- 5. Contract Number: CUPD90622
 - a. Contract Start Date: 3/8/2024
 - **b.** Contract End Date: 3/8/2028
- 6. Total Contract Cost (without optional years): \$10,263,691.11
 - a. Optional Years (Number of Months): 60 months
- 7. Total Cost of Optional Years: \$15,973,842.00

8. Total Contract Cost (with optional years): \$26,237,533.00

Are the following Project Management Plan Drafts approved by the designated Agency/state entity authority and available for the Department of Technology to review? **Choose**: 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Not Applicable.' If 'No' or 'Not Applicable,' provide the artifact status in the space provided. These plans may be completed with the selected primary vendor.

1. Configuration Management Plan (Draft): Yes

Status: Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Data Management Plan (Draft): Yes

Status: Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Maintenance and Operations Transition Management Plan (Draft): Yes

Status: Click or tap here to enter text.

4.10 Risk Register

Attach Risk Register to your email submission.

End of Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval Document.

Please ensure ADA compliance before submitting this document to CDT.

When ready, submit Stage 4 and all attachments in an email to ProjectOversight@state.ca.gov.

TIP: Use the Gate 4 Project Readiness and Approval Evaluation Scorecard (<u>SIMM Section 19-D</u>) as an internal tool to ensure a quality submission.

Department of Technology Use Only

Original "New Submission" Date: 2/7/2024 Form Received Date: 2/7/2024 Form Accepted Date: 2/7/2024 Form Status: Completed Form Status Date: 03/13/2024 Form Disposition: Approved Form Disposition Date: 03/13/2024