

Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19 D.2 (Rev. 3.0.9, 2/28/2022)

4.1 General Information

1. Agency or State Entity Name: 3600 - Fish and Wildlife, Department of

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

- 2. Proposal Name: Environmental Review and Permitting Project
- 3. Department of Technology Project Number (0000-000): 3600-081
- 4. S4PRA Version Number: Version 1
- 5. CDT Billing Case Number: Click or tap here to enter text.

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

4.2 Submittal Information

1. Contact Information

Contact Name: Usha Menon

Contact Email: usha.menon@wildlife.ca.gov

Contact Phone: (916) 902-9138

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):

Click or tap here to enter text.

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): No

Status: Drafted – Pending Approval

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? No

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

The Post-Award Kick-Off meeting is in the planning stages and will be scheduled by November 20, 2024.

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: Drafted – Pending Approval

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:

Click or tap here to enter text.

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:

Click or tap here to enter text.

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:

In our current permitting systems, permit workflows and business processes are based on solution limitations and there are many workarounds in these permit workflows. During the Discovery Activities phase of the project, CDFW will be looking for opportunities to streamline these permitting workflows and improve the business environment.

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: Hybrid

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

CDFW is planning on using a hybrid agile-waterfall methodology. This methodology will allow CDFW use the planning and requirement stages of Waterfall and the Development and Testing stages of Agile as it allows for thorough planning upfront, but also the flexibility to adapt as development proceeds.

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.

CDFW has project implementation experience with both agile and waterfall methodologies.

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:

CDFW will not leverage OTech services for this proposed solution.

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: Significantly reduce internal and external user frustration and loss of time by replacing EPIMS and SCP with an upgraded, ease-of-use User Interface.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Reduce the average time to complete one permit in EPIMS and SCPP by 30%

Baseline: Current average time to complete one EPIMS permit is 107 days and one SCPP permit is 180 days. The remaining permit types are submitted manually, so the average amount of time to complete one permit is unknown.

Target Result: Achieve an average time of 75 days for EPIMS permits and 126 days for SCP permits. Obtain the ability to track the amount of time it takes to complete the remaining permit types.

Valuation: 14%

Objective ID: 2

Objective: Implement a new software solution that allows for streamlined and efficient workflows that are flexible for each type of environmental permit submitted in EPIMS and SCP.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Implement a unified system for submitting and processing multiple permit types.

Baseline: Currently, four different software solutions are needed to submit and manage ten identified permit types within the project scope. Of these, only three permit types can be submitted online through EPIMS and SCPP. The remaining seven permits must be submitted manually and entered into two tracking databases (CESA and Project Tracking.)

Target Result: A single software solution will be used to submit and manage all ten permit types identified in the project scope.

Valuation: 22%

Objective ID: 3

Objective: Ensure the new software solution has robust reporting capabilities that allow for data searches for internal users (e.g., searches based of geographical location or wildlife species).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Create a unified system enabling reporting capabilities across all permit types.

Baseline: Currently, reporting capabilities are limited to two systems (EPIMS, SCP). The remaining permit types in CESA and Project Tracking lack any reporting functionality.

Target Result: The new system will offer comprehensive reporting capabilities for both custom and ad hoc reports.

Valuation: 18%

Objective ID: 4

Objective: Implement a new software solution that allows flexibility for data updates. Example: Internal users may need to update permit information in the event regulations or department guidelines are updated.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Develop a unified system for updating permitting information across all permit types, significantly reducing the time required to complete updates.

Baseline: Currently, any changes to permit conditions and form requirements must be handled by either the Contractor or System Administrator. For EPIMS, it takes an average of four weeks to implement these changes, while for SCP, changes cannot be made at all.

Target Result: Staff users will be able to make all language and text changes to forms within one week of change approval, without needing support from a system administrator.

Valuation: 12%

Objective ID: 5

Objective: Implement a new software solution that allows better customer management. Example: External users may need to update their individual and/or business information (in the event that contact information or employment changes or a business entity changes names or employees).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Enable changes in user information without data loss.

Baseline: In SCP, user login information is tied to the customer email. Changing the email results in loss of access to all permit information. For CESA and Project Tracking, permits are submitted manually and external users do not have login access and cannot change user information.

Target Result: Both external and staff users will be able to update individual and business email information without disrupting any data relationships.

Valuation: 10%

Objective ID: 6

Objective: Ensure the new software solution provides faster times to return information when selecting data from a range of choices (e.g., geographical locations or wildlife species).

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Enhance the average return time for selecting a record from large drop-down lists to fifteen (15) seconds.

Baseline: Presently, in EPIMS and SCP, data retrieval time is two (2) minutes.

Target Result: Achieve an average retrieval time of fifteen (15) seconds.

Valuation: 8%

Objective ID: 7

Objective: Improve GIS functionality and compatibility with other geographic mapping programs.

Change and Reason for Change from Stage 1: No change to the Objective. Metric, Baseline, and Target Result were updated to provide further clarification of methodology.

Metric: Integrate GIS functionality into the software solution and synchronize data with the current GIS program (Esri ArcGIS).

Baseline: Presently, there is no GIS integration, requiring staff to enter location information manually.

Target Result: The new system will integrate with GIS, enabling seamless transfer of location data.

Valuation: 16%

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + in the lower right corner of the above seven fields to add multiple objectives.

4.7 Schedule Baseline

1. Schedule Summary

Project Execution Start Dates

Proposed Project Start Date (from most recently approved schedule/roadmap): 1/2/2024

Baseline Project Start Date: 1/7/2025

Variance: 12 months

Project End Dates

Proposed Project Finish Date (from most recently approved schedule/roadmap): 12/31/2025

Baseline Project Finish Date: 1/6/2027

Variance: 12 months

2. Reason(s) for Variances

Provide reasons for any date variances: Extended procurement process, which also included Pre-Solicitation that was not incorporated in the proposed Stage 2 project roadmap. The Technical Evaluation and Negotiation processes took longer than CDT STP and CDFW's expectations.

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): No

Status: Drafted – Pending Approval

2. Cost Summary

Total Planning Cost (One-Time)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$1,789,054

Baseline Cost: \$2,371,551

Variance: + \$582,497

Total Project Cost (One-Time)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$6,375,725

Baseline Cost: \$9,538,874

Variance: + \$3,163,149

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

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$3,390,209

Baseline Cost: \$2,268,140

Variance: - \$1,122,069

Total Cost

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$11,554,988

Baseline Cost: \$14,178,565

Variance: + \$2,623,577

Annual Future Operations IT Costs (Annual M&O)

Estimated Proposed Cost (from most recently approved FAW): \$3,217,120

Baseline Cost: \$893,879

Variance: - \$2,323,241

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

3. Reason(s) for Variances

Provide reasons for any cost variances: Cost variances are due to the following:

- Planning Cost Planning costs were further clarified by permit type and additional staff were found to be necessary to implement the solution. Additionally, CDT PAO and STP resources were not estimated correctly.
- Total Project Cost Quality Management costs were added to the project. Independent Verification and Validation costs were not accurately entered into the FAWs (S2 only listed one year of costs, not the term of the contract). Additionally, CDT PAO resources were not estimated correctly.
- Future Ops IT Staff and OE&E Cost Annual subscription costs were added to the Future Ops costs. Cost estimation was higher than actual cost due to the selected contractor's lower maintenance costs
- Annual Future Ops IT Costs Cost estimation was higher than actual cost due to the selected contractor's lower maintenance costs.

4. Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Summary

Budget Request ID: N/A

Budget Request Year (0000-00): Click or tap here to enter text.

Requested Amount (specific to the project): Click or tap here to enter text.

Status: Choose an item.

Budget Bill Language (if supported): Click or tap here to enter text.

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: Eduloka Limited dba inLumon

5. Contract Number: P2482005

- a. Contract Start Date: 1/7/2025
- b. Contract End Date: 1/6/2027
- 6. Total Contract Cost (without optional years): \$4,800,134
 - a. Optional Years (Number of Months): 24 months
- 7. Total Cost of Optional Years: \$1,878,758

8. Total Contract Cost (with optional years): \$6,587,892

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): No

Status: This plan is to be completed by the primary vendor in accordance with the Statement of Work.

2. Data Management Plan (Draft): No

Status: This plan has been drafted but will be completed by the primary vendor in accordance with the Statement of Work.

3. Maintenance and Operations Transition Management Plan (Draft): No

Status: This plan is to be completed by the primary vendor in accordance with the Statement of Work.

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: 12/4/2024 Form Received Date: 12/4/2024 Form Accepted Date: 12/4/2024 Form Status: Completed Form Status Date: 12/23/2024 Form Disposition: Approved Form Disposition Date: 12/23/2024