



Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19B.2 (Ver. 3.0.8, 02/28/2022)

2.1 General Information

1. Agency or State Entity Name: 5180 - Social Services, Department of

If Agency/State entity is not in the list, enter here with the [organization code](#).

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Proposal Name: California Supporting Providers and Reaching Kids (CalSPARK).

3. Department of Technology Project Number (0000-000): 5180-227

4. S2AA Version Number: Version 1

5. CDT Billing Case Number: CS0063982

Don't have a Case Number? [Click here to get one.](#)

2.2 Submittal Information

1. Contact Information

Contact Name: Shyamal Chattaraj

Contact Email: Shyamal.Chattaraj@dss.ca.gov

Contact Phone: (916) 698-5940

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 update or resubmission: (List all the sections that 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. Please see attached document ([Link](#))
4. Attach [Procurement Assessment Form](#) to your email submission. Please see attached document ([Link](#))
5. **Conditions from Stage 1 Approval** (Enter any conditions from the Stage 1 Business Analysis approval letter issued by CDT or your AIO): None

2.3 Baseline Processes and Systems

1. **Current Business Environment (Describe the current business environment of which the effort will be understood and assessed in 500 words)**

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) California Supporting Providers and Reaching Kids (CalSPARK) program is comprised of the Child Care Development Division (CCDD) and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). The programs are currently operating on five legacy systems:

1. Provider Accounting Reporting Information System (PARIS)
2. Child Development Program Enrollment Attendance and Fiscal Reporting (CDPR), formerly known as Child Development Provider Accounting Reporting Information System (CPARIS)
3. Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS)
4. Child Development Fiscal System (CDFS), also known as the CalWORKs Alternative Payment Online Reporting Portal
5. Child Nutrition Information & Payment System (CNIPS)

The delivery of these services was transformed by the Early Childhood Development Act of 2020, which authorized the transfer of Child Care Development programs administered by the California Department of Education (CDE) to the CDSS, effective July 1, 2021.

Although the Stage 1 Business Analysis describes “three key data systems”, it combined the PARIS and CPARIS data system as one because they shared one central database. In the middle of Stage 2 efforts for CalSPARK, PARIS and CPARIS were decoupled due to an expiration of the Inter-Agency Agreement (IAA) with CDE. Thus, CDPR was developed as a temporary solution to enable continued business support for activities previously conducted in CPARIS. Similarly, CDFS was not previously documented as a separate system because it is used to collect data for CDMIS. Since CDPR and CDFS are used as portals to provide data for the legacy systems, they were added to the scope of the project since their use will be eliminated by this project’s solution.

As the transition of ownership of the legacy systems from CDE to CDSS is ongoing, the CDSS has expanded their role in the operation of Child Care and Nutrition programs considerably. The CDSS’ scope, which already included regulatory enforcement, licensing support, and voucher-based subsidy management, now includes the administration of 18 child care subsidy programs and the CACFP.

PARIS/CPARIS (replaced by CDPR), are used to manage fiscal information to reimburse child care providers following the timely and accurate submission of their claims (CPARIS is a CDE owned system whose functionality is mirrored in CDPR as of September 2023 for child care contractors). CDMIS supports CDSS in meeting federal reporting requirements by collecting demographic information from child care contractors. CNIPS supports the CACFP with monitoring program operations, tracking meals and reimbursing program operators.

This mixed-delivery system for providing child care and nutrition programs have yielded administrative and operational challenges that impact the programs' quality and efficiency. The disjointed systems that require heavily manual business processes have caused significant redundancies and inefficiencies in completing necessary functions, like contract administration, subsidy processing, case management and information sharing.

Key functions of CDSS' contract administration scope include application acceptance, contract development and annual contract renewal. Due to the separate and disjointed systems, data shared in new applications is not spread across systems automatically, requiring manual transfer of information from one system to another. Contract renewals require the same manual effort, slowing the process significantly while also creating greater opportunity for error. Lack of information sharing across systems challenges the State's ability to have comprehensive oversight of program administration and efficacy.

The State's current case management solution places an administrative burden on contractors, many of whom are small businesses or individuals, to manually collect, organize and store data. This requirement detracts from their ability to provide high-quality care, submit reports timely, and maintain transparency with clients.

The principles of the CalSPARK Core Solution are rooted in better supporting child care providers and nutrition program operators, providing a more streamlined experience, effective case management solutions, and increase capacity for CDSS to support California's children.

Tip: Current Environment costs will be asked for in the Financial Analysis Worksheet to be completed in Section 2.12.

Attach relevant documentation to email submission (i.e., business process, workflow, problem analysis, user/stakeholder list, research findings). If these types of documents are not available, please indicate "Not Available," and explain the reason below:

The business and technical capabilities and functions for the current business environment are documented in Deliverable 08 ([Link](#)), and the current business processes are documented via process maps in Deliverable 07 ([Link](#)). These process maps reflect business stakeholders and the activities they currently perform to operate and maintain the CCDD and CACFP Programs. Within each process map, relevant actors are reflected in individual "swim lanes," with activities in each swim lane that encompass their responsibilities.

Not available reason:

2. Technical Context (Describe the technical environment of which the effort will be understood and assessed in 500 words)

I. CDMIS

- Web application hosted on premises based on .Net Framework 4.0 with source control being Team Foundation Server (On-Prem) v2012.
- The external users upload data related to the Child Care services via CDMIS application whether manually or through file transfers/batch processes.
- Interface with various systems in the existing technical environment, including the systems identified in the following bullet points.
- Act as the data source for CATS systems, G Drive, Research and Data Division (RADD), Resource and Referral Program Data Report (RRAS), Governance and Administration Unit Monitoring Database (GAUMD), Child Care Automated Reporting System (CARS), and CDE Management Tool (CMT) transitioning to MSS in the future.
- Receives data from CACFP, License Information System (LIS), Subsidy Management Systems, CATS Systems, and CDE Technical Services Division (TSD).

II. CNIPS

- Web application accessed by internal users in Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) Branch and external users like Program Operators to report Nutrition services provided and more.
- Hosted on premises at CDE based on .Net Framework 4.8 with source control/source code with current contractor- Colyar Technologies and Operating system being Windows Server 2012 R2.
- Interface with various systems in the existing technical environment.
- Act as the data source for USDA's Food Program Reporting System (FPRS) as well as their Western Region Office, Fi\$Cal, SCO, CA Meals for Kids mobile application, and CDE TSD.
- Receives data from LIS, Nutrition Data Management Systems like KidKare, State Controllers Office, Fi\$Cal, USDA Western Region Office.
- Receives manual data input from Bright Track (a Learning Management System) with no direct integration. Nutrition staff will make use of Mailchimp to broadcast informational campaigns to program operators. Nutrition staff also facilitate email or phone requests for information or questions.

III. CDPR

- Hosted on premises in Nitro Studio framework (no-code/low code platform) on Sharepoint which includes data collection for payment collection and generation of payments.
- Direct Service Providers will use CDPR to enter their monthly reporting data. CDSS analysts will review the Nitro forms submissions and manually enter the data into the PARIS system.

IV. PARIS

- FoxPro application with 0.97 TB total amount of storage on SQL Server 2017 (Standard for SQL DB).
- Hosted on premises and uses integrated Visual Fox Pro (VFP) database.

- Visual Fox Pro application files are accessed by users via a network share on an internal file server.
- Interfaces with a PARIS Links Access database, Foundation for California Community Colleges (FCCC), CDFS, CDPR, CDSS Blob Storage, and CDSS Accounting Unit. These exchanges are currently through manual entry, data file exports, and through email.
- Mapforce is used in the annual rollover process which maps data columns to table entries for mass data imports into PARIS.

V. CDFS

- An Azure PaaS web application with Windows Server 2012 R2 operating system on CDSS Azure environment on .Net Framework 3.5. with source control being Team Foundation Server (On-Prem) v2012.
- Interfaces with PARIS, Alternate Payment Provider's Subsidy Management Systems, and State users through Excel macros or database connections.
- Also known as CalWORKs AP Portal, which collects and houses caseload and fiscal data pertaining to the fiscal operations of the Alternative Payment (AP) Child Care program contracts at the CDSS.

Attach relevant documentation to email submission (i.e., logical system environment diagrams, system interactions, business rules, application flows, stakeholder information, data flow charts). If these types of documents are not available, please indicate "Not Available," and explain the reason below:

[TechnicalArchitectureHighLevel.pdf](#)
[PARIS-CDPR As-Is Data Flow\(updated\).pdf](#)
[CDMIS As-Is Data Flow\(updated\).pdf](#)
[CDFS As-Is Data Flow\(updated\).pdf](#)
[CNIPS As-Is Data Flow \(updated\).pdf](#)
[CalSPARK Stakeholder Register.xlsx](#)

Not available reason: Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Data Management (Enter the information to indicate the data owner and custodian of the current system, if applicable.)

I. CDFS (CalWORKs AP Portal)

Data Owner Name: Leeanna Anguiano

Data Owner Title: Staff Services Manager I

Data Owner Business Program Area: Fiscal Forecasting Branch

Data Custodian Name: Christopher Staggs

Data Custodian Title: IT Specialist I

Data Custodian Technical Area: IT Operations and management

Security Data Classification and Categorization: No

Security - Privacy Threshold & Impact Assessment: No

II. PARIS

Data Owner Name: Adrienne Sady

Data Owner Title: Staff Services Manager II

Data Owner Business Program Area: Child Development Fiscal Services

Data Custodian Name: Herbert Weaver

Data Custodian Title: IT Specialist II

Data Custodian Technical Area: IT Operations and management

Security Data Classification and Categorization: No

Security - Privacy Threshold & Impact Assessment: No

III. CDPR

Data Owner Name: Adrienne Sady

Data Owner Title: Staff Services Manager II

Data Owner Business Program Area: Child Development Fiscal Services

Data Custodian Name: Brittney Gossard

Data Custodian Title: Research Data Manager

Data Custodian Technical Area: RADD

Security Data Classification and Categorization: No

Security - Privacy Threshold & Impact Assessment: No

IV. CDMIS/CATS

Data Owner Name: Jessica Caplinger

Data Owner Title: Staff Services Manager I

Data Owner Business Program Area: Data Information Support Unit

Data Custodian Name: Jason Williamson

Data Custodian Title: IT Specialist II

Data Custodian Technical Area: IT Operations and management

Security Data Classification and Categorization: Yes

Security - Privacy Threshold & Impact Assessment: No

V. CNIPS

Data Owner Name: CDE

Data Owner Title: N/A

Data Owner Business Program Area: CACFP

Data Custodian Name: Kelly Falk

Data Custodian Title: Information Technology Supervisor II

Data Custodian Technical Area: ITSD – Department of Education

Security Data Classification and Categorization: No

Security - Privacy Threshold & Impact Assessment: No

4. Existing Data Governance and Data

a) Do you have existing data that must be migrated to your new solution?

Answer (Unknown, Yes, No): Yes

If data migration is required, please rate the quality of the data.

Select data quality rating: Few issues identified with the existing data.

- b)** Does the Agency/state entity have an established data governance body with well-defined roles and responsibilities to support data governance activities?

Answer (Unknown, Yes, No): Yes

If Yes, include the data governance organization chart as an attachment to your email submission.

Note: There was direction for the CDE transition efforts to stand up the legacy systems as quickly as possible. There was not a traditional project lifecycle with these preparatory components. We understand that data governance is vital to the CalSPARK data migration efforts, however, it will take time to further develop.

A draft of the Data Governance Plan can be found here: ([CalSPARK Data Governance.docx](#)) As we progress through Stage 3 of PAL, this will be finalized.

- c)** Does the Agency/state entity have data governance policies (data policies, data standards, etc.) formally defined, documented, and implemented?

Answer (Unknown, Yes, No): Yes

If Yes, include the data governance policies as an attachment to your email submission.

Please see the following attachment to this submission ([Link](#))

- d)** Does the Agency/state entity have data security policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented?

Answer (Unknown, Yes, No): Yes

If Yes, attach the existing documented security policies, standards, and controls used to your email submission.

Please see the following attachment to this submission ([Link](#))

- e)** Does the Agency/state entity have user accessibility policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented?

Answer (Unknown, Yes, No): Yes

If Yes, attach the existing documented policies, accessibility governance plan, and standards used to the email submission.

Please see the following attachment to this submission ([Link](#))

5. Security Categorization Impact Table

Consult the [SIMM 5305-A Information Security Program Management Standard - Security Categorization Impact Table](#).

Attach a table (in PDF) that categorizes and classifies the agency/state entity's information assets related to this effort (e.g., paper and electronic records, automated files, databases requiring appropriate protection from unauthorized use, access, disclosure, modification, loss, or deletion). Each information asset for which the agency/state entity has ownership responsibility shall be inventoried and identified.

Please see attached Security Impact Table PDF ([Link](#))

6. Security Categorization Impact Table Summary

Consult the [SIMM 5305-A Information Security Program Management Standard - Security Categorization Impact Table](#) to provide potential impact levels of the following areas:

Confidentiality: High

Integrity: High

Availability: High

7. Technical Complexity Score: 3.0

Please see attached SIMM-45-Appendix-C-Complexity-Assessment-CalSPARK ([Link](#))

2.4 Requirements and Outcomes

At this time in the project planning process, requirements and outcomes should be documented and indicative of how the Agency/State Entity envisions the final solution. This shall be accomplished either in the form of mid-level requirements (predictive methodology)/business capabilities or representative epics and user stories (adaptive methodology) that will become part of the product backlog. The requirements or representative epics and user stories must tie back to the Objectives detailed in the Stage 1 Business Analysis. Regardless of which tool/method is used, an understanding of the following, at a minimum, must be clearly articulated:

- Functional requirements
- Expected user experience(s)
- Expected system outcome
- Expected business operations (e.g., How do you envision operations in the future?)
- Alignment to the project's objectives identified in Stage 1
- Product ownership (e.g., Who owns these requirements?); and
- Verification of need(s) fulfillment (e.g., How will success be measured?)

Tip: If providing requirements, the recommended range of requirements is between 50 and 100.

Attach Requirements and/or Outcomes narratives, mid-level requirements, and/or epics/user stories to submission email.

Find attached document: B_3_Stage_2_Midlevel_Solution_Requirements_Final Version.xlsxm ([Link](#))

2.5 Assumptions and Constraints

Relevant assumptions and constraints help define boundaries and opportunities to shape the scope and complexity of the project.

Assumptions:

1. **Assumption:** PAL is intended to ensure projects are undertaken with clear business objectives, accurate costs, and realistic schedules. It includes Stage 1 Business Analysis (S1BA), Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis (S2AA), Stage 3 Solution Analysis (S3SA) and Stage 4 Project Readiness and Approval (S4PRA). The Project Plan will follow leading principles, methods, tools, and techniques based on the Project Management Institute (PMI)'s Project Management Body of Knowledge and aligns the project using agile project management methodology and a challenge-based procurement.

Description/Potential Impact:

Deviation from this approach and methodologies could impact deliverables and outcomes during the Lifecycle of the project.

2. **Assumption:** The Project Plan may alter or change throughout the lifecycle of project.

Description/Potential Impact: The Project Plan is a living document that is updated on a regular basis. If changes are made at any given time, the Plan is baselined, so changes are evident.

3. **Assumption:** The scope of each deliverable will remain fixed as defined in the executed contract.

Description/Potential Impact: Deviation from the scope of each deliverable could impact deliverable acceptance as well as the overall project plan.

4. **Assumption:** CDSS will define and design processes regarding feedback, review cycle, project communications, risks, issues, escalation procedures, and adhere to them throughout the lifecycle of the project.

Description/Potential Impact: Adherence to CDSS processes is paramount to deliverable acceptance and on time project completion.

5. **Assumption:** The timeline for the project is aligned to the approved project plan. Throughout the project lifecycle, any potential changes to the project plan, project task and duration, and deliverable schedule need to be discussed and approved with CDSS CalSPARK Project Team and business program partners.

Description/Potential Impact: Deviation from the approved project plan could delay the progress of project.

6. **Assumption:** The CalSPARK solution, as per the project's approved California Department of Technology (CDT), Project Approval Lifecycle (PAL) Stage 1 Business Analysis (S1BA), will modernize the CDSS-needed capabilities of the key five legacy child care and nutrition data systems, including CNIPS, CDMIS, PARIS, CDPR (CPARIS replacement) and CDFS, and ancillary applications and processes.

Description/Potential Impact: Deviation from the CalSPARK Core Solution objectives could delay the progress of project.

7. **Assumption:** CDSS Business Program Partners and external stakeholders will be available for interactive/collaboration sessions and workshops throughout the duration of the Project.

Description/Potential Impact: Lack of stakeholder engagement could delay the progress of project.

8. **Assumption:** The CalSPARK project adheres to the Project Approval Lifecycle process administered by CDT. Therefore, it is imperative that each PAL stage be reviewed and approved by CDT. This includes PAL Stage 2: Alternatives Analysis, Stage 3: Solution Analysis; Stage 4: Project Readiness and Approval.

Description/Potential Impact: Any deviation from PAL stage process could delay the progress of project.

9. **Assumption:** Organizational Change Management (OCM) and training to assist in change management is a critical component once the solution is selected.

Description/Potential Impact: As this requires a significant level of effort and time commitment, it could delay the progress of project during implementation.

10. **Assumption:** Functional and non-functional requirements will adhere to all State requirements/directives as applicable to solution selected.

Description/Potential Impact: This could delay the progress of project during implementation.

11. **Assumption:** When the solution vendor is selected, the vendor must adhere to state security clearance requirements throughout project lifecycle.
- Description/Potential Impact:** This could delay the progress of project during implementation.
12. **Assumption:** Once solution is architected and delivered, there will not be a need for CDSS to exchange data with certain legacy partners.
- Description/Potential Impact:** Once solution is architected and delivered, there will not be a need for CDSS to exchange data for processing to support CDSS program administration and reporting with CDE.
13. **Assumption:** Scope will not substantially expand or shift more than 10% during the design development.
- Description/Potential Impact:** Expansion or shift of more than 10% could alter budget and overall project health.
14. **Assumption:** CDSS will continue to have access to historical data in PARIS/CDPR, CDMIS, and CNIPS.
- Description/Potential Impact:** CDSS will continue to have access to historical data in PARIS/CDPR, CDMIS, and CNIPS for any retrospective reporting needs.
15. **Assumption:** A data migration strategy will need to be developed with input from the program areas. Data extraction, transformation, and loading can be completed in phases, starting with the most essential data elements (Providers, sites, budgets, agreements, users, families, etc.). Note: up to 3 years of readily available data may need to be included in this initial phase. If access to older historical attendance and reports still remains with the legacy systems, they can slowly be phased out, or importing of older historical data can be another phase of the migration.
- Description/Potential Impact:** There will be a significant level of effort for data conversion/extraction from PARIS/CDPR and CDMIS. For CACFP Data is currently provided by CDE.
16. **Assumption:** There will not be substantial changes to policies surrounding receipt, retention, or use of child care and nutrition program data once development commences.

Description/Potential Impact: Changes beyond this timeframe could alter project timeline and implementation.

Constraints:

1. **Constraint:** The project budget is a set amount approved by the legislature – budget change proposal (BCP) process.

Description/Potential Impact: Project changes/extension will require further approval from the legislature and could delay the progress of the project.

2. **Constraint:** The State has limited staff currently available to support the entire CalSPARK project lifecycle.

Description/Potential Impact: This constraint requires heightened awareness to complete activities in a timely manner.

3. **Constraint:** Data Migration is a critical task that must be planned and prepared for before and during implementation of core solution. This includes migrating data from legacy systems, which include one external vendor-managed system: CNIPS.

Description/Potential Impact: Data migration must be completed in a timely fashion; a delay could impact full functionality and reporting from the selected CalSPARK solution.

4. **Constraint:** The selected CalSPARK solution may have limited functionality due to the need to comply State directives issued by CDT, including not exclusive of Cloud and Gen AI directives.

Description/Potential Impact: This could delay full functionality from the selected CalSPARK solution if not addressed before solution is selected.

5. **Constraint:** Timelines may change based on resource availability and support from control agencies. CDT and CalHHS supporting PAL and other project stages.

Description/Potential Impact: Timelines may change based on resource availability and support from control agencies due to CDT and CalHHS supporting PAL and other project stages.

6. **Constraint:** BCP funds are denied or not available until the following Fiscal Year.

Description/Potential Impact: Available budget funds and forecasting is critical to overall success up to and including implementation.

7. **Constraint:** Lack of existing data exchange documentation, including data transfer schemas, file layouts, and supporting materials from oversight and control agencies.

Description/Potential Impact: Lack of timely data exchange may compromise and delay project timeline.

8. **Constraint:** Reporting requirements for the child care and development and child and adult care food program vary and may not be logically compatible.

Description/Potential Impact: Solution must be flexible to accommodate both business program areas functionalities and needs.

TIP: Copy and paste to add Assumptions/Constraints with Descriptions/Impacts as needed.

2.6 Dependencies

Dependencies are elements or relationships in a project reliant on something else occurring before the function, service, interface, task, or action can begin or continue.

Dependency Element: Nutrition or child care policy changes may cause functional redesign.

Dependency Description: CDSS administers these programs, but policy changes are determined by the state.

Dependency Element: Availability and accuracy of cost data from vendors for planning purposes.

Dependency Description: Sufficient cost data is required to develop FAW worksheets and accurate cost estimates.

Dependency Element: Vendor will train users on access and navigation of the solution.

Dependency Description: Vendors commonly provide “train the trainers” for knowledge transfer. A lack of training quality risks the knowledge transfer process.

Dependency Element: Interface to external systems

Dependency Description: CalSPARK will utilize data/services from external systems to facilitate licensing, financial, administration, reporting, and monitoring needs.

Dependency Element: Timely project approval from the California Department of Technology (CDT) and funding approval from the Department of Finance (DOF).

Dependency Description: CalSPARK is dependent on both timely project approval from CDT and timely funding approval from DOF to succeed.

Dependency Element: Due to the nature of the COTS solution, the schedule of the release management timeline will be determined by the solution vendor.

Dependency Description: The State will need to conform to the solution vendors' release schedule to implement any changes to the solution.

Dependency Element: Availability of Subject Matter Experts and resources from other departments.

Dependency Description: Transparent and consistent communication regarding cross-departmental resource roles, responsibilities, expectations, and time frames is critical to meeting key milestones and achieving project success.

Dependency Element: Data Migration Preparation efforts

Dependency Description: This is critical before any work can be done by the solution implementer who will also be doing the Data Migration

TIP: Copy and paste to add Dependency Elements and Descriptions as needed.

2.7 Market Research

Market Research ([CDT Market Research Guidelines](#)) determines whether products or services available in the marketplace can meet the business needs identified in this proposal. Market Research can also determine whether commercial practices regarding customizing/modifying products or tailoring services are available, or even necessary, to meet the business needs and objectives of the business.

Before undertaking a Market Research approach. Contact your PAO Manager to schedule a collaborative review to review planning to date and discuss the procurement approach.

1. **Project Management Methodology:** Hybrid
2. **Procurement approach recommended:** Standard Procurement
3. **Market Research Approach**

Provide a concise narrative description of the approach used to perform market research.

- The vendors researched were identified based on various criteria relevant for finding a good fit for a systems implementation vendor. This included criteria such as expertise in Child Care programs, Nutrition programs, cloud-based system implementation, Artificial Intelligence (AI) specializations, experience working with state and local government agencies, or experience implementing Child Care or Nutrition solutions. During the information gathering phase of the market research, data was compiled about companies and their available solutions, and contact information was solicited to identify the appropriate point-of-contact at each company. The information collected for the twenty-two viable vendors is summarized in the attachment for section 2.7.4 Market Research

Artifacts. The Market Assessment Research started with identifying different types of vendors available in the marketplace who offered:

Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) products, which are designed as a nearly complete solution that can be minimally adjusted to suit client needs. Hybrid products which are partially standardized and are the ones that could meet the requirements for both program areas-CCDD (Child Care and Development Division) and CACFP (Child and Adult Care Food Program) and configured based on CDSS requirements.

- Child Care specific products catering to meet CCDD program specific requirements, do not necessarily meet the needs of CACFP programs.
- Nutrition specific products catering to meet CACFP program specific requirements do not necessarily meet the needs of CCDD programs.

The market study was conducted based on various product's key capabilities/features, the technology platform the product operated on, and any relevant product implementation experience the vendor has.

- Twenty-two viable solution/products vendors were identified during market research. The first phase included thirty-five written questionnaires, all intended to learn more about the companies and their solution offerings in greater detail. These responses were then evaluated by an Evaluation Review Committee ("Committee") comprised of key stakeholders of CalSPARK. Seven vendors were selected to participate in the next phase. The second phase included virtual vendor demonstrations where companies had the opportunity to present their product's capabilities. Longitudinal Use Cases (LUCs) were developed to form a framework for the vendors to demonstrate capabilities from each of their solutions relevant to CDSS' business needs.
- The capability of Artificial Intelligence (AI) was demonstrated by the vendors beyond the longitudinal use cases presented for market research. Consequently, it was incorporated into the assessment for alternative analysis, although it is not yet linked to any specific business requirement. The AI requirement and its associated business need will be evaluated at a later stage in the project, and the detailed non-functional (technical) requirements will be added or updated accordingly.
- Evaluation Criteria for both phases served as guidelines to help support the Committee's ability to determine if a vendor's product has the features and technology necessary to potentially meet CDSS' needs for the CalSPARK system. The criteria are accompanied by Evaluation Guiding Principles developed to maintain reviewers' objectivity and provide concrete benchmarks for evaluating solution quality and capabilities. The criteria were borne out of the business and technical capabilities documented for CalSPARK. Each vendor received a grade of their ability to meet the key underpinnings of the desired CalSPARK Core solution in the following areas:
Vendor Demographics, Financial Stability, Reputation and References Claims Submission and Reimbursement.
- Vendor Profile Management
- Attendance and Meals Information
- Notifications and Alerts
- Application Intake, Enrollment and Case Management

- Financial Management
- Contract Management
- Technology platform and Integration
- Report Generation Capabilities
- Mobile Access
- Data Migration, Integrity, and Customization
- Scalability and Performance
- Security
- Upgrades, Maintenance, and Operations Support
- Training and Support
- Total Cost of Ownership

Vendors were asked to respond to a questionnaire. The responses received from the vendors were evaluated based on the metrics/criteria described above. Following the responses, planning and development activities were conducted to support the release of a Proof of Concept (POC) solicitation (questionnaire, use cases, relevant personas, and process maps as directed by the CalSPARK Project Manager. The seven vendors were then invited to give a POC demonstration to respond to the LUCs and the overall functionality of their systems. Each demo provided was used to gather market research generally for the CalSPARK solution.

4. Market Research Artifacts

Market Research Artifacts can include internet research, collaboration with other governmental entities, or other documentation.

Attach Market Research artifacts to the email submission.

Market Research Artifacts attached include Deliverable 16: Market Research Support ([Link](#)) and Deliverable 18: POC Execution Support ([Link](#))

2.8 Viable Alternative Solutions

The CDT expects Agencies/state entities to conduct a thorough analysis of all feasible alternatives that will meet the proposal's objectives and requirements. Agencies/state entities should provide at minimum the three (3) most viable solutions, one (1) of which could be leveraging and/or enhancing the existing solution (if applicable).

Following the thorough market research conducted to understand the available solutions in the market, as discussed in Section 2.7 Market Research, three viable alternative solutions were identified: Commercial off the Shelf (COTS), Modified off the Shelf (MOTS), and Custom-Built Solution. Details about each alternative can be found in Deliverable 17: Alternatives Analysis Documentation.

1. Viable Alternative Solution #1

Name: Commercial Off the Shelf Solution (COTS)

Description: The software vendors researched offered COTS products hosted on different platforms, including Salesforce, Amazon Web Services (AWS), Microsoft (MS) Azure, and Google Cloud platform (GCP). The different COTS products demonstrated by POC vendors were predeveloped and pre-built with functionalities and features that eliminate the need for the CDSS to develop and maintain its own software from scratch. The COTS product(s) demonstrated by the software vendors could be utilized across both the Child Care and Nutrition programs requiring configuration to meet specific Program needs. The proposed average development time for the COTS product(s) ranged from 12-24 months, with the CDSS needing to procure certain licenses based on the chosen hosting platform.

Maintenance of the COTS product(s) will usually be handled by the vendor with regular maintenance of the COTS software, and they will be responsible for pushing updates to make the product/solution relevant as technology evolves. COTS product(s) typically involves a subscription or license fee affording CDSS the opportunity to better predict expenses involved in Product Maintenance & Operations (M&O) costs and to budget effectively for the product's M&O costs in the upcoming years.

As noted in Section 2.6 Dependencies, the State will need to conform to the solution vendors' release schedule to implement any changes. In addition to being dependent on the vendors' release management window, the State expects that the COTS vendor will define the changes included in each release with an impact analysis to maintain continuous support to prior COTS product releases or periodic upgrades.

A discussion on the Cloud Services Assessment requirements was conducted with CDT in relation to a future COTS implementation. At this time, there is no need to produce such an assessment since all requirements are met by selecting CDT as the service provider.

Why is this a viable solution? Timesaving COTS product software typically includes the essential features and functionality to meet business needs, although it offers less flexibility for configuration based on specific CDSS requirements. Since COTS software is pre-developed, the CDSS can quickly deploy the solution, bypassing the lengthy process associated with custom product development. This rapid deployment leads to faster operations, enhanced overall efficiency, and seamless integration with existing systems, making a COTS product a viable option for immediate and effective implementation.

Vendor-managed Implementation

The COTS base product is a pre-existing solution that needs to be installed and then configured based on the CDSS' needs. The installation and operation of the COTS product is usually supported and managed by the vendor.

Proven Functionality

COTS product software has been tested and used by various organizations, proving their reliability and functionality. COTS products already exist in the marketplace, as do users that use the features and functionality of the product. If there are common bugs/issues with the base product, they are usually resolved by the vendor on priority basis to make the product more effective.

Reduced Risk

Since COTS products have been tested and proven effective by various users/organizations, the risk of software failure is lower, and this reduces the risks associated with the bugs/issues that could impact the CDSS' business operations.

Cost Effective

The COTS base product is a pre-existing product that is mass produced compared to dedicated software. The COTS product is purchased by many users/organizations which reduces the overall development and implementation cost spread over many users.

Immediate and Effective Support

Vendors of COTS software usually offers immediate support to assist with any critical issues that might arise with production running systems. This helps to ensure that the same issue is not repeated by conducting a thorough root cause analysis, providing timely solutions, and reducing potential downtime.

Security and Reliability

COTS product architecture and the CDSS' Business data protection measures includes effective safeguards for PII and PHI, including securing the CDSS' data both in-transit and at-rest. A COTS solution ensures CDSS' data protection by using security methods like data encryption with identifying controls required to preserve data confidentiality and provide protection from unauthorized use. Most COTS products use encryption-at-rest as one of the key controls that complies with the State of California and NIST security standards for data confidentiality and helps mitigate risks associated with a data breach. A COTS solution uses a Security Information and Event Management approach to collect and analyze security data from various sources like firewalls, intrusion detection systems, and application log. COTS also uses multi-step authentication to ensure that the CDSS' data is protected and provides enhanced business continuity and data protection, with automatic backups and failover capabilities with robust disaster recovery plans.

Scalability and Integration

COTS solution offers various options to scale up when required. This includes increasing computational resources, adding more instances, and optimizing performance to handle increased loads efficiently. As CDSS' number of users and data volumes increase, the COTS solution can expand its capacity without requiring significant manual intervention or

infrastructure changes. A COTS solution can dynamically adjust to varying loads, ensuring reliable and cost-effective operations. This capability is crucial for meeting the CDSS' needs. COTS products have integration capabilities for data sharing across programs, enhancing interoperability and efficiency with features like service creation & hosting, service mediation, message routing, data transformation. COTS solutions also include a prebuilt API management suite to easily connect the solution with other internal systems/3rd party applications. The solution has the flexibility to integrate with any of the CDSS' services/applications using the State's existing or preferred technology with minimal customization. COTS solutions also support custom integration to fulfill the CDSS' specific data needs with custom API deployment and custom workflows for specific use cases.

Approach

The purpose of Alternative Analysis is to help the CDSS explore, examine, and document approaches to meet the CDSS' business and technical needs for the CalSPARK solution. This information was discussed at length during consensus meetings and the final evaluation meeting at the conclusion of the POC vendor demonstrations.

The CDSS team followed a two-phased approach throughout this process, consisting of Initial Vendor Screening and Detailed Evaluation with product demonstrations.

During Phase 1, the Initial Vendor Screening phase, the primary focus was on identifying potential marketplace solutions that best fit the CDSS program area needs. This involved a comprehensive analysis to pinpoint vendors whose products or solutions potentially aligned closely with the CDSS' needs and was presented in Deliverable 16, Market Research Support.

In Phase 2, the focus shifted to a more detailed evaluation of the vendor responses and the actual products, which were documented in Deliverable 18, POC Execution Support. Throughout this structured and systematic approach, the KPMG team helped the CDSS make informed decisions based on a thorough understanding of both the market landscape and the specific capabilities of each vendor.

The latter phase of the POC demonstrations included two critical components: Consensus Meetings and Final Evaluation. Using materials and information gathered during consensus meetings, the KPMG team, in collaboration with the CDSS, was able to identify potentially viable approaches presented by vendors to reflect the true capabilities of each vendors' product.

Ultimately, a meeting was held with the CDSS and evaluators on 6/20/2024 to discuss the various market alternatives that could meet their demands. The feasibility of these alternatives was thoroughly discussed, leading to the finalization of three alternatives:

1. Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS)
2. Modified Off -The Shelf (MOTS)
3. Custom-Built solution

The preferred alternative and additional alternatives were then formally selected as key decision points in a subsequent meeting on 7/8/2024. These alternatives provided herein will guide subsequent deliverables, including financial analysis tasks as well as updates to detailed business and technical requirements.

This overall approach provided a systematic and thorough evaluation process, including the involvement of a core committee of the CDSS business partners, technical subject matter experts, and project leadership at every stage aligned with the CDSS's business and technical needs, ultimately leading to the identification of feasible approaches for the organization.

Increase staff – new or existing capabilities: Yes

Modify the existing business process or create a new business process: No

Reduce the services or level of services provided: No

Utilize new or increased contracted services: Yes

Enhance the existing IT system: Yes

Modify Statute/Policy/Regulations: No

Please Specify: N/A

Create a new IT system: Yes

Other: No Specify: N/A

Architecture Information

Business Function(s)/Process(es):

Child Care:

Level 0 Process Map

Publish CFA

Publish RFA

Contactor Evaluation and Scoring

Contractor Onboarding

Grant Award Notification

Non-Direct Service Contracts Reporting

Contract Monitoring Review

Annual Program Self-Evaluation

RFA Appeals

Payment Remittance to Contractor

Contractor Reporting

ELAR

Readers Conference

Business Function(s)/Process(es):

Nutrition:

Level 0 Process Map

Application Intake and Eligibility Determination
Process Sponsor Application
Conduct Trainings
Creation and Submission of Monthly Data Reports
Annual Settings for Monthly Data Reports
Process Review and Remit Payment to Sponsor
Reporting Activities
Annual Update Process
Program Monitoring
Year End Close-Out
Bright Track
Serious Deficiency
Outreach
Conducting Reviews
Missing Warrant
Annual Expansion Grant
Appeals

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add business processes with the same application, system, or component; COTS/Cloud Technology or custom solution; runtime environment; system interfaces, data center location; and security.

Conceptual Architecture

Attach a copy of the conceptual architecture to your email submission.

Conceptual Architecture Diagrams Attached:

Cloud Conceptual Diagram ([Link](#))

Hybrid Conceptual Diagram ([Link](#))

COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology or Custom: COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology

Name/Primary Technology: Cloud

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add system software information if the application, system, or component uses additional system software.

Explain Existing System Interfaces: There are 45 existing interfaces which have been identified in the As-Is State which are integrated with legacy systems. Out of the existing 45 interfaces, a total of 19 interfaces were identified to be dropped/sunset for the new CalSPARK system. The link to these interfaces can be found here: [As Is Systems Interfaces.xlsx](#)

Explain New System Interfaces: Total of 11 interfaces were identified to be integrated with CalSPARK system in addition to the existing 26 interfaces which would be carried forward to be integrated with CalSPARK system. The link to these interfaces can be found here: [As Is Systems Interfaces.xlsx](#)

Data Center Location of the To-be Solution: Commercial data center

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

Security

Access

Public: Yes

Internal State Staff: Yes

External State Staff: Yes

Other: Choose Yes or No. Specify: N/A

Type of Information (Select Yes or No for each to identify the type of information that requires protection. See the SAM Section 5305.5 for more information.)

Personal: Yes

Health: No

Tax: Yes

Financial: Yes

Legal: Yes

Confidential: Yes

Other: No Specify: N/A

Protective Measures (Select Yes or No to identify the protective measures used to protect information.)

Technical Security: Yes

Physical Security: Yes

Backup and Recovery: Yes

Identity Authorization and Authentication: Yes

Other, specify: N/A

Total Viable Alternative #1 Solution Cost (copy from FAW – Executive Cost Summary tab, cells AL13:17):

Planning Costs: \$ 18,513,458

One-Time (Project) Costs: \$66,904,025

Total Future Ops. IT Staff OE&E Costs: \$19,716,056

Total Proposed Cost: \$105,133,539

Annual Future Ops. Costs (M&O): \$12,626,362

2. Viable Alternative Solution #2

Name: Modified Off the Shelf (MOTS)

Description: MOTS utilizes a COTS product as a starting point which is then modified to meet certain business needs. The COTS product demonstrated by the POC vendors had the capability of customizing/configuring the product in terms of intuitive design, user centric interface, and custom features based on Child Care and Nutrition program needs making it a MOTS product. Some of the key features of the MOTS application, which could be customized/configured, included business rules engine, report generation, notification, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), forms and documents, workflow templates, and integrations.

Why is this a viable solution? Please explain:

Configuration and Customization

Modifying off the shelf software offers deep customization ensuring that the systems align precisely with unique business/operational requirements and reducing the development time involved as compared to full custom-built software.

Integrations and Adherence to Interoperability Standards

Since MOTS can be designed for specific integration needs, the configuration ensures that the software aligns perfectly with the business needs. Seamless integration and adherence to interoperability standards are critical factors when implementing solutions and MOTS solution can integrate with existing systems and technologies as well as any third-party applications. MOTS interoperability standards also allow greater control over the software and allows for continuous adaptation to changing requirements and emerging technologies.

Maintain Compliance

Maintaining compliance and regulatory requirements with program requirements is a crucial factor. This can be accomplished by modifying off the shelf products to meet specific governance, risk, and compliance regulations based on the CDSS' specific needs.

Approach

The purpose of Alternative Analysis is to help the CDSS explore, examine, and document approaches to meet the CDSS' business and technical needs for the CalSPARK solution. This information was discussed at length during consensus meetings and the final evaluation meeting at the conclusion of the POC vendor demonstrations.

The CDSS team followed a two-phased approach throughout this process, consisting of Initial Vendor Screening and Detailed Evaluation with product demonstrations.

During Phase 1, the Initial Vendor Screening phase, the primary focus was on identifying potential marketplace solutions that best fit the CDSS program area needs. This involved a comprehensive analysis to pinpoint vendors whose products or solutions potentially aligned

closely with the CDSS' needs and was presented in Deliverable 16, Market Research Support.

In Phase 2, the focus shifted to a more detailed evaluation of the vendor responses and the actual products, which were documented in Deliverable 18, POC Execution Support. Throughout this structured and systematic approach, the KPMG team helped the CDSS make informed decisions based on a thorough understanding of both the market landscape and the specific capabilities of each vendor.

The latter phase of the POC demonstrations included two critical components: Consensus Meetings and Final Evaluation. Using materials and information gathered during consensus meetings, the KPMG team, in collaboration with the CDSS, was able to identify potentially viable approaches presented by vendors to reflect the true capabilities of each vendors' product.

Ultimately, a meeting was held with the CDSS and evaluators on 6/20/2024 to discuss the various market alternatives that could meet their demands. The feasibility of these alternatives was thoroughly discussed, leading to the finalization of three alternatives:

1. Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS)
2. Modified Off -The Shelf (MOTS)
3. Custom-Built solution

The preferred alternative and additional alternatives were then formally selected as key decision points in a subsequent meeting on 7/8/2024. These alternatives provided herein will guide subsequent deliverables, including financial analysis tasks as well as updates to detailed business and technical requirements.

This overall approach provided a systematic and thorough evaluation process, including the involvement of a core committee of the CDSS business partners, technical subject matter experts, and project leadership at every stage aligned with the CDSS's business and technical needs, ultimately leading to the identification of feasible approaches for the organization.

Increase staff – new or existing capabilities: Yes

Modify the existing business process or create a new business process: No

Reduce the services or level of services provided: No

Utilize new or increased contracted services: Yes

Enhance the existing IT system: Yes

Modify Statute/Policy/Regulations: No

Please Specify: N/A

Create a new IT system: Yes

Other: No Specify: N/A

Architecture Information

Business Function(s)/Process(es):

Child Care:

Level 0 Process Map
Publish CFA
Publish RFA
Contactor Evaluation and Scoring
Contractor Onboarding
Grant Award Notification
Non-Direct Service Contracts Reporting
Contract Monitoring Review
Annual Program Self-Evaluation
RFA Appeals
Payment Remittance to Contractor
Contractor Reporting

ELAR

Business Function(s)/Process(es):

Nutrition:

Level 0 Process Map
Application Intake and Eligibility Determination
Process Sponsor Application
Conduct Trainings
Creation and Submission of Monthly Data Reports
Annual Settings for Monthly Data Reports

Process Review and Remit Payment to Sponsor
Reporting Activities
Annual Update Process
Program Monitoring
Year End Close-Out
Bright Track
Serious Deficiency
Outreach
Conducting Reviews
Missing Warrant
Annual Expansion Grant
Appeals

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add business processes with the same application, system, or component; COTS/Cloud Technology or custom solution; runtime environment; system interfaces, data center location; and security.

Conceptual Architecture

Attach a copy of the conceptual architecture to your email submission.

Conceptual Architecture Diagrams Attached:

Hybrid Conceptual Diagram ([Link](#))

On-Premises Conceptual Diagram ([Link](#))

COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology or Custom: COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology

Name/Primary Technology: Cloud

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add system software information if the application, system, or component uses additional system software.

Explain Existing System Interfaces: There are 45 existing interfaces which have been identified in the As-Is State which are integrated with legacy systems. Out of the existing 45 interfaces, a total of 19 interfaces were identified to be dropped/sunset for the new CalSPARK system. The link to these interfaces can be found here: [As Is Systems Interfaces.xlsx](#)

Explain New System Interfaces: Total of 11 interfaces were identified to be integrated with CalSPARK system in addition to the existing 26 interfaces which would be carried forward to be integrated with CalSPARK system. The link to these interfaces can be found here: [As Is Systems Interfaces.xlsx](#)

Data Center Location of the To-be Solution: Commercial data center

If Other, specify: N/A

Security

Access:

Public: Yes

Internal State Staff: Yes

External State Staff: Yes

Other: No Specify: N/A

Type of Information (Select Yes or No for each to identify the type of information that requires protection. See the SAM Section 5305.5 for more information.)

Personal: Yes

Health: No

Tax: Yes

Financial: Yes

Legal: Yes

Confidential: Yes

Other: No Specify: N/A

Protective Measures (Select Yes or No to identify the protective measures used to protect information.)

Technical Security: Yes

Physical Security: Yes

Backup and Recovery: Yes

Identity Authorization and Authentication: Yes

Other, specify: N/A

Total Viable Alternative #2 Solution Cost (copy from FAW – Summary tab, cell AL33):

Total Proposed Cost: \$84,390,008

3. Viable Alternative Solution #3

Name: Custom Built Solution

Description: A Custom Solution would be one built specifically for the business needs of the CalSPARK solution. This would ensure that all necessary business requirements would be addressed by the solution. Few of the POC vendors demonstrated Child Care Information Management Systems hosted on cloud platforms that included key characteristics like delivery, scalability, security, and simplified software management. Any Custom solution would need to be compliant with SIMM 141 California Cloud Assessment Guide and approved by CDT. Overall, a custom solution would offer steady improvements, automation, data management, and a tailored user experience.

Why is this a viable solution? Please explain:

Configuration and Customization

A custom solution offers several advantages, including ensuring that the system aligns precisely with unique business/operational requirements, customized security, and ownership of both data and code.

Maintain Compliance

Maintaining compliance and regulatory requirements with program requirements is a crucial factor. This can be accomplished by coding the custom solution to meet specific governance, risk, and compliance regulations based on the CDSS' specific needs.

Integrations and Adherence to Interoperability Standards

Since the custom solution can be designed for specific integration needs, the configuration ensures that the software aligns perfectly with the business needs. Seamless integration and

adherence to interoperability standards are critical factors when implementing solutions and a custom solution can integrate with existing systems and technologies as well as any third-party applications.

Approach

The purpose of Alternative Analysis is to help the CDSS explore, examine, and document approaches to meet the CDSS' business and technical needs for the CalSPARK solution. This information was discussed at length during consensus meetings and the final evaluation meeting at the conclusion of the POC vendor demonstrations.

The CDSS team followed a two-phased approach throughout this process, consisting of Initial Vendor Screening and Detailed Evaluation with product demonstrations.

During Phase 1, the Initial Vendor Screening phase, the primary focus was on identifying potential marketplace solutions that best fit the CDSS program area needs. This involved a comprehensive analysis to pinpoint vendors whose products or solutions potentially aligned closely with the CDSS' needs and was presented in Deliverable 16, Market Research Support.

In Phase 2, the focus shifted to a more detailed evaluation of the vendor responses and the actual products, which were documented in Deliverable 18, POC Execution Support. Throughout this structured and systematic approach, the KPMG team helped the CDSS make informed decisions based on a thorough understanding of both the market landscape and the specific capabilities of each vendor.

The latter phase of the POC demonstrations included two critical components: Consensus Meetings and Final Evaluation. Using materials and information gathered during consensus meetings, the KPMG team, in collaboration with the CDSS, was able to identify potentially viable approaches presented by vendors to reflect the true capabilities of each vendors' product.

Ultimately, a meeting was held with the CDSS and evaluators on 6/20/2024 to discuss the various market alternatives that could meet their demands. The feasibility of these alternatives was thoroughly discussed, leading to the finalization of three alternatives:

1. Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS)
2. Modified Off -The Shelf (MOTS)
3. Custom-Built solution

The preferred alternative and additional alternatives were then formally selected as key decision points in a subsequent meeting on 7/8/2024. These alternatives provided herein will guide subsequent deliverables, including financial analysis tasks as well as updates to detailed business and technical requirements.

This overall approach provided a systematic and thorough evaluation process, including the involvement of a core committee of the CDSS business partners, technical subject matter experts, and project leadership at every stage aligned with the CDSS's business and technical needs, ultimately leading to the identification of feasible approaches for the organization.

Increase staff – new or existing capabilities: Yes

Modify the existing business process or create a new business process: No

Reduce the services or level of services provided: No

Utilize new or increased contracted services: Yes

Enhance the existing IT system: Yes

Modify Statute/Policy/Regulations: No

Please Specify: N/A

Create a new IT system: No

Other: No Specify: N/A

Architecture Information

Business Function(s)/Process(es):

Child Care:

Level 0 Process Map

Publish CFA

Publish RFA

Contactor Evaluation and Scoring

Contractor Onboarding

Grant Award Notification

Non-Direct Service Contracts Reporting

Contract Monitoring Review

Annual Program Self-Evaluation

RFA Appeals

Payment Remittance to Contractor

Contractor Reporting

ELAR

Business Function(s)/Process(es):

Nutrition:

Level 0 Process Map

Application Intake and Eligibility Determination

Process Sponsor Application

Conduct Trainings

Creation and Submission of Monthly Data Reports

Annual Settings for Monthly Data Reports

Process Review and Remit Payment to Sponsor

Reporting Activities

Annual Update Process

Program Monitoring

Year End Close-Out
Bright Track
Serious Deficiency
Outreach
Conducting Reviews
Missing Warrant
Annual Expansion Grant
Appeals

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add business processes with the same application, system, or component; COTS/Cloud Technology or custom solution; runtime environment; system interfaces, data center location; and security.

Conceptual Architecture

Attach a copy of the conceptual architecture to your email submission.

Conceptual Architecture Diagrams Attached:

Cloud Conceptual Diagram ([Link](#))

Hybrid Conceptual Diagram ([Link](#))

COTS/SaaS/Cloud Technology or Custom: Custom

Name/Primary Technology: Cloud

TIP: Copy and paste or click the + button in the lower right corner to add system software information if the application, system, or component uses additional system software.

Explain Existing System Interfaces: There are 45 existing interfaces which have been identified in the As-Is State which are integrated with legacy systems. Out of the existing 45 interfaces, a total of 19 interfaces were identified to be dropped/sunset for the new CalSPARK system. The link to these interfaces can be found here: [As Is Systems Interfaces.xlsx](#)

Explain New System Interfaces: Total of 11 interfaces were identified to be integrated with CalSPARK system in addition to the existing 26 interfaces which would be carried forward to be integrated with CalSPARK system. The link to these interfaces can be found here: [As Is Systems Interfaces.xlsx](#)

Data Center Location of the To-be Solution: Commercial data center

If Other, specify: N/A

Security

Access:

Public: Yes

Internal State Staff: Yes

External State Staff: Yes

Other: Choose Yes or No. Specify: N/A

Type of Information (Select Yes or No for each to identify the type of information that requires protection. See the SAM Section 5305.5 for more information.)

Personal: Yes

Health: No

Tax: Yes

Financial: Yes

Legal: Yes

Confidential: Yes

Other: No Specify: N/A

Protective Measures (Select Yes or No to identify the protective measures used to protect information.)

Technical Security: Yes

Physical Security: Yes

Backup and Recovery: Yes

Identity Authorization and Authentication: Yes

Other, specify: N/A

Total Viable Alternative #3 Solution Cost (copy from FAW – Summary tab, cell AL50):

Total Proposed Cost: \$98,905,330

2.9 Project Organization

Project planning includes the process of identifying how and when specific labor skill sets are needed to ensure that the proposed project has sufficient staff with the appropriate knowledge and experience by the time the project moves into execution. All staff identified in the following sections should be included in the Financial Analysis Worksheet to be completed in Section 2.12.

1. Project Organization Chart:

Attach the Project Organization Chart to your email submission.

Please see attachment ([Link](#))

2. Is the department running this project as a matrixed or projectized organization?

Matrixed

In each of the following sections, provide a concise description of the approach to staffing the proposed project including contingencies for business/program, IT, or administrative areas to maintain ongoing operations in conjunction with the proposed project.

1. Administrative

The Department has internal Project Oversight and Strategic Technology (POST) Branch that is part of the ISD. The POST Branch will provide necessary project support and best project management practices using existing staff. In addition to this, each of the Divisions involved in this project have areas that specialize in procurement, contracts, and budget activities.

2. Business Program

We have staff in CalSPARK 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. 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 the testing environment.

3. Information Technology

Based on our market research, the project team has decided to implement a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product with a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) delivery model, which entails deploying a pre-built, vendor-supported application that is hosted in the cloud and accessed via the internet. This approach will allow the project to leverage standardized, scalable, and regularly updated services without the need for extensive on-premise infrastructure or custom development. Development and implementation will primarily be carried out by the selected primary vendor, with support from ISD staff. During the implementation phase, the project will focus on configuring the product to meet CalSPARK's business needs, integrating it with existing systems through APIs, migrating data, and training users to ensure successful adoption and operational efficiency. Additionally, the project will coordinate with the Information Security & Privacy Office (ISPO) for security analysis and auditing, as well as with the Innovative Technology Solutions Branch (ITSB) as needed for vendor solution configurations

4. Testing

The CalSPARK Business Analyst will help coordinate and perform the testing throughout the configuration process with the Program staff, as well as end to end testing for the entire solution with support from the vendor.

5. Data Conversion/Migration

Historical data, including data for the FY of the data migration execution and the preceding five fiscal years, as well as claims and late claim exception data will be uploaded into the solution. Upon approval of this alternative, the CalSPARK will work with the vendor to ensure data is made available in the new system.

Refer to CalSPARK Data Migration Preparation Plan _V_2.0 ([Link](#)) for the complete details.

6. Training

CalSPARK has a Data Integration Support Unit tasked with implementing data collection improvement efforts. This unit will lead the testing, training, and technical assistance for new users on the implemented solution. This includes developing training materials and presentations to support accurate and consistent data entry and collection. This unit will also be involved in the transition efforts from the current process to the proposed solution to offset any substantial business disruptions.

7. Organizational Change Management

The Project Portfolio Management Bureau (PPMB) and CalSPARK will collaborate on:

- Mitigating business disruption,
- Reducing the time required to adopt change,
- Planning activities and,
- Preparing and involving stakeholders to achieve and sustain those changes

The chosen vendor will support CalSPARK until implementation is achieved.

Organizational Change Management (OCM) and related tasks will be included as part of the primary procurement. The CDSS has decided that the solution vendor will own the OCM responsibilities. OCM activities will include coordinating communication among stakeholders of upcoming changes, providing timely and thorough training on changes, and developing and distributing supportive companion documentation such as user guidebooks and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), among other responsibilities. As part of OCM efforts, the solution vendor should also prepare business-friendly release notes that explain the additional functionality/changes included in each release.

8. Resource Capacity/Skills/Knowledge for Stage 3 Solution Development

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

2.10 Project Planning

1. Project Management Risk Assessment

Updated Project Management Risk Score: **1.2**

Attach Updated PM Risk Assessment to your email submission. [SIMM Section 45A](#)

[Please see attached SIMM 45 Appendix A CalSPARK \(Link\)](#)

2. Project Charter

Is your project charter 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.

[Project Charter \(Approved\):](#) Yes

Status: Project Charter approved by CDSS Leadership.

Attach a copy of the Project Charter to your email submission.

[Please see attached CalSPARK Project Charter Plan_V_2.0 to this submission \(Link\)](#)

3. Project Plans

Are the following project management plans or project artifacts 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.

Note: For Low to medium complexity and cost projects, discuss with your PAO manager the option of submitting a Master Project Management Plan in place of individual plans.

[Scope Management Plan \(Approved\):](#) Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Scope_Management_Plan - V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Communication Management Plan \(Approved\):](#) Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Communication_Management_Plan - V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Schedule Management Plan \(Approved\)](#) : Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Schedule_Management_Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Procurement Management Plan \(Approved\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Procurement_Management_Plan_V.2 ([Link](#))

[Requirements Management Plan \(Approved\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Requirements_Management_Plan_V.2.0 ([Link](#))

[Stakeholder Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK_Stakeholder_Management_Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Governance Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Governance_Management_Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Contract Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Contract Management Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Resource Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK_Resource_Management_Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Change Control Management Plan \(Draft\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Change Control Management Plan_V2.0 ([Link](#))

[Risk Management Plan \(Draft + Risk Log\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Risk and Issue Management Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Issue and Action Item Management Plan \(Draft + Issue Log\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Risk and Issue Management Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

[Cost Management Plan \(Approved if planning BCP approved\)](#): Yes

Status: Reviewed by CDSS Management and will be reviewed and approved as part of S2AA review and approval process by Agency and CDT

Please see attached CalSPARK Cost Management Plan_V_2.0 ([Link](#))

4. Project Roadmap (High-Level)

Attach a high-level Project Roadmap showing remainder of planning phase and transition into execution phase to the email submission.

Attached is the High-Level Project Roadmap for the CalSPARK Project ([Link](#))

The estimated planning dates listed below are based on Alternative 1: COTS Solution. These dates are subject to change depending on alternative selected and vendor onboarding and procurement.

- a) Planning Start Date: 7/1/2021
- b) Estimated Planning End Date: 6/30/2027
- c) Estimated Project Start Date: 7/1/2027
- d) Estimated Project End Date: 12/31/2029

2.11 Data Cleansing, Conversion, and Migration

If in Section 2.3 (above) the answer to the question “Do you have existing data that must be migrated to your new solution?” was marked “Yes,” please complete this section.

The California Department of Technology recommends having a Data Consultant start data cleansing, conversion, and migration activities as soon as possible.

Identify the status of each of the following data activities. If “Not Applicable” is chosen, explain why the activity is not applicable or if “Not Started” is chosen, explain when the activity will start and its anticipated duration:

1. Current Environment Analysis: Completed

CDSS has collected all “as-is” documentation that is available on the current environments supporting CDMIS, PARIS, CDPR, CDFS, and CNIPS. A full review of discovery artifacts is detailed in Deliverable #2.

2. Data Migration Plan: In Progress

CDSS has finalized a Data Migration Preparation Plan. This has been peer reviewed both internally and by CDT/ISO personnel. A complete Data migration plan will be produced in the PAL Stage 3. Data migration preparation will be conducted by CDSS technical staff leading to a staging environment for data. From there, the SI vendor will execute the final data migration efforts. The initial tasks of this preparation plan have already begun. A thorough data analysis is in progress for the CDMIS and CNIPS systems. A similar analysis of the PARIS/CDPR and CDFS systems will follow. As of February 2025, the CalSPARK technical team has obtained access to all they legacy system’s databases.

Please see attached CalSPARK Data Migration Preparation Plan_Final ([Link](#))

3. Data Profiling: In Progress

4. Data Cleansing and Correction: Not Started

This task has not yet started. Tentative start date is 5/5/25.

5. Data Quality Assessment: Not Started

This task has not yet started. Tentative start date is 5/5/25.

6. Data Quality Business Rules: Not Started

This task has not yet started. Tentative start date is 5/5/25.

7. Data Dictionaries: In Progress

CDSS is continuing efforts to review and refine Data Dictionaries. Being a solution that will replace several legacy systems, creating a complete Data Dictionary is a lengthy task. As the analysis of the databases is completed, the Data Dictionaries are further refined.

8. Data Conversion/Migration Requirements: Not Started

This task has not yet started. Tentative start date is 5/25/25.

2.12 Financial Analysis Worksheets

Attach [F.2 Financial Analysis Worksheet\(s\)](#) to the email submission.

Attached are the Financial Analysis Worksheets (FAWs), which estimate the cost of various solution alternatives for the CalSPARK systems implementation project from FY 24/25 through FY 30/31. The FAWs estimate the project and maintenance & operations costs, as well as project resources for all three alternatives presented in Section 2.8 Viable Alternative Solutions. The preferred alternative listed in the FAWs is Alternative 1, Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) Solution.

The FAWs are attached to this submission and available for review here: ([Link](#))

End of agency/state entity document.

Please ensure ADA compliance before submitting this document to CDT.

When ready, submit Stage 2 and all attachments in an email to ProjectOversight@state.ca.gov.

Department of Technology Use Only

Original “New Submission” Date: 6/5/2025

Form Received Date: 6/5/2025

Form Accepted Date: 6/5/2025

Form Status: Completed

Form Status Date: 11/17/2025

Form Disposition: Approved

Form Disposition Date: 11/17/2025