# Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

## 1.1 General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Agency or State Entity Name:** | California Department of Social Services |
| **Organization Code:** | 5180 |
| **Proposal Name:** | State Verification Hub |
| **Proposal Description:** | The State Verification Hub (Hub) will be a centralized system that supports fast, accurate, and efficient verification processes required for eligibility determinations for clients and program staff across CA Health and Human Services Agency (CHHSA) Departments and programs. Initial efforts will be focused on CalFresh, CalWORKs, and MediCal, but with a system designed to integrate other programs (e.g., WIC) to conduct verifications through this service hub in the future. |
| **When do you want to start this project?:** | 7/1/2019 |
| **Department of Technology Project Number:** | 5180-219 |

## 1.2 Submittal Information

**Contact Information:**

| Contact First Name | Contact Last Name |
|---|---|
| Raquel | Givon |

| Contact Email | Contact Phone Number |
|---|---|
| **Raquel.Givon@dss.ca.gov** | 916-654-1770 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Submission Date:** | Date Picker |
| **Version Number:** | 1 |

**Project Approval Executive Transmittal**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Attachment:** | Include the Project Approval Executive Transmittal as an attachment to your email submission. |

## 1.3 Business Sponsorship

**Executive Sponsors**

| Title | First Name | Last Name | Business Program Area |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chief Deputy Director | Pete | Cervinka | California Department of Social Services (CDSS) |
| Deputy Director | Rene | Mollow | Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), Health Care Benefits and Eligibility |
| Agency Information Officer | Adam | Dondro | California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHSA) |

*Select + to add additional Executive Sponsors*

**Business Owners**

| Title | First Name | Last Name | Business Program Area |
|---|---|---|---|
| Branch Chief | Kim McCoy | Wade | CalFresh and Nutrition Branch |
| Branch Chief | Natasha | Nicolai | CalWORKs and Child Care Branch |
| Division Chief | Sandra | Williams | Medi-Cal Eligibility Division |

# Stage 1 Business Analysis

| Deputy Director | Kim | Johnson | Family Engagement and Empowerment Division |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assistant Director | Todd | Bland | Automation, Integrity and Client Initiatives Branch |

*Select + to add additional Business Owners*

## Program Background and Context

As part of its ongoing commitment to continuously improve access to benefits by Californians in need of assistance, the California Health and Human Services Agency is seeking to streamline and modernize the processes of obtaining required verifications, and to simplify that process across departments and programs. Verification services have been identified in the CHHSA Information Strategic Plan as a function that can be built once and leveraged by multiple programs across the Agency.  This was further explored in the CDSS CalFresh Branch project in 2018, led by consultant Social Interest Solutions, to assess current state and alternatives, engage stakeholders, and make recommendations on streamlining verifications, including potentially building a State Hub. As such, the intent for this request is to establish a verification hub that, while initially scoped more specifically, can over time be leveraged by additional programs/departments to perform their verifications.  This will provide consistency in results across programs and reduce repeated investments by multiple programs to achieve the same capability.   While ensuring the scalability of the system, the initial development will be focused on CalFresh, CalWORKs, and MediCal.  These programs are already integrated as the county eligibility workers conducting determinations for these programs all operate in an automated system for all three programs.

Eligibility determinations for CalFresh, CalWORKs, and MediCal are made by county welfare departments (CWD) at initial application, periodic report, and annual recertification/redetermination. As well, eligibility may be reassessed during the certification period based on client report or other information received by the CWD. For CalFresh and CalWORKs, at initial application and recertification/redetermination, an eligibility determination requires three key steps: application, interview, and verification. The Medi-Cal program also requires similar processes to complete the eligibility determination process at application, change of circumstance, and annual redetermination. Medi-Cal does NOT require an interview at either application OR renewal as CalFresh and CalWORKs does. Under federal and state rules, all relevant eligibility information must be verified, such as information about identity, residency, immigration and citizenship status, income, and expenses. CWDs use a variety of verification methods, including electronic data matching with trusted sources, review of paper documents provided by an applicant or recipient, collateral contacts with third parties, and client statements. Current methods for collecting verifications are time consuming and rely on data from multiple sources, some of which are out dated. This creates a problem for both the county worker and the applicant, who may have their verification process prolonged, and can result in multiple visits to the county office to receive an eligibility decision.   In addition, the Medi-Cal program relies on paper verifications for the Non-Modified Adjusted Gross Income (Non-MAGI) cases.  CalWORKs and CalFresh also rely on paper verifications for certain requirements.  A program goal will be to eliminate some level of the reliance on paper verifications and to leverage automation to gather required verifications to facilitate the Medi-Cal application process.

In January of 2018, the CalFresh & Nutrition Branch, in partnership with CalWORKs, launched a project that would examine the state of CalFresh over issuance (OI) and CalWORKs overpayment (OP) of benefits. As an example, according to fiscal year (FY) 2016 data, the most recently available federal reporting data, California carries approximately 10% of the national Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) caseload but created approximately 63% of the newly established overpayment claims in the country that year.  Of those newly established claims, California established 49% of the inadvertent household error (IHE) claims and 80% of the administrative error (AE) claims. For CalWORKs, IHEs occur six times more often than AEs.

Currently, counties receive IEVS information that is six to nine months old. Not having real-time access or at least close to real-time access to information to determine the correct benefit amount is the likely cause of the high number of OI and OP claims. Misalignment between CalWORKs and CalFresh policy has also contributed to OIs/OPs. A program goal is to streamline and improve the effectiveness of the verification process, minimizing errors at the point of an eligibility

determination and lowering the number of OI/OP claims, reducing both client and administrative burdens and ultimately improving access.

## 1.4 Stakeholders

**Key Stakeholders**

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| County Welfare Departments | All 58 California Counties |

| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal   ☒ External |
|---|---|

**When is the Stakeholder impacted?**

| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**

CalFresh/CalWORKS/Medi-Cal Eligibility Workers, Program Integrity Staff, Welfare to Work Program and Child Care Staff, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Adult Programs, and Child Support Services will utilize the Hub for initial and ongoing eligibility, as well as data integrity purposes. County eligibility workers (EWs) determine the applicant's and recipient's eligibility by verifying required information for the CalWORKs and CalFresh programs. While the county business processes differ by county, but the eligibility requirements are the same for all counties.Utilization of a centralized hub will streamline the verification process. Streamlining and improving the verification process will result in an effective eligibility determination and significantly improve clients' experience, and will significantly reduce the administrative burden on county staff and allow clients to receive benefits and services in a timely manner.

**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**

County representatives will be involved throughout the project including workgroups, requirements development and validation, and testing. It is the intent that the county stakeholders be involved early and often in the development proces to ensure a user-centered design.

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHSA) | Adam Dondro |

| **Internal or External?** | ☒ Internal   ☐ External |
|---|---|

**When is the Stakeholder impacted?**

| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**

The CHHSA has specified verification services as a shared service in its Information Strategic Plan, and is a sponsor of this project to ensure that the architecture, design, and execution are done in such a way as to meet the broader Agency goal for enterprise services.  By building this solution correctly, it will enable CHHSA to reduce costs for other programs to build out these same services, simplify the Agency IT architecture, and ensure more consistent/accurate verifications are conducted consistently across the Agency.  CHHSA and their representatives will be included in the build, design, and implementation phase to ensure their technical requirements are addressed and carried throughout the execution process.

**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**

The CHHSA Chief Information Officer will provide strategic direction in relation to the enterprise approach to this initiative, specifically but not exclusively in the context of horizontal integration and the CHHSA Mission of increasing those in need/at risk with increased opportunity for a high quality of life through access to appropriate health and human services.  The OAIO will provide guidance and support through the Project Approval Lifecycle (PAL) and willl coordinate with California oversight entities.

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|

| Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Consortia | C-IV, CalWIN, LRS, CalSAWS, CalACES North, CalSAWS (Including SME's as required (i.e., portal & mobile app SME staff) | |
|---|---|---|
| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal  ☒ External | |
| **When is the Stakeholder impacted?** | | |
| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |
| **How are Stakeholders impacted?** | | |
| The SAWS Consortia are the governing bodies for the current and future SAWS systems. The SAWS systems are used throughout the verification processes and will be positively impacted by the creation of a State Hub. The verifications needed for the SAWS system to determine eligibility will be easily and accurately accessible. Business process will potentially be impacted. There will also be improvement in data governance and policy development implementation for both initial application and recertification. | | |
| **How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?** | | |
| Consoritia representatives will be involved throughout the project including workgroups, requirements development and validation, and testing. | | |
| **Org. Name** | Name | |
| County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA) | | |
| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal  ☒ External | |
| **When is the Stakeholder impacted?** | | |
| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |
| **How are Stakeholders impacted?** | | |
| CWDA is a nonprofit association representing the County CHHS Directors from each of California's 58 counties. CWDA is invested in the outcomes of the whole buisness processes from the county worker perspective, in that way they are involved througout the business process from beginning to end.  CWDA educates state and federal policy-makers and the public regarding the significance of human services policies on individuals, communities, and county human services operations. They also collaborate with county human service agencies, state and federal government entities and community-based organizations to ensure efficient and effective service delivery and exchange of best and promising practices. | | |
| **How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?** | | |
| CWDA representatives will be involved throughout the project including workgroups, requirements development and validation, and testing. | | |
| **Org. Name** | Name | |
| Customers (Applicants & Recipients) | | |
| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal  ☒ External | |
| **When is the Stakeholder impacted?** | | |
| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**

The customer is involved througout the entire business process. At initial application, the customer may have to supply the worker with documentation to verify information provided on the application. The customer continues to engage in the process and depending on verifications provided, the end result is either approval or denial of benefits. This can also apply at periodic report, recertification, and during the certification period. The customer experience as it relates to verification will be streamlined and the burden of providing verification will be lessened. Customers will be more likely to receive effective service and an accurate eligibility and benefit determination, potentially reducing the risk of an OI/OP.

For the CalWORKs program, as a condition of eligibility, applicants or recipients are required to provide verification of citizenship, social security number, and income information.  Clients and counties have up to 45 days from the application date to verify all required information.  In most cases, applicants who meet the immediate need criteria will receive a partial grant  and the rest of the grant will be held due to pending verifications. The customer is involved throughout the eligibility determination process. Their eligibility and how fast they get their full grant approved are dependent upon the county's receipt of the required verifications.

**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**

TBD

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| Welfare Advocates | Various |

| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal  ☒ External |
|---|---|

**When is the Stakeholder impacted?**

| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☐ | ☒ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**

They represent the customers that will be impacted by the changes to the eligibility process. Advocates are invested in their clients experience with the eligibility process as well as the approval or denial of benefits.

**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**

Welfare advocates are expected to participate in workgroups on an as needed basis

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| Federal Oversight Agencies | United States Department of Agriculture- Food and Nutrition Services (USDA-FNS), Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), Administration for Children and Families (ACYF), Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) |

| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal  ☒ External |
|---|---|

**When is the Stakeholder impacted?**

| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**

Provide federal oversight of all impacted programs. During the verification process, county workers use multiple sytems to verifiy eligibility, and federal partners are interested in the process and outcome of the alignment of those systems. The creation of the state hub would streamline the process and provide a system alignment solution.

**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**

Provide federal oversight of all impacted programs and Federal Funding Participation (FFP).

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| Office of System Integration (OSI) | Kristine Dudley |

| **Internal or External?** | ☐ Internal  ☒ External |
|---|---|

**When is the Stakeholder impacted?**

| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**

Numerous other projects and systems that the OSI provides Project Management of will be impacted by this project, including SAWS, EBT, MEDS, and other CHHSA sponsored projects. Depending on the system and interface, the OSI is involved in every part of the eligbility process

**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**

OSI will act as the Project Manager and technical oversight of this effort.

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
|  |  |

**Internal or External?** ☐ Internal  ☐ External

**When is the Stakeholder impacted?**

| Input to Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**How are Stakeholders impacted?**



**How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?**



*Select + to add additional Stakeholders*

## 1.5 Business Program

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| OSI on behalf of CDSS, DHCS and OAIO | CalFresh, CalWORKs and MediCal programs |

**When is the unit impacted?**

| Input to the Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How is the business program unit impacted?**

It is anticipated that the project will have a positive effect on the process of securing accurate verifications. Ultimately, reducing administrative burdens for both clients and eligibility workers and reducing the potential for unintended error(s). This process will also reduce the number of paper verifications needed from clients during the process.

**How will the business program participate in the project?**

OSI will coordinate program representatives from CDSS and DHCS to engage all relevant external stakeholders to gather the requirements for the Hub. The outcome of this initiative will be to design, develop, and implement a centralized process for completing the verification process.  CalFresh, CalWORKs, and MediCal statute, both state and federal, policy, and guidance will inform the design, development, testing, training, and implementation of the solution.

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| Automation, Integrity and Client Initiatives Branch (AICI) | Todd Bland |

**When is the unit impacted?**

| Input to the Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How is the business program unit impacted?**

Counties mostly rely on clients to provide verification.  At application, full CalWORKs grants are authorized after the clients provide the required verifications. In some cases, benefits are withheld for up to 45 days due to missing verification. At redetermination, missing verification such as wage stubs prevent the EWs from authorizing the grant immediately. Client statements are accepted but only as a last resort when all other ways of verifying the information have been exhausted. With the proper technology, collecting information from multiple sources could be streamlined to allow for efficiency and maximum use of the counties' time.

It is anticipated that the project will have a positive effect on the process of securing accurate verifications. Ultimately, reducing the admistrative burden on both clients and eligibility workers and reducing the potential for unintended error. The Branch may need to review and update policies related to automation and verification procedures.

**How will the business program participate in the project?**

**The** Automation, Integrity, and Client Initiatives Branch will act as the main project sponsor entitiy within CDSS, working with partnering CDSS programs to engage all external stakeholders to gather the requirements for the development of the Hub. The outcome of this initiative will be to design, develop, and implement a centralized process for the eligibility verification process considering the short term and long term recommendations. The branch will also be closely engaged in design, development, testing, training, and implementation of the solution.

| Org. Name | Name |
|---|---|
| Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) | Medi-Cal Program |

**When is the unit impacted?**

| Input to the Business Process | During the Business Process | Output of the Business Process |
|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**How is the business program unit impacted?**

It is anticipated that the project will have a positive effect in securing more accurate verifications for the Non-Modified Adjusted Gross Income (Non-MAGI) Medi-Cal cases. This project will also facilitate the decrease of the use of paper verifications in the Medi-Cal application process, which reduces administrative burden on both client and eligibility workers.   DHCS will need to review existing verification policies as it relates to the Medi-Cal program to ensure the automation comports with Medi-Cal state and federal statute.  In addition, DHCS will need to make assess system changes in the Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System (MEDS) to understand technical impacts of data transmission.

**How will the business program participate in the project?**

The Medi-Cal Eligibility Division (MCED) will act as the main project sponsor entity within DHCS, partnering with our EITS (technical) experts. MCED, in concert with CDSS, discuss opportunities for the streamlining of verification policies, and to look at potential possibilities in policy alignment.  MCED will serve as the main program liaison between internal DHCS impacted divisions and take lead in stakeholder engagement with the Medi-Cal consumer advocate community. MCED will also work closely with OSI and CDSS on the design, development, testing, training, and implementation of the solution.

*Select + to add additional Business Programs*

## 1.6 Business Alignment

**Business Driver(s)**

**Financial Benefit**

| Increased Revenue | Cost Savings | Cost Avoidance | Cost Recovery |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**Mandate(s)**

| State | Federal |
|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ |

**Improvement**

| Better Services to Citizens | Efficiencies to Program Operations | Improved Health and/or Human Safety | Technology Refresh |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

**Security**

| Improved Information Security | Improved Business Continuity | Improved Technology Recovery | Technology End of Life |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☐ |

| Strategic Business Alignment | |
|---|---|
| Strategic Plan Last Updated? | 2/1/2018 |
| **Strategic Business Goal** | **Alignment** |
| CHHSA Mission<br>"All Californians, especially those most at risk or in need, have the opportunity to enjoy a high quality of life as measured by the sound physical, mental and financial health of children, adolescents and adults; strong and well-functioning families; safe and sustainable communities; and dignity for all." | • Allow clients to receive benefits and serives in a timely manner.<br>• Improves coordination of services for clients and benefits.<br>• Supports Agency strategy for services and enterprise-wide approach for IT solutions. |
| **Strategic Business Goal** | **Alignment** |
| Agency Information Strategic Plan<br>• Goal 2.1 Leveraging assets to improve utilization of resources<br>• Goal 2.3 Planning and Design toward shared business service and delivery. | Implementing the system will:<br>• Create a centralized verification service available for all Agency programs to use.<br>• Bring participants and experts from across multiple programs together during design to understand the similarities, differences, and overlaps/inconsistencies in process they each use.<br>• Minimize the need for future investment in verification services by other programs. |
| **Strategic Business Goal** | **Alignment** |
| CalFresh Strategic Plan<br>• Ensure that all eligible people have access to timely and accurate benefit determinations | Establishing and Implementing the Hub will<br>• Eliminate the current and unnecessary client barrier of requiring them to gather a variety of documents and submit them to an eligibility worker to evaluate, scan, and archive with the case record.<br>• Reduce time spent securing verification and aid the client in receiving an eligibility determination and benefits more quickly.<br>• Improve the quality of service significantly by incorporating the enhancements of existing business processes into a new solution.<br>• Improve the eligibility verification process by providing a centralized hub for eligibility verification.<br>• Reduce the admnistrative burden for both clients and eligibility workers by eliminating the need to secure paper documentation to verify eligibility criteria.<br>• Reduce unintended errors associated with inefficient verification processes. |
| **Strategic Business Goal** | **Alignment** |
| CalFresh Strategic Plan<br>• Continually improve digital and other shared services to clients, counties, partners, and staff | Implementing the system will<br>• Enable more streamlined policies and regulations implementation and better alignment between various programs.<br>• Support the continuous improvement initiatives being adapted as a strategic organizational goal.<br>Develop a system that is leverageable by CHHSA programs for |

| Strategic Business Goal | Alignment |
|---|---|
| DHCS Stratgic Plan<br>• Improve the consumer experience so individuals can easily access integrated, high-quality health care when they need it, where they need it, at all stages of life<br>• Be prudent, responsible fiscal stewards of public resources | Implementing the hub will:<br>• Improve the enrollment experience for the consumer and streamline specific functions of eligibility<br>• Enable a system that is user-centric and facilitates more efficient processing of applications<br>• Increase the interoperability of existing state verification resources<br>• Advance the use of automation in protecting the integrity and compliance of the Medi-Cal program |

**Executive Summary of the Business Problem or Opportunity**

The CHHSA aims to provide programs, services, and coverage to individuals and families in need of assistance. The verfication process for MediCal, CalWORKs, and CalFresh can be costly, inefficient, and time consuming for both clients and eligibility workers. The process is heavily paper reliant and is cumbersome to eligibility workers who may have to access information through multiple data sources or to clients who may have to provide additional documentation which can cause a delay in receiving benefits. Although there may still be circumstances which require paper documentation, current technology allows for more automated solutions, including image scanning or Optical Character Recognition, as a part of the solution. It would also be beneficial to the eligibility worker to have a centralized repository of verfication to avoid replicating verification requests across multiple programs.

As previously mentioned, with regards to the potential for unintended errors, the current verification process is problematic. In January of 2018, analysis of CalFresh OI and CalWORKs OP found that in FY16 California comprised 36 percent of national CalFresh OI claims, resulting in $248M in OIs. The study finds $121 M of that error was due to agency error. The CDSS aims to minimize errors by creating a State Verification Hub, which will streamline the verification process, minimizing errors at point of verification and lowering the number of OI/OP claims.

Applicants for the CalWORKs program have up to 45 days to provide verifications.  In most cases, applicants meet the timeline.  However, the waiting period may be difficult especially for clients with transportation issues, mobility issues, or clients with very young children for whom collecting information from multiple sources and locations could be burdensome. Clients apply for services because their basic needs are unmet. Counties are finding ways to provide timely benefits to address this issue, and each county has its own business process.  Having a centralized system to gather the required information would be beneficial to the participants of the CalWORKs and CalFresh programs.

Eligibility workers receive Applicant and Recipient IEVS reports to assist with eligibility determinations. The current IEVS system is outdated and archaic in design.  The batch processing of the IEVS data is another outdated process in need of modernization.  The data received becomes stale due to the antiquated data processes of the IEVS system.  Providing counties with timely and accurate data and ensuring recipients are continuing to receive timely and accurate benefits is the goal. A new system will allow more useful information to be sent to the counties and have better data analytics for reporting to state and federal oversight.

With changing regulation and statute, automation systems have to be customizable to fit the needs of policy. With the current workforce, the current legacy systems used for verification are not easily customizable to accommodate policy changes. These legacy systems have become supportable only with increasingly rare staff/consultants who still maintain skills in the disappearing technology. Modernized technology will be better aligned with current workforce skillset.

There is an opportunity to be more beneficial to Californians by supporting modernization efforts in the future and provide a person centric view by consolidating/computing all information in once place to deliver accurate & timely benefits.

# Stage 1 Business Analysis

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

| Business Problem or Opportunity and Objectives Table | |
|---|---|
| **Problem ID** | **Problems/Opportunities** |
| 01 | The verification process for CalWORKs, CalFresh, and Medi-Cal can be a costly and time consuming, for both clients and county eligibility workers. It would be beneficial to both to have one centralized verification system to provide timely verification of information that may not be readily available to the client, avoid duplication of requests for verification already provided to other programs, and centralize verification information from mulitple state and federal sources that today are referenced separate and apart from each other. |
| Objective ID | 01.a |
| Objectives | Reduce the amount of time needed for eligibility workers to verify eligibility |
| Metric | Average days to process application |
| Baseline | 30-45 days, depending on the program |
| Target | 24-72 hours |
| Measurement Method | County Reporting |
| Objective ID | 01.b |
| Objectives | Reduce the number of systems used by county workers to verify eligibility |
| Metric | Number of systems needed to be checked to determine eligibility |
| Baseline | Multiple |
| Target | One |
| Measurement Method | County Surveys (Survey timing TBD) |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| Objective ID | 01.c |
| Objectives | Reduce the amount of time from customer application to decision on approval or denial of benefits. |
| Metric | Average days to process application |
| Baseline | 30-45 days, depending on the program |
| Target | 24-72 hours |
| Measurement Method | County Reporting |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| 02 | The process is heavily paper reliant and is cumbersome to both clients and eligibility workers who have to find alternative forms of verification through multiple sources, which may cause a delay in receiving benefits |
| Objective ID | 02.a |
| Objectives | Reduce reliance on paper process by verifying customer eligibility in a real time electronic data source |
| Metric | Percent of cases reliant on paper process |
| Baseline | 100% |
| Target | 50% |
| Measurement Method | County Surverys (Survey timing TBD) |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| 03 | Provide more accurate eligibility determinations. The occurrence OI/OPs driven by agency or admnistrative errors is too high and is problematic both for the county and the client. It is assumed part of the problem is the accuracy and timeliness of the data available at the time of an eligibility determination. |
| Objective ID | 03.a |
| Objectives | Minimize agency caused over issuance |

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| Metric | Percent of California-agency caused over issuance based on national average. |
| Baseline | 80% |
| Target | 10% |
| Measurement Method | USDA Report |
| Objective ID | 03.b |
| Objectives | Minimize agency caused over payment |
| Metric | Amount of combined yearly ove rpayments |
| Baseline | 850 Million |
| Target | 700 Million |
| Measurement Method | CA Common Sense Report |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| 04 | Applicant and Recipient IEVS data are outdated and does not provide counties with useful information to uphold the integrity of the programs. The IEVS matches are currently sent at different frequencies to the counties depending on the report. With the development of the Hub there is potential to improve processes of retrieving IEVS data that better suits the needs of the counties. |
| Objective ID | 04.a |
| Objectives | Improve usefulness and accuracy of data provided to counties |
| Metric | Frequency of IEVS report transfer to counties |
| Baseline | Varies |
| Target | On Demand |
| Measurement Method | County Reports |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| 05 | Finding CDSS technology staff to maintain the legacy system is difficult because of the outdated programming languages. Developing a modernized system with updated technology will increase the Department's ability to maintain and update the system over time, based on policy changes and other needs. |
| Objective ID | 05.a |
| Objectives | Easily implement new statutes and regulations in system |
| Metric | Number of CDSS technology staff able to configure the system |
| Baseline | Less than two |
| Target | More than 10 |
| Measurement Method | Employee metrics |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| 06 | |
| Objective ID | |
| Objectives | |
| Metric | |
| Baseline | |
| Target | |
| Measurement Method | |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| *Select + to add additional Objectives* | |
| *Select + to add additional Problems* | |
| **Project Approval Lifecycle Completion and Project Execution Capacity Assessment** | |

1. Does the proposal development or project execution anticipate sharing resources (state staff, vendors, consultants or financial) with other priorities within the Agency/state entity (projects, PALs, or programmatic/technology workload)?

⦿ Yes    ○ No    ○ Clear

2. Does the Agency/ state entity anticipate this proposal will result in the creation of new business processes or changes to existing business processes?

○ No   ○ New Processes   ○ Existing Processes   ⦿ Both New and Existing    ○ Clear

## 1.7 Project Management

| Project Management Risk Score: | **CDSS Risk 1.6**<br><br>**DHCS Risk 5.5** |
|---|---|
| Attach completed Statewide Information Management Manual (SIMM) Section 45 Appendix A: | Include the completed SIMM 45 Appendix A as an attachment to your email submission. |

**Existing Data Governance and Data –** ==answers, CDSS Departmental==

| # | Question | Answer | Attachment |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Does the Agency/state entity have an established data governance body with well-defined roles and responsibilities to support data governance activities? If an existing data governance org chart is used, please attach. | ○ Unknown<br>⦿ Yes<br>○ No<br>○ Clear | If applicable, include the data governance org chart as an attachment to your email submission. |
| 2. | Does the Agency/state entity have data governance policies (data policies, data standards, etc.) formally defined, documented, and implemented? If yes, please attach the existing data governance plan, policies or IT standards used. | ○ Unknown<br>⦿ Yes<br>○ No<br>○ Clear | If applicable, include the data governance policies as an attachment to your email submission. |
| 3. | Does the Agency/state entity have data security policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented? If yes, please attach the existing documented security policies, standards, and controls used. | ○ Unknown<br>⦿ Yes<br>○ No<br>○ Clear | If applicable, include the documented security policies, standards, and controls as an attachment to your email submission. |
| 4. | Does the Agency/state entity have user accessibility policies, standards, controls, and procedures formally defined, documented, and implemented? If yes, please attach the existing documented policies, accessibility governance plan, and standards used, or provide additional information below. | ○ Unknown<br>⦿ Yes<br>○ No<br>○ Clear | If applicable, include the documented accessibility policies, standards, and controls as an attachment to your email submission. |

| 5. Do you have existing data that you are going to want to access in your new solution? | ○ Unknown<br><br>◉ Yes<br><br>○ No<br><br>○ Clear | If applicable, include the data migration plan as an attachment to your email submission. |
|---|---|---|

| 6. If data migration is required, please rate the quality of the data. | No information available |
|---|---|

## 1.8 Criticality Assessment

**Business Criticality**

| **Legislative Mandates**: | N/A ☒ | |
|---|---|---|

| Bill Number(s)/Code(s): | |
|---|---|

| Language that includes system relevant requirements: | |
|---|---|

| **Business Complexity Score** | **CDSS Business Complexity 2.9 & Technical 2.5**<br><br>**DHCS Business Complexity 2.2 & Technical 0.0** | Include the completed SIMM 45 Appendix C as an attachment to your email submission. |
|---|---|---|

**Noncompliance Issues**

Indicate if your current operations include noncompliance issues and provide a narrative explaining the how the business process is noncompliant.

| Programmatic Regulations | HIPPA/CJIS/FTI/PII/PCI | Security | ADA | Other | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

| 1. What is the proposed project start date? | 7/1/2020 |
|---|---|

| 2. Is this proposal anticipated to have high public visibility? | ◉ Yes ○ No ○ Clear |
|---|---|

If "Yes," please identify the dynamics of the anticipated high visibility below:

It is anticipated that this project will have multiple stakeholders and interested parties. The goal is to make a user centered system and will require ongoing collaboration with those users/organizations, including regular stakeholder meetings.

3. If there is an existing Privacy Information Assessment, include as an attachment to your email submission.

| 4. Does this proposal affect business program staff located in multiple geographic locations? | ◉ Yes ○ No ○ Clear |
|---|---|

If "Yes," provide an overview of the geographic dynamics below and enter the specific information in the space provided.

The system will be used throughout the state by program staff and all 58 counties, as well as state users. This project could potentially change business process of other programs that will be able to leverage the system.

| City | State | Number of Locations | Approximate Number of Staff |
|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple | CA | 58 | All county eligibility workers |

*Select + to add Locations*

## 1.9 Funding

California Department of Technology, SIMM 19A.2 (Rev. 2.4), Revised 4/2/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Does the Agency/state entity anticipate requesting additional resources through a budget action to complete the project approval lifecycle? | ⦿ Yes ◯ No ◯ Clear |
| 2. Will the state possibly incur a financial sanction or penalty if this proposal is not implemented?  If yes, please identify the financial impact to the state below: | ⦿ Yes ◯ No ◯ Clear |

Implementation of the State Verification Hub will likely improve accuracy in the eligibility and benefit determination processes and in turn reduce potential errors that could result in fiscal penalties/sanctions.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Has the funding source(s) been identified for this proposal? | ◯ Yes ◯ No ⦿ Clear |

| FUNDING SOURCE | | FUND AVAILABILITY DATE |
|---|---|---|
| General Fund | ☒ | 7/1/2019 |
| Special Fund | ☐ | |
| Federal Fund | ☒ | 1/1/2019 |
| Reimbursement | ☐ | Date Picker |
| Bond Fund | ☐ | Date Picker |
| Other Fund | ☒ | Date Picker |
| If "Other Fund" is checked, specify the funding: | The funding for initial planning and startup in SFY 2018-19 and 2019-20, in part, will be from the CalFresh Performance Bonus funding.  As this funding is drawn down, there is a Federal match component. | |

## 1.10 Reportability Assessment

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Does the Agency/state entity's IT activity meet the definition of an IT Project found in the State Administrative Manual (SAM) Section 4819.2? <br> If "No," this initiative is not an IT project and is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. | ⦿ Yes ◯ No ◯ Clear |
| 2. Does the activity meet the definition of Maintenance or Operations found in SAM Section 4819.2? <br><br> If "Yes," this initiative is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Please report this workload on the Agency Portfolio Report. And provide an explanation below. | ◯ Yes ⦿ No ◯ Clear |
| 3. Has the project/effort been previously approved and considered an ongoing IT activity identified in SAM Section 4819.2, 4819.40? <br><br> If "Yes," this initiative is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Please report this workload on the Agency Portfolio Report. | ◯ Yes ⦿ No ◯ Clear |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. Is the project directly associated with any of the following as defined by SAM Section 4812.32?<br><br>Single-function process-control systems; analog data collection devices, or telemetry systems; telecommunications equipment used exclusively for voice communications; Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) phone systems; acquisition of printers, scanners and copiers.<br><br>If "Yes," this initiative is not required to complete the Project Approval Lifecycle. Please report this workload on the Agency Portfolio Report. | ○ Yes ◉ No ○ Clear |
| 5. Is the primary objective of the project to acquire desktop and mobile computing commodities as defined by SAM Section 4819.34, 4989?<br><br>If "Yes," this initiative is a non-reportable project. Approval of the Project Approval Lifecycle is delegated to the head of the state entity. Submit a copy of the completed, approved Stage 1 Business Analysis to the CDT and track the initiative on the Agency Portfolio Report. | ○ Yes ◉ No ○ Clear |
| 6. Does the project meet all of the criteria for Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) Software and Cloud Software-as-a-Services (SaaS) delegation as defined in SAM 4819.34, 4989.2 and SIMM 22<br><br>If "Yes," this initiative is a non-reportable project. Approval of the Project Approval Lifecycle is delegated to the head of the state entity; however, submit an approved SIMM Section 22 form to CDT. | ○ Yes ◉ No ○ Clear |
| 7. Will the project require a Budget Action to be completed? | ◉ Yes ○ No ○ Clear |
| 8. Is it anticipated that the project will exceed the delegated cost threshold assigned by CDT as identified in SIMM 10? | ◉ Yes ○ No ○ Clear |
| 9. Are there any previously imposed conditions place on the state entity or this project by the CDT (e.g., Corrective Action Plan)?<br><br>If "Yes," provide the details regarding the conditions below. | ○ Yes ◉ No ○ Clear |
| 10. Is the system specifically mandated by legislation? | ○ Yes ◉ No ○ Clear |

## Department of Technology Use Only

| | |
|---|---|
| **Original "New Submission" Date** | 4/04/2019 |
| **Form Received Date** | 4/04/2019 |
| **Form Accepted Date** | 4/04/2019 |
| **Form Status** | Completed |
| **Form Status Date** | 4/04/2019 |
| **Form Disposition** | Approved          If "Other," specify: |
| **Form Disposition Date** | 4/04/2019 |