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:	Food and Agriculture, California Department of (CDFA)
Organization Code:	8570
Proposal Name:	Emerging Threats 2
Proposal Description:	CDFA Animal Health and Food Safety Services (AHFSS) Division is proposing to replace their existing Emerging Threats system to correct and eliminate multiple deficiencies that have arisen over the maintenance and operations life cycle of the system and to provide an enterprise-wide solution for all Programs within the AHFSS Division.
When do you want to start this project?	7/1/2021
Department of Technology Project Number:	8570-089

1.2 Submittal Information

Contact Information:

Contact First Name	Contact Last Name
Robert	Peterson
Contact Email	Contact Phone Number
Robert.peterson@cdfa.ca.gov	(916) 403-6837

Submission Date:	1/4/2019
Version Number:	**1.0**

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
Director	Annette	Jones	Animal Health and Food Safety Services Division

Select + to add additional Executive Sponsors

Business Owners

Title	First Name	Last Name	Business Program Area
Assistant Director	David	Preciado	Animal Health and Food Safety Services Division
Program Manager	Victor	Velez	Animal Health and Food Safety Services Division

Select + to add additional Business Owners

Program Background and Context

Animal Health and Food Safety Services mission is to serve the citizens of the State and consumers of California agricultural products to assure the safety, availability and affordability of agricultural products by promoting California agriculture, protecting public and animal health while enhancing stewardship of the environment.

In 2004, AHFSS initiated efforts to consolidate several stand-alone legacy systems distributed over the State into a single Web-based system to enhance the collection, processing and reporting of program activity data. These program activities included the licensing and inspection of agricultural business and commodities, animal and product sampling, animal movement traceability, and compliance activities performed by field and office personnel. The consolidation efforts resulted

in development and implementation of the Emerging Threats Data Management system (ET) that is currently the primary source of information management for the following programs: Animal Health (AH), Livestock Identification (LID), Meat, Poultry and Egg Safety (MPES), and Milk and Dairy Food Safety (MDFS). The Antimicrobial Use and Stewardship (AUS) program, a new program statutorily approved in October 2015 that currently has limited access to ET. The ET system development started in 2007 and was deployed in several phases beginning in 2009. The Project Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER), submitted to the California Department of Technology (CDT) in September 2013, indicates the project team achieved the stated objectives and kept the project within 10% tolerance of scope, schedule, and budget.

Over time, ET's critical shared core data information (people and places) has been added or modified resulting in data quality issues, such as duplicate and/or incomplete records, that directly impacts the correctness and accuracy of ETs reporting. After ET development was completed, the Egg Safety and Quality Management (ESQM) and the AUS programs were assigned to the AHFSS Division. Integration of the information for these two programs into ET is limited due to concerns that ET has limited ability to secure confidential information, which is required for these programs.

A 2016 analysis of ET, performed by a CDT Data Management Consultant, reports that ET's current data model no longer represents the business need. The report stated ET's "data integrity may have already been compromised" impacting the ability to exchange essential demographic information (core data, "people and places") amongst AHFSS programs. This problem was highlighted during the current and ongoing May 2018 outbreak of a highly contagious foreign avian disease, virulent Newcastle Disease (vND), in Southern California where critical core ET information for the ESQM program did not match ET information from the Animal Health program resulting in untimely delays in disease surveillance activities. The CDT report also identified that the means to ensure reliable shared data, necessary for key management decision, are not fully implemented resulting in duplicate information and orphaned records, records not linked to a parent record. The following data quality issues are just a few of the issues identified in the CDT report: duplicate farm records, (over 3,000); incomplete data (59,380 active operation records with no date); invalid data issues (street number, street name, and street suffix are all in the same field and are not uniform, making it hard to search for existing premises). The CDT report concluded, "it is recommended that the current data model should be further reviewed to determine whether it is still fit for the business need".

In November 2018, California voters approved Proposition 12, which creates new minimum requirements for farmers to provide more space for egg-laying hens, breeding pigs, and calves raised for veal. These requirements, which apply to farm animals raised in California, would be phased in over the next several years. The proposition also bans the sale of products that do no not meet the new housing standards and makes illegal for businesses in California to knowingly sell eggs (including liquid eggs) or uncooked pork or veal that came from animals housed in ways that do not meet the measure's requirements. This sales ban applies to products from animals raised in California or out-of-state. The measure requires CDFA to write regulations to implement these requirements. It is expected that CDFA AHFSS will register these facilities and implement an inspection process to ensure compliance with the provisions of the law; most of these facilities (operations, locations, and responsible party) already exist within ET though the data quality, correctness, and proper/valid relationship (operation-to location-to responsible party) to each is questionable. AHFSS needs to integrate future programs, processes, and functionality into ET to ensure data is shared across programs and that each program has the necessary and sufficient information to accomplish their mandated mission.

Since the ET project was deployed, the CDFA Office of Information Technology (OITS) has taken numerous steps to strengthen its ability to successfully manage projects and maintain existing systems. CDFA has established an IT Governance Committee anchored in best business practices to ensure that OITS is focused on business-driven enterprise priorities. The project to replace ET, ET 2, is included on CDFA IT Governance Committee's list of approved projects. In addition to CDFA's IT Governance Committee, the AHFSS Division established an internal AHFSS IT Governance Committee that fully supports the replacement of both the current ET system and the replacement of the California Animal Health and Food Safety (CAHFS) Laboratory's Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS).

Stage 1 Business Analysis

1.4 Stakeholders

Key Stakeholders

Org. Name	Name
Animal Health and Food Safety Services Division - Animal Health Branch Chiefs	Kent Fowler, Dennis Wilson, John Suther, Paula Batarseh, Stephen Beam
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?

Branch Chiefs manage each program and perform an important role in ensuring that information management technology projects align with the business needs of the programs and provide business value, such as enhanced data collection, analysis and reporting. The Branch Chiefs via the AHFSS IT Governance Committee participate in the decision-making process and provide direction for all AHFSS Information Management Technology needs.

How will the Stakeholders participate in the project?

All AHFSS Programs have endorsed and approved this project via the AHFSS IT Governance Committee and agreed to provide subject matter experts to assist during the different phases. The AHFSS IT Governance Committee will continue to be engaged throughout all aspects of the project during the review and approval process.

Select + to add additional Stakeholders

1.5 Business Program

Org. Name	**Name**
Animal Health and Food Safety Services	Annette Jones (Director) and Dave Preciado (Special Assistant)

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?

This proposal is for an AHFSS Division-wide project that will modernize information management for all AHFSS Division business programs. This proposed project will require programs to review and document their business processes and evaluate them to determine their efficiency and reengineer and standarize as needed. The development of common business processes, organizational data governance and standards, standardization for the collection of information, and the use of common analytical and reporting tools will enhance management and effectiveness of the Division as a whole as well as individual programs.

How will the business program participate in the project?

AHFSS Division leadership will coordinate with project management to ensure Programs clearly identify their business needs, resources are available and assigned to support the project, and that business processes are standardized and integrated across the Division.

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

Stage 1 Business Analysis

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?	12/7/2018
Strategic Business Goal	Alignment
1. Promote and Protect **1.E) Provide a comprehensive prevention, response and surveillance system of adverse events that protects the agricultural, natural, and water conveyance resources.**	Development of a comprehensive information system for animal health and food safety programs to be used for the management of animal health and food safety incidents. This project will provide reliable and consistent demographic and geographic information needed to quickly respond to animal disease and food safety incidents and outbreaks.
Strategic Business Goal	Alignment
2. Maximize Resources **2.A) Strengthen effectiveness of CDFA's information systems' capabilities and databases.**	Modernize the AHFSS enterprise-wide information management system and the creation of data governance and standards for the system will significantly improve the capabilities of the system and the effectiveness, and usefulness of information retrieved from the system for the business programs.
Strategic Business Goal	Alignment
2. Maximize Resources **2.B) Expand and incorporate tools and approaches which improve the efficacy and/or efficiency of programs.**	The standardization of business processes, data collected, and reported will significantly improve the overall efficiency of AHFSS programs. The efficacy for common business activities such as licensing, inspections, investigations, and enforcement, will be enhanced by implementation of online tools for license application, reporting, and case management.
Strategic Business Goal	Alignment
2. Maximize Resources **2.C) Leverage process improvement learnings across the Department.**	The development of common, standardized, and integrated business processes across programs will enhance management for all AHFSS programs.
Strategic Business Goal	Alignment
4. Customer Service **4.A) Identify and resolve overlapping inefficiencies in regulatory oversight by CDFA and other state agencies.**	The development of an integrated data repository for all AHFSS programs, where data can be shared across multiple programs, will significantly reduce overlapping inefficiencies between business programs and enhance regulatory oversight.
Select + to add additional Business Goals and Alignment	

Executive Summary of the Business Problem or Opportunity

The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) Animal and Health and Food Safety Services (AHFSS) Division is the lead state organization for protecting consumers, livestock, and California's economy from catastrophic animal diseases and other health or agricultural related issues. As such, AHFSS is responsible for declaring an Agricultural Emergency, establishing Quarantine Zones, and recalling contaminated dairy and egg products. These quarantines and recalls rely heavily on accurate demographic and geographic information for farms, processing and retail facilities. In

addition to responding to emergencies, AHFSS focuses on preventative programs that optimize the use of limited resources through the use of risk-based inspections that uses real-time data. Therefore, the collection and management of reliable data becomes essential in the prevention and response efforts.

Food safety and animal disease incidents and outbreaks continue to threaten California consumers and the States' animal agriculture and infrastructure. Recent examples include disease outbreaks of avian vND in May 2018, which remains in effect as of January 2019; Swine Seneca Virus in 2017-18, which remains in effect as of January 2019; Low Pathogenicity Avian Influenza in 2018; High Pathogenicity Avian Influenza in 2014-15; Bovine Tuberculosis in 2013-14; food safety incidents such as Salmonella in unpasteurized cheese in 2015 and early 2016. The ET system, used by approximately two hundred AHFSS personnel, is used to collect, manage, and report all program activities and serves as the primary source of demographic and geographic information used to respond to emergency animal disease outbreaks and food safety incidents.

Significant issues affect the ET system in use today. These include operational constraints that directly affect information quality causing duplicate and/or incomplete data in the system. There are also functional limitations such as the inability for staff to adequately schedule activities, to include inspections, product and animal sampling. There are integration limitations between systems, such as integrating external data from the California Animal Health and Food Safety (CAHFS) Laboratory, which provides laboratory results for samples collected. ET also lacks business integration such as between licensing, inspection and enforcement functions, which does not provide staff the ability to efficiently manage non-compliance cases. The replacement of ET is essential to address mission critical gaps in information management for AHFSS programs and to establish a system that can effectively provide time sensitive reliable data and reports for daily workload and emergency response. The following identifies ET operational and functional issues that require expeditious resolution:

Fixing Defects and Making Minor Enhancement is Slow and Error-prone

The existing ET system consists of a total of 28 applications, including web-modules and mobile applications, that utilizes a common underlying database. The current ET system uses a variety of software, five different programming languages and numerous versions of the programming languages. The assortment of software languages makes daily maintenance and operations (M&O) by CDFA OITS a challenge, and maintaining a team of properly trained OITS personnel for the diverse software is problematic. As an example, some of the production mobile device applications are no longer compatible with current development tools, making debugging of the code impossible. Similarly, some of the older web modules were developed using versions of old web development software frameworks, while newer applications use current versions. This limits AHFSS ability to quickly have changes made and implemented to respond to routine and emergency animal disease and food safety issues.

Inconsistent and Unreliable Information

The 2018 animal disease emergency response (avian vND) highlighted the significance of accurate innacurate information to effectively respond. Early in the outbreak, personnel spent the first two weeks validating and cleaning information for over 3,000 ET records for poultry farms in Southern California. Quick actions are essential for emergency disease response and inaccurate ET data resulted in the inability to promptly start disease surveillance testing and perform farm assessments to mitigate disease introduction and spread.

Although the effects of this delay has yet to be evaluated, a 2011 study conducted by University of California Davis researchers on another highly contagious animal disease, Foot and Mouth Disease Virus (FMD), determined that effective early detection will avoid dramatic losses to both livestock and the economy. The study concluded that "the median economic impact of an FMD outbreak in California was estimated to result in national agriculture welfare losses of $2.3 to $69.0 billion as detection delay increased from 7 to 22 days, respectively". The study also determined that the economic impact of a 1-day delay in diagnosis and notification in California was $8.1 million, with economic impacts of $60.7 million and $197.1 million for 2 or 3-day delays.

Common Data Business Rules and Ability to Share Data Amongst Programs is Inadequate
Although some business rules were implemented in ET to share demographic and geographic information among programs, there are no underlying business rules to ensure data is consistent across multiple programs. This means that changes in shared information must be enforced by policy rather than by the system. ET has approximately 200 AHFSS statewide users and unfortunately not all personnel keep abreast of policy memorandums. This has resulted in changes to core program information that can have an immediate adverse impact during animal disease and food safety emergency responses and daily routine work, which includes, but is not limited to, the inspection of high risk facilities, annual license renewals, and/or administrative or criminal investigations. As previously mentioned, there are over 3,000 duplicate premises in ET and approximately 40,000 of the 47,000 farm premises and operations that were imported into ET remain in a pending status until validation takes place. A new data storage solution must have business rules and security built-in to mitigate the risk of duplicate premises and inadvertent changes to core data that crosses multiple programs.

Data Exchange between Stakeholders and Mobile Device Data Capture are Inadequate
ET has a limited ability to accept electronically submitted information from mobile devices, which is mission critical for the AHFSS workforce where two-thirds of the workforce are assigned to the field and would work more efficiently if they were provided with real time connectivity to the local field office and Sacramento AHFSS Headquarters. Currently, AHFSS programs have implemented the limited use of mobile devices to collect data for some activities such as shell egg facility inspections, dairy products sampling, and cattle inspections. However, integration of data between systems has been challenging, costing hundreds of extra hours in programming time and needing to hire outside consultants to trouble-shoot applications. Additionally, some mobile applications security protocols do not meet current State security standards.

The proposed solution needs to provide an architectural framework that utilizes common standards for both data exchange and for mobile devices and their communications. This will provide AHFSS' the ability to quickly, efficiently, and securely create data exchange solutions with various business partners and to standardize communications between mobile devices, field offices, and AHFSS Headquarters.

Compliance-Enforcement and Case Management Features are Limited
The CDT ET Data report found that eighty-five (85) percent of the tables within ET do not have referential integrity defined or enforced at the database level, record relationships may or may not be defined at the software application level. This assessment of ET means that key program information for an activity such as licensing a dairy product processor may not be linked to a compliance or enforcement action, though all of the information is stored in ET. For example, MDFS environmental scientists collect over 11,000 samples per year at dairy farms and dairy products facilities to test for food safety and quality control standards. The sample and testing information, though stored within ET, may not be linked to a specific farm or to the specific inspection or compliance activity that collected the sample; if it is linked, the relationship was created at the software level and could easily be in error or altered without any impact at the database level. This is a major issue with compliance, case management, and any potential enforcement action that may result as data correctness and integrity could easily be called into question; ET does not currently have any data auditing or change logs to trace when, who, and what data may have changed.

The current ET system does not provide the capabilities or functions of a traditional case management system; an individual ET module is more a collection of independent activities where data is collected and stored for the specific activity but no workflow between activities is provided. Also, the lack of access to current and historical information for cases, both within a program and across programs, limits the ability of investigators to track a case from an inspection to an investigation, assess non-compliant activities that may have occurred in another program that may provide pertinent background information. The proposed solution needs to provide a case management solution that ensures individual business sub-processes are completed and integrated with other sub-processes and provides an overall

process workflow. Further, within the case management functionality, access to related historical and current data must be available to all programs within AHFSS.

Management Reporting and Trend Analysis Abilities are Weak

ET is a Web-based system developed over 10 years ago and its design limits development of trend analysis reports and summary reporting across activities. Currently, most of the reporting is restricted to simple query lists associated with only one business-set of information. The AUS program recently attempted to use ET's demographic data to conduct legislatively mandated surveys. The lack of integration severely impacted the ability of the program to leverage existing demographic information resulting in the need to combine ET data with data from other sources, and hire a temporary employee to address the thousands of data errors. During a food safety or animal disease emergency, this type of delay will compromise an effective response, potentially costing millions of dollars and have serious negative impacts on human health.

Program managers are not able to use ET effectively to manage operations by gaining insight into the trends and take effective strategies to increase operational efficiencies and check for anomalies. What's lacking includes accurate reports for internal and external stakeholders that provide the ability to forecast resource needs, direct inspection and compliance activities utilizing cost effective lean risk-based analysis, and examine trends and patterns to prevent animal disease introduction and mitigate food safety incidents.

Online Services to the Public are Inadequate

The current system does not allow the public to manage application and renewal of licenses- permits-certificates. These processes require manual data entry once an application is received. Automating these processes will decrease licensing processing time, increase accuracy and be more convenient to applicants. Additionally, ET lacks a Web-based portal to allow producers on-line, real-time access to inspection results. Currently, producers are faxed, emailed, or receive manually generated hard copies of reports, which can be a slow, time-consuming, resource intensive process. ET also does not have the ability to process fees paid for licenses or fines by credit card.

Business Problem or Opportunity and Objectives Table	
Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
1	As the business needs change, such as through legislation, AHFSS needs to make minor modifications to the ET system to implement the required changes; due to the age and design of the system, making these changes is slow and often has side-effects to other ET applications, resulting in failures to other areas of the ET system.
Objective ID	1.1
Objective	Provide for the ability to make minor changes to business steps/workflow, such as the changing of fees, to be done timely and without changing the software code, e.g., changes made through configuration tables.
Metric	Time to make minor changes, such as changing fee amounts.
Baseline	4-6 weeks
Target	1-day
Measurement Method	Measured time to make the change.
Objective ID	1.2
Objective	Provide the ability to make changes to one business area/application without causing side-effects to other business areas.
Metric	Number of defects identified that are not directly related to the desired changes that were implemented.
Baseline	~10 defects are currently identified that are unintended side-effects of modifying the software to implement a minor change.

Target	Zero (0) defects due to side-effects.
Measurement Method	Count of number of defects that are not related to the change made.
Objective ID	1.3
Objective	Standardize on a limited set of programming langauges, where necessary, to enhance the ability to find, retain, and train staff to maintain the ET system applications.
Metric	Number of unique programming languages and versions.
Baseline	Five (5) different programming languages are currently in use and up to six (6) different version are being used, e.g., Microsoft .NET Framework from version 2.3 to current.
Target	Three (3) different with each localized to specific components/layers of the architecture that only utilizes one common framework for each.
Measurement Method	Count of programming languages and framworks used.
Problem ID	Problems/opportunities
2	The ET system currently provides incomplete, inconsistent, and generally unreliable information, which is a problem for normal day-to-day single business operations and a critical issue when responding to statewide emergencies where information is gathered across multiple business operations.
Objective ID	2.1
Objective	Ensure the information/data entered into the ET system is complete and consistent by implementing and enforcing business rules when any information is captured.
Metric	Number on data elements stored in the system that do not adhere to defined business rules.
Baseline	>10,000 data elements do not adhere to required business rules
Target	Zero (0) data elements stored in the system do not adhere to required business rules.
Measurement Method	Data quality assessment of the data stored within the system.
Objective ID	2.2
Objective	Ensure that information collected and reported across business operations is consistent and reliable.
Metric	Number of unique business rules for individual business operations and the specific unique data elements collected.
Baseline	Zero (0) business rules have been intentionally standardized and each business program has unique/separate definitions for their information/data elements.
Target	All (100%) of common business rules are identified and implemented and the definitions of the information/data collected and documented is defined in a standardized AHFSS data dictionary.
Measurement Method	Analysis of business rules and review of the data dictionary to ensure all data elements are documented and standardized.
Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
3	While much of the information stored within ET is program/business specific, some of the information is common and shared across all AHFSS programs; however, this data has become inconsistent due to individual programs not interpeting the implied meaning of the common/shared information consistently.
Objective ID	3.1
Objective	Place tighter controls on changes to all information and data within the ET system through the establishment of a data governance process that approves all changes to the systems' data.
Metric	Number of information/data changes to ET approved by a data governance committee.

Baseline	Zero (0), not data dovernance process exists
Target	All changes to the systems information/data are controlled and approved by a data governance committee
Measurement Method	Analysis and traceability of changes to the information/data to data governance approved changes.
Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
4	The current ET system has numerous interfaces to share information/data with various contracted entities, stakeholders, and mobile devices used in the field; these interfaces are limited, each unique, and difficult to maintain.
Objective ID	4.1
Objective	Provide a standardized set of interfaces implemented through a common interface subsystem, where information can be transmitted to eternal entities, and the interface could be quickly tailored to individual stakeholder needs.
Metric	Number of unique interface subsystems.
Baseline	~12 unique interface subsystems exist, each implementing a completely unique interface, even to common components, such as mobile devices.
Target	One (1) interface subsystem implementing a standardize set of two (2) interfaces to communicate with mobile devices and external stakeholders.
Measurement Method	Count of interface subsystems and unique interface protocols.
Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
5	Because of the design of the existing ET system, compliance enforcement can be challenged due to the lack of the systems ability to enforce relationships between different information components/records, and the lack of a case management function to track a case from initiation through completion.
Objective ID	5.1
Objective	Ensure all information is tightly related and all changes to the information traceable to who made the change, when the change was made, and what was the change.
Metric	Enforced relationships between information components and traceability of changes to the information.
Baseline	<~10 information components have enforced relationships and there is no auditing capability when information is changed.
Target	All (100%) of the information components will have relationships established and auditing will be implemented.
Measurement Method	Review of the data model and through testing of the audit features.
Objective ID	5.2
Objective	Provide the business with the capability to track a case from initiation through completion that allows the review of related current and historical data from all programs within AHFSS.
Metric	Number of case management steps that can the traced and the amount of related current and historical information that can be reviewed at each step.
Baseline	Zero (0), the existing ET system has no case management functionality.
Target	All (100%) case management steps can be traced and related current and historial data can be viewed.
Measurement Method	Execution of all case management steps during testing to verify they are all implemented.

Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
6	Since most of the AHFSS staff operate away from the Sacramento headquarters, the manager needs to have management reporting and trend analysis capabilities to manage staff workload, direct the work efforts to higher-risk areas, and initiate actions when activities start trending in a negative direction
Objective ID	6.1
Objective	Provide management with management reporting capabilities to review staff workload, performance, and activities.
Metric	Management knowledge of staff workload, performance, and activities.
Baseline	ET does not provide reliable information on staff workload, performance, or activities.
Target	Managers can review the workload, performance, and activities of individual staff and teams of staff/an office.
Measurement Method	Testing of the solution.
Objective ID	6.2
Objective	Provide management with the ability to perform trend analysis on activities and active results to identify high-risk areas where actions, such as increased inspections, could be performed to lower risks.
Metric	Number of trend analysis reports availible.
Baseline	ET does not provide trend analysis reporting, this is done outside of ET.
Target	Each manager within their respective business area and across business areas can perform trend analysis.
Measurement Method	Testing of the solution.
Problem ID	Problems/Opportunities
7	The existing ET system provides no services to the public, it's an internal system; applicants and customers interact with AHFSS through paper submissions of via email.
Objective ID	7.1
Objective	Allow applicants to submit applications and payment through an online service
Metric	Number of applications submitted online.
Baseline	None.
Target	50% in first year, 75% in second year.
Measurement Method	Number of online application submissions.
Objective ID	7.2
Objective	Allow customers to review their data, inspection results, actions underway, etc. online
Metric	Number of customers reviewing their information through an online portal.
Baseline	None, ET does not have this capability.
Target	50% in first year, 75% in second year.
Measurement Method	Number of customers accessing their online records.
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:	1.3		
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			
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 ○ Yes ◉ No ○ 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 ○ Yes ◉ No ○ 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 ◉ Yes ○ No ○ 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 ◉ Yes ○ No ○ 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 ◉ Yes ○ No ○ 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.		Significant issues identified with the existing data	

1.8 Criticality Assessment

Business Criticality

Legislative Mandates:	N/A ☒	
Bill Number(s)/Code(s):		
Language that includes system relevant requirements:		
Business Complexity Score	1.4	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?	7/1/2021
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:

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.

AHFSS staff are located throughout the state and are the primary users of the system. They perform inspections, compliance checks, investigations, etc. and the information is entered into the current Emerging Threats system using mobile devices and Web applications. Licensing and certification processes are managed in Sacramento Headquarters via web applications. These processes are not expected to change. However, the process governing what "field users" are required to do, how they perform their work, what data they collect, and how it is reported are Program staff located at the AHFSS Division headquarters in Sacramento CA; which will significantly reduce the complexity in defining and eventually developing an Emerging Threats 2 solution.

City	State	Number of Locations	Approximate Number of Staff
Statewide and Other States	Various		~200

Select + to add Locations

1.9 Funding

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
3. Has the funding source(s) been identified for this proposal?	○ Yes ◉ No ○ Clear

FUNDING SOURCE		FUND AVAILABILITY DATE
General Fund	☐	Date Picker
Special Fund	☐	Date Picker
Federal Fund	☐	Date Picker
Reimbursement	☐	Date Picker
Bond Fund	☐	Date Picker
Other Fund	☐	Date Picker
If "Other Fund" is checked, specify the funding:		

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? 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? 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? 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? 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. 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? 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 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)? 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	1/10/2019	
Form Received Date	1/10/2019	
Form Accepted Date	1/10/2019	
Form Status	Completed	
Form Status Date	3/20/2019	
Form Disposition	Approved	If "Other," specify:
Form Disposition Date	3/20/2019	