Gate 2 Alternatives Analysis Evaluation Scorecard (Part A)

SIMM 19B.4 (New 07/2015)

Department of Technology Project Number: 0000-000

Submittal Completeness	
☐ 2.1 General Information	☐ 2.8 Dependencies
☐ 2.2 Preliminary Submittal Information	☐ 2.9 Market Research
☐ 2.3 Preliminary Assessment	☐ 2.10 Alternative Solutions
☐ 2.4 Submittal Information	☐ 2.11 Recommended Solution
☐ 2.5 Baseline Processes and Systems	☐ 2.12 Staffing Plan
☐ 2.6 Mid-Level Solution Requirements	☐ 2.13 Data Conversion/Migration
☐ 2.7 Assumptions and Constraints	☐ 2.14 Financial Analysis Worksheets

ITPOD Instructions: The statements below will help to ensure that all information is provided and complete. Any information that results in a deficiency will need to be corrected by the submitting Agency/state entity.

2.3 Preliminary Assessment	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The Stage 2 Preliminary Assessment was completed.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. The Business Complexity Assessment was completed and has been verified.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

2.4 Submittal Information	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. Contact information and submission type is identified.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. Condition(s) from Stage 1 Business Analysis (S1BA) are adequately addressed with an appropriate response and clearly define an action status.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. The project adheres to formal quality management guidelines.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. The Project Approval Lifecycle Executive Transmittal was signed off by the authorized staff.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

2.5 Baseline Processes and Systems	Meets Requirements	Deficiency	Comments
1. As provided in Section 2.5.1, the scope has not changed from Stage 1.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. The current processes and supporting systems are described in Section 2.5.1. This should include a description of each component identified in Section 2.5.3 Current Architecture Information.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. The Business Process Workflow diagram(s) accurately illustrate all existing business processes related to the proposal (Section 2.5.2).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. All business processes associated with the system have been listed in Section 2.5.3 Current Architecture Information.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. All system components associated with the existing architecture have been provided (e.g., applications, COTS, MOTS, runtime environment, system interfaces, network) (Section 2.5.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. The internal and external systems which interact with the current system interfaces have been identified and described (Section 2.5.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
7. The development platform that the system was built on, architecture of the system, and the location of the data center(s) where the current system is housed has been provided (Section 2.5.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. The security information for the current baseline process systems are identified (i.e., who has access, type of information, protective measures, data owner, and data custodian) (Section 2.5.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
9. The architecture diagram clearly illustrates current business processes, supporting systems, and identifies user groups and their interaction with processes/systems (Section 2.5.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
10. The current architecture diagram indicates the user groups and their interaction with business processes and systems (Section 2.5.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

11. A logical depiction of the data entities, relationships and attributes of the system(s)/application(s) have been created (Section 2.5.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
12. The security categorization impact table has been provided and is complete (Section 2.5.5).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
13. Section 2.5.5 Security Categorization Impact Table Summary is complete and accurately reflects the Agency/state entity's information assets provided.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.6 Mid-Level Solution Requirements	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The Mid-level Solution functional requirements provide applicable details for each objective identified in the S1BA.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. ***(For Use Case Requirements only)*** Use cases are attached and clearly illustrate the functional requirement detail. ☐ Not Applicable	☐	☐	
3. ***(For Mid-Level Solution Requirements only)*** The completed requirements template is attached and clearly illustrates the functional, non-functional, project/transition requirement detail, including specific criteria, priority, and stakeholder benefactors. ☐ Not Applicable	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. The mid-level solution requirements provide sufficient detail how the system should function (e.g., capacity, speed, security, response time, etc.).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. The project/transition requirements from current state to future state are described in a clear, descriptive manner.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. The mid-level solution requirements align with the guidance provided in the instructions located in CA-PMM (e.g., contains a requirements traceability matrix).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

7. The mid-level solution requirements address business, technical, data migration, security, implementation, maintenance and operations, and applicable laws, rules, and legislative requirements.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. The mid-level solution requirements validate the scope, complexity, and cost of the solution as stated in the FAWs (Section 2.14) and High Level Proposed Project Schedule (Section 2.11.6).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.7 Assumptions and Constraints	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The assumptions and constraints and other associated impacts are reasonable, realistic, and supported by quantifiable information.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.8 Dependencies	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The dependencies (i.e., other business functions) are reasonable and clearly describe the elements reliant on something else occurring before the function, service, interface, task, or action can begin or continue.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.9 Market Research	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The proposal indicates the methodologies used to conduct the market research (MR), how the results were analyzed, who conducted the analysis (e.g., technical staff, key stakeholders, business sponsors, etc.), time spent, date started and completed, and if the results align with the proposal's business, technical and functional objectives, including cost estimates.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. The MR conducted aligns with the guidance provided in the State Contracting Manual Volume 3, Chapter 13 for a project of this complexity and scope.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. The MR results provide an analysis which evaluates and identifies alignment with the recommended solution.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

4. If the MR identified and reviewed the approach/methodology used for past similar procurement projects, the Agency/state entity explained if the proposal's approach differs and, if so, why.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.10 Alternative Solutions	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The proposal has at least two alternative solutions listed in addition to the recommended alternative. If only one recommended solution is provided, there is a detailed narrative that justifies why no other possible alternative exists or was considered.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. The technology alternatives considered align with the market research results from Section 2.9.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. Each alternative includes a detailed description, approach, benefits analysis, assumptions/constraints, and implementation approach consistent with the scalability instructions.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. The description identifies how the alternative(s) will solve the business problem or opportunity and meet the proposal objectives (Section 2.10.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. Each alternative is reasonable in its ability to solve the business problem or opportunity and meets the proposal objectives (Section 2.10.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. Each alternative provides proposed business process(es) and technology information solution.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
7. The benefits and disadvantages of each alternative as stated align with the Agency/state entity program (Section 2.10.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. A valid reason is given for each alternative that has been rejected (Sections 2.10.4 and 2.10.5).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
9. The costs associated with each alternative have been analyzed and are consistent for each alternative. (Sections 2.10.4 and 2.14).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

10. The financial benefit aligns with the Section 2.14 FAWs and has been divided into two categories – one-time cost (i.e., software, equipment and services); and continuing cost (i.e., maintenance and operations) (Section 2.10.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
11. The recommended approach/solution demonstrates the feasibility of the recommended alternative (Section 2.10.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
12. The benefits justify the cost or best value, and can be observed, measured, and achieved (Section 2.10.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
13. The proposal provides sufficient detail on specific ways to measure and observe the proposal's benefits (Section 2.10.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
14. The recommended solution complies with the State Enterprise Architecture Framework (http://www.cio.ca.gov/ea/docs/California-Enterprise-Architecture-CEAF2-Framework-V2.pdf) (Section 2.10.7).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.11 Recommended Solution	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. There is sufficient detail on how the recommended solution meets the identified requirements and objectives (Section 2.11.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. The business advantages over the other alternatives are described (Section 2.11.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. The disadvantages are described, along with an explanation of why the disadvantages do not eliminate the recommended solution (Section 2.11.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. There is sufficient detail on the availability of resources (e.g., Agency/state entity staff, contracts, software, funding) and a description of the alignment with Agency/state entity and state strategies for business and IT (Section 2.11.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

5. The proposal's alignment with Agency/state entity and state strategies for business and IT is provided (Section 2.11.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. The proposal has a Technical/Initial CA-PMM Complexity Assessment provided for the recommended alternative. Based on your assessment, using CA-PMM Complexity Assessment tool, the results agree (Section 2.11.2).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
7. The planned procurement and staffing strategy is complete and adequately addresses project staffing for the remaining project approval lifecycle activities through the project implementation (Section 2.11.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. The quantity and type of activities identified in the Section 2.11.3 Procurement and Staffing Strategy aligns with the size and scope of the recommended solution.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
9. The Procurement and Staffing Strategy activities align with the costs identified in the Financial Analysis Worksheets (Sections 2.11.3 and 2.14).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
10. This proposal describes how the recommended solution moves the Agency/state entity closer to its target enterprise architecture (Section 2.11.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
11. Information technology (IT) capabilities are identified that may be necessary to meet the business objectives (Section 2.11.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
12. The proposal has project phases planned/identified with details including major tasks and milestones, duration of critical tasks, and the expected deliverable at the end of phase (Section 2.11.5).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
13. The project schedule is complete, feasible, and plans for all stages of the project before and after approval (Section 2.11.6).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
14. A detailed work plan/schedule has been created using industry accepted methodology (e.g., CA-PMM) and experience from projects of similar size and scope (Sections 2.11.5 and 2.11.6).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

15. The project proposal has a proposed start and end date, including identification of high level activities/tasks/milestones with start/end dates (Section 2.11.6).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
16. Clearly measureable and achievable milestones with firm dates have been created (Section 2.11.6).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
17. There is a total proposed project cost and average proposed operations cost listed that coincides with the Financial Analysis Worksheets Summary tab (Sections 2.11.7 and 2.14).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
18. The technology has been implemented in government, as supported by Section 2.9 Market Research.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.12 Staffing Plan	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. Senior management are fully committed as provided by the resources assigned to the proposed project (Section 2.12.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. The administrative staff resources narrative describes the experience, capability, and capacity of the resources, i.e., contract, procurement, budgeting, and project support services, etc. (Section 2.12.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. The business program resources narrative describes the capacity and capability of the resources needed to support this proposal and maintain ongoing program business operations (Section 2.12.2).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. The IT resources narrative describes the capacity and capability of the resources needed to support the proposal and maintain existing responsibilities (Section 2.12.3).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. The testing program and resources narrative describes the capacity, capability, and availability of resources dedicated to support all stages of testing (Section 2.12.4).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. If applicable, the proposal describes data conversion/migration activities (Section 2.12.5).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

7. The proposal describes the training and organization change management in detail, addressing business disruption and the customer impact anticipated as a result of project implementation. The training methodologies and processes are described to ensure the Agency/state entity will be ready for the change (Section 2.12.6).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. The narrative describes the capacity, skills, and knowledge of the resources needed to perform the work required in Stage 3 (CA-PMM and Section 2.12.7).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
9. The Project Management Risk Score was submitted and has been verified (Section 2.12.8.1).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
10. Is each project management plan or project artifact identified (i.e., Yes, No, Not Applicable)? (Section 2.12.8.2	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
11. If any project management plans or project artifacts are identified as "Not Applicable," was a clear, concise description provided as to why it is not needed? (Section 2.12.8.2) ☐ Not Applicable	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
12. The organization charts are attached and depict project reporting relationships for all parties involved in the proposed project (Section 2.12.9).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.13 Data Conversion/Migration	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The status of all the data conversion/migration activities have been identified.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. If any data conversion/migration activities are identified as "Not Applicable," was a clear, concise description provided as to why it is not needed?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. If any data conversion/migration activities are identified as "Not Started" or "In Progress," was a clear, concise description provided for their completion?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

4. The data conversion/migration activities identified as "Completed" are attached (if applicable).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2.14 Financial Analysis Worksheets	**Meets Requirements**	**Deficiency**	**Comments**
1. The FAWs are attached and address the cost and resource assumptions the Agency/state entity made during the Project Approval Lifecycle. The proposed project costs and financial benefits of the current method of operation and the proposed alternative are included.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. As identified in Section 2.5.1, the current processes and supporting systems costs (both information technology and program) are documented in the FAWs.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. The funding sources are listed, by fiscal year, for all proposed project costs.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. The amounts are indicated for each funding source.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. The total cost (positions and dollars) that it currently takes to run the impacted business operations have been provided.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. The existing system or method of operation was used as a baseline to measure the fiscal impact of the alternatives.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
7. An initial basis of estimate has been prepared for each alternative under consideration.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. The system economic benefits have been assessed (cost reductions, avoided future costs or increased revenue).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
9. There are intangible benefits for each alternative (e.g., improves information, allow for better decisions; provides more accurate information; results in greater reliability; provides faster response to questions from clients).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

10. The selected alternative indicates a monetary return on investment, and clearly indicates the payback period.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
11. The proposed project's funding sources have been clearly identified.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
12. The cost estimates contain all the resources required for successful completion of the project. This would include any interfaces with external systems and projects.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
13. The proposed project staffing numbers and classifications meet the needs of the project to completion have been sufficiently identified.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
14. New and redirected positions associated with this proposed project/investment have been appropriately classified.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
15. Key acquisition-related items (e.g., costs for hardware, software, and service acquisitions) have been provided.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
16. The IT security cost for the proposed project/investment has been integrated into the overall cost (including any re-accreditation, system security plan, risk assessment, privacy impact assessment, configuration/patch management, security control testing and evaluation, and contingency planning/testing).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
17. User training and cut-over costs have been included.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
18. Shut-down and transition costs have been included.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
19. The project cost estimate as detailed in the FAWs appears to be accurate and reflect the selected alternative.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

20. A funding stream for maintenance and operations has been identified. If identified, the budget is sufficient for steady state operation of the business solution.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
21. Funds specified for each fiscal year are adequate and reasonable to maintain the proposed project's implementation schedule.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

Critical Partner Evaluation

IT Project Oversight Division	Yes	No	Comments
1. Does the information provided in Stage 2 Alternatives Analysis (S2AA) align with the information approved during the S1BA?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. Are there any anticipated potential workforce disruptions, Labor Relations or Employee Relations issues associated with the project?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. Does the proposal provide an opportunity to leverage other existing initiatives or services in the state?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. If a budget augmentation needed has the Stage 2 submission met the deadline for review associated with a Budget Change Proposal (BCP)?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. Will staff numbers be reduced as a result of implementing the new system?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. Will multiple business organizations, units, departments or stakeholders be affected by the new system? (Refer to FAWs).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
7. Will implementing the recommended solution require a fundamental change to the way the Agency/state entity conducts its business?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

Enterprise Architecture	Yes	No	Comments
1. Does the Recommended Solution describe the future state architecture in support of the state's "architect – invest – implement" sequence of activities in order to make sure that investment decisions are based on architectural solutions that result in the achievement of strategic and/or tactical outcomes by employing technology and other resources in an effective manner? Describe how well the future state architecture aligns with State Enterprise Architecture principles, target architecture vision, applicable reference architectures and their implementation patterns.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. Are there any reference architectures, reusable assets, shared business services existing statewide or other standards and guidance that can be potentially leveraged that have not been included in the Alternative Solutions or the Recommended Solution?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
California Information Security Office	**Yes**	**No**	**Comments**
1. Does the proposal improve information security, business continuity, or technology recovery?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. Does the proposal meet or exceed the privacy or confidentiality laws or regulations which will require a Privacy Impact Assessment?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. Are there information security and/or privacy program requirements (SAM Sections 5100 and 5300) that have not been addressed or require significant program remediation?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. The information security and/or privacy considerations have been described, such as confidentiality, integrity, or availability.	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

Office of Technology Services, OTech	Yes	No	Comments
1. Has the project engaged OTech during the development of Stage 2 for information and/or consultation?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. Is there an opportunity to use data center services (i.e., hosting, IaaS, SaaS, subscription services) for the recommended solution?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. Is there an opportunity to use Geospatial Information Systems (GIS) and/or the State of California's GIS infrastructure and services?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. Is cloud a consideration for use with the recommended solution?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
Statewide Technology Procurement Division	**Yes**	**No**	**Comments**
1. Has the Assumptions and Constraints Section been reviewed for any concerns, such as hard deadlines, contract provisions?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
2. Has the Section 2.8 Dependencies been reviewed for any concerns?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
3. Are the mid-level solution requirements contained in Section 2.6 ready to mature into an RFP? Consider if they are organized and have been vetted through a group with the requisite skill and capacity (e.g., IT and Business areas).	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
4. Did the Agency/state entity complete a formalized Request for Information?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
5. Did the Agency/state entity develop core criteria or use the mid-level solution requirements to evaluate feedback?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
6. Did Section 2.9 Market Research (MR) contain both large and small business responses?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
7. Did the MR contain similar projects from other Federal/governmental entities?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
8. Does the planned procurement staffing resources look adequate and sufficient, especially if a Request For Offer is used for activities?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.

9. Do procurement related activities look complete and practical?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
10. Do the resources identified possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities to address the IT procurement activity needs?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
11. Does the planned proposal project schedule dates meet the level of information needed to provide realistic dates?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
12. Do the Financial Analysis Worksheets provide STPD/DGS costs? If so, are the costs feasible?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
13. Does the complexity level match the procurement level of complexity?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
14. Are there any outstanding approval conditions placed on this gate that concern procurement activities?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
15. Was the Market Research Section reviewed for discrepancies or inefficiencies?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
16. Was the Procurement Chief Officer or authorized procurement official involved in the development?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
17. Was the appropriate procurement authority signed off on the executive route slip for S2AA submission?	☐	☐	Click here to enter text.
ITPOD Oversight Manager:	**Email:**		**Phone:**
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.		XXX-XXX-XXXX

Gate 2 Alternatives Analysis Evaluation Scorecard (Part B)

(New 07/2015)

Gate 2 Exit Criteria

Critical Partner Review	Reviewer	Date	Comments
Enterprise Architecture review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.
IT Project Oversight Division review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.

California Information Security Office review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.
Office of Technology Services, OTech review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.
Statewide Technology Procurement Division review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.
California Project Management Office review completed (as a service provider)	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.
Department of Finance review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.
Office of GIS review completed	Click here to enter text.	Date picker	Click here to enter text.

Collaborative Review				
Collaborative Review completed	☐ Not Applicable (Anticipated Non-Reportable)	☐ Yes	Date picker	Click here to enter text.

Risk	**Agency/State Entity Risk Strategy**	**Agency/State Entity Risk Strategy Response**
Select or type…	Choose an item.	Click here to enter text.
Select or type…	Choose an item.	Click here to enter text.

California Department of Technology Decision	☐Approved ☐Not Approved	☐Approved with Conditions ☐Withdrawn

Condition(s):

Condi-tion #	Condition Category	Condition Sub-category	Condition
Condi-tion #	Select or type…	Choose an item.	Click here to enter text.

Rationale for Decision:

Click here to enter text.

ITPOD Oversight Manager:	Email:	Phone:
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	XXX-XXX-XXXX