Project Investment Justification

DCSS ATLAS Replacement

DE20023

Department of Economic Security

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

PIJ ID: DE20023
PIJ Name: DCSS ATLAS Replacement
Account: Department of Economic Security
Business Unit Requesting: Department of Economic Security (DES) / Division of Child Support Services (DCSS)
Sponsor: Heather Noble
Sponsor Title: Assistant Director/IV-D Director
Sponsor Email: hnoble@azdes.gov
Sponsor Phone: (602) 542-4500

2. MEETING PRE-WORK

2.1 What is the operational issue or business need that the Agency is trying to solve? (i.e....current process is manual, which increases resource time/costs to the State/Agency, and leads to errors…):

Division of Child Support Services (DCSS) operates as a division within the Department of Economic Security (DES) with the mission to "Provide timely child support services that are in the best interest of the child." The Agency is mandated and authorized through Title IV-D of the Social Security Act to provide child support services to children and families. Services include: locating non-custodial parents; establishing legal paternity for children born out-of-wedlock; establishing legal child or medical support orders; enforcing child and medical support orders; and collecting and dispersing child support payments.

The Agency's caseload is comprised of clients who request IV-D child support services and those referred to the Agency because they are receiving other client services. Twenty-one child support offices (excluding Gila county and Navajo Nation) provide IV-D services throughout the state. The Agency currently uses ATLAS for processes such as case management and financial distribution of child support payments. There is also a non-IV-D program, which differs from the IV-D program primarily because it has only minimal enforcement remedies available. Non-IV-D child support cases typically have paternity and child support orders established and do not require enhanced monitoring and collection efforts. The non-IV-D program is administered by the Arizona Superior Court – Clerk of the Court.

The Agency supported a total of 247,993 IV-D children and 227,986 non-IV-D children in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019. The Agency collects approximately $691,050,601 per year in current debt and arrearages for the children of Arizona, including the Navajo Nation and for child support cases in other jurisdictions. ATLAS had an active yearly caseload for the FFY2019 of 325,707. New cases opened in ATLAS for the FFY2019 is 27,754. ATLAS currently holds 1.9 billion active and inactive records.

The Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA-88) was the first major piece of legislation mandating IV-D programs develop and operate a single, statewide computer system. On March 10, 1999, the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) certified the ATLAS system as fully meeting the automation requirements of the Family Support Act of 1988. Since that time, federal legislation, such as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 (PRWORA), mandates additional requirements for states' automated computer systems. All automated systems must meet all federal certification requirements mandated under FSA-88 and PRWORA. The PRWORA requirements mandated that states develop various automated

enhancements and incorporate them into their respective Title-IV-D child support enforcement systems. Phase II and PRWORA development activity for Arizona ensued from 1993 to final certification in 2003. OCSE certified ATLAS as meeting the child support enforcement system requirements on May 3, 2003.

Although ATLAS has both the original federal certification and the subsequent PRWORA requirements certification, there is still a potential for additional efficiencies to business operations. Those potential cost savings include new automation technologies that result in improved customer service, better information management, increased worker efficiency, and decision support capabilities for system users. A modern case management system shall increase child support collections by allowing for enhanced tracking of payment sources, automated data cross-matches with more financial institutions to increase the sources of funds intercepted, and enhanced predictive analytics for targeted case management activities to include enforcement and early intervention.

A new system shall more adeptly handle the complexity of debt calculations, which shall prevent delays in additional child support collections, and improve the ability to promptly issue and track income withholding orders to ensure that wage deductions are received sooner.

Prior to the Feasibility Study, the business case identified the deficiencies of ATLAS in six primary areas as follows:

Technical Platform – The core ATLAS application is mainframe-based and is almost 20 years old. The application runs on an IBM Z-Series Operating System (OS) with NATURAL programming language and Adaptable DAta BAse System (ADABAS) database technologies. Several of the periphery systems also utilize COBOL, Java, MS SQL Server, and DB2. Technical resources needed to support the maintenance and operations of the mainframe system are increasingly difficult to locate, often requiring significant in-house training. Many DCSS developers familiar with NATURAL, ADABAS, and other mainframe languages are reaching retirement age. The unit that currently works with ATLAS is comprised of an aging workforce of eight mainframe programmers. The Portfolio Manager of this business unit reports that all eight could potentially retire soon.

2.2 How will solving this issue or addressing this need benefit the State or the Agency?
The Department anticipates that successful implementation of this project shall provide the following benefits:

Service Enhancement – The modernized/replacement ATLAS system is expected to provide DCSS with new functional capabilities and increased automated processes, offering opportunities for DCSS to enhance child support enforcement services.

Cost Reduction – The current ATLAS system is complex in design and requires highly skilled technical personnel to make changes to business processing rules. DCSS shall request functional capabilities within the system to allow the modification of business rules by DCSS business analysts. In addition, there are current processes that force case managers to manually enter data that is readily available from other systems and organizations. The modernized/replacement ATLAS system is expected to support more efficient methods of obtaining data.

Problem Avoidance – The design of the current ATLAS system makes system access and usage a complex task for the DCSS workforce. The modernized/replacement system is expected to address current system usage problems by providing a "user friendly" worker interface. ATLAS is essentially a data entry system; the current best practices are to move towards a decision support system that provides field personnel with recommendations. The upgraded system is expected to address these issues with real-time data

collection using mobile technology, Interactive Voice Response (IVR) systems, Global Positioning System (GPS), multi-media, biometric scanning, and sensing solutions.

Increased Collections – A modern case management system will increase child support collections by allowing for enhanced tracking of payment sources, automated data cross-matches with more financial institutions to increase the sources of funds intercepted, and enhanced predictive analytics for targeted case management activities to include enforcement and early intervention.

By pursuing the Delaware transfer solution, DCSS expects to obtain the following benefits:

Provide the ability to move to a cloud-based environment and move off the current mainframe environment

Provide a platform based on the most modern technology design principles that facilitate future maintenance and enhancements

Reinforce DES' efforts to improve efficiency and timely delivery of services through automated workflows

Improve performance measures through automated workflows and increased efficiencies of staff

Increase customer service through easily accessed information of case managers

Increase customer service through access to information in a timely manner and through method of their choice

Allow DES to increase the use of predictive analytics through business intelligence queries directly in the system

Allow DES to have confidence in the accuracy of financial calculations

Allow DES to reduce reliance on standalone software outside of the system

Create a more user-friendly environment for DCSS staff to perform tasks in an efficient and timely manner

Reduce time taken to become proficient in the understanding and management of the system

Reduce development and implementation time by transferring a federally certified system

2.3 Describe the proposed solution to this business need.

To achieve the strategic goals of the DCSS program and considering the current status and deficiencies of ATLAS, DES deemed the need for a suitable replacement system alternative. The first step was to conduct a needs assessment to identify the Status Quo processes and challenges, To-Be system requirements, constraints and assumptions, system objectives and business process reengineering opportunities.

The next step was to conduct an Alternatives Analysis to identify and rank the viable alternatives to meet the needs of the To-Be system requirements. The final step was to conduct a detailed Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) for the top two ranked alternatives and identify the alternative with the highest economic return.

Based on the results of an objective evaluation of the various alternatives, DES has decided that the best solution is to transfer the Delaware Child Support System (DECSS). This solution is based on transferring base system functional and technical components from the DECSS and customizing to meet the needs of

DES requirements.

Each vendor proposal has been thoroughly reviewed in various areas of expertise like

Capability

Domain experience

Approach

Technical Architecture

Responsiveness and

Cost

The selected vendor solution provides an advanced and cloud ready ATLAS Replacement System based on Delaware Transfer Solution with various upgrades to UI, Integrations, Batch, Security and Infrastructure that are on par with latest industry trends. And customized to meet 100% of the requirements from ADES/DCSS. Refer to the attachment "ATLAS Replacement – System Requirements"

Out of all the proposals of Delaware Transfer solutions, finalist's solution not only transfers Delaware system it also provides state of the art architecture powered by GovConnect accelerator built on Salesforce with low code to no code solution integrated with Mulesoft ESB enabling efficient internal and external data exchange which in turn enhances usability, maintainability, scalability, and interoperability.

The selected vendor's solution provides responsive web design for all user interfaces enabling the users to be able to access the application on various devices and browsers. In addition, their solution provides an out of the box native mobile app for iOS and Android giving unified mobile experience for the citizens, employers and staff. Optimal mix of SaaS & PaaS based solution reduces ongoing overhead of infrastructure and middleware maintenance.

The selected vendor's proposal provides all of this best of the breed solution for a highly competitive price within an impressive timeline delivering the solution quicker than any other proposals and the original expected duration in the feasibility study.

2.4 Has the existing technology environment, into which the proposed solution will be implemented, been documented?
Yes

2.4a Please describe the existing technology environment into which the proposed solution will be implemented.

2.5 Have the business requirements been gathered, along with any technology requirements that have

been identified?

Yes

2.5a Please explain below why the requirements are not available.

3. PRE-PIJ/ASSESSMENT

3.1 Are you submitting this as a Pre-PIJ in order to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to evaluate options and select a solution that meets the project requirements?

No

3.1a Is the final Statement of Work (SOW) for the RFP available for review?

3.2 Will you be completing an assessment/Pilot/RFP phase, i.e. an evaluation by a vendor, 3rd party or your agency, of the current state, needs, & desired future state, in order to determine the cost, effort, approach and/or feasibility of a project?

No

3.2a Describe the reason for completing the assessment/pilot/RFP and the expected deliverables.

3.2b Provide the estimated cost, if any, to conduct the assessment phase and/or Pilot and/or RFP/solicitation process.

3.2e Based on research to date, provide a high-level cost estimate to implement the final solution.

4. PROJECT

4.1 Does your agency have a formal project methodology in place?

Yes

4.2 Describe the high level makeup and roles/responsibilities of the Agency, Vendor(s) and other third parties (i.e. agency will do...vendor will do...third party will do).

DES will be responsible for managing the project and budget to ensure all project milestones are met by the Contractors. DES will work with the below Contractors to ensure ATLAS Replacement System is built to meet the identified requirements and functioning efficiently.

Project Management Contractor – The Project Management Contractor assists the Program in developing and implementing additional project control plans and structures. This contractor assists in monitoring and updating the project management plan and schedule. This contractor assists the Program in coordinating between entities and keeping them contributing to the project per the agreement in the project charter. This contractor assists the Program in ensuring that other contracted staff stay on schedule or otherwise mitigate project delays. Where state staff do not possess the individual skill sets necessary for supporting the development of the ATLAS Replacement, ...

*** See Paper PIJ for the full response. ***

4.3 Will a PM be assigned to manage the project, regardless of whether internal or vendor provided?
Yes

4.3a If the PM is credentialed, e.g., PMP, CPM, State certification etc., please provide certification information.

4.4 Is the proposed procurement the result of an RFP solicitation process?
Yes

4.5 Is this project referenced in your agency's Strategic IT Plan?
Yes

5. SCHEDULE

5.1 Is a project plan available that reflects the estimated Start Date and End Date of the project, and the supporting Milestones of the project?
Yes

5.2 Provide an estimated start and finish date for implementing the proposed solution.

Est. Implementation Start Date	Est. Implementation End Date
1/4/2021 12:00:00 AM	1/3/2025 12:00:00 AM

5.3 How were the start and end dates determined?
Based on project plan

5.3a List the expected high level project tasks/milestones of the project, e.g., acquire new web server, develop software interfaces, deploy new application, production go live, and estimate start/finish dates for each, if known.

Milestone / Task	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Finish Date
• Initiation & Planning	01/04/21	03/31/21
• Requirements Validation	01/04/21	03/31/21
• Design	04/01/21	06/30/22
• Development	04/01/21	06/30/22
• System Testing	06/30/21	06/30/22
• User Acceptance Testing	07/01/22	09/30/22
• Implementation	10/01/22	01/04/23
• Warranty	01/04/23	01/03/24
• Transition	01/04/23	01/03/25
• Operations & Maintenance	01/04/23	01/03/25
• Closeout	12/01/24	01/03/25

5.4 Have steps needed to roll-out to all impacted parties been incorporated, e.g. communications,

planned outages, deployment plan?

Yes

5.5 Will any physical infrastructure improvements be required prior to the implementation of the proposed solution. e.g., building reconstruction, cabling, etc.?

No

5.5a Does the PIJ include the facilities costs associated with construction?

5.5b Does the project plan reflect the timeline associated with completing the construction?

6. IMPACT

6.1 Are there any known resource availability conflicts that could impact the project?

No

6.1a Have the identified conflicts been taken into account in the project plan?

6.2 Does your schedule have dependencies on any other projects or procurements?

No

6.2a Please identify the projects or procurements.

6.3 Will the implementation involve major end user view or functionality changes?

Yes

6.4 Will the proposed solution result in a change to a public-facing application or system?

Yes

7. BUDGET

7.1 Is a detailed project budget reflecting all of the up-front/startup costs to implement the project available, e.g, hardware, initial software licenses, training, taxes, P&OS, etc.?

Yes

7.2 Have the ongoing support costs for sustaining the proposed solution over a 5-year lifecycle, once the project is complete, been determined, e.g., ongoing vendor hosting costs, annual maintenance and support not acquired upfront, etc.?

Yes

7.3 Have all required funding sources for the project and ongoing support costs been identified?

Yes

7.4 Will the funding for this project expire on a specific date, regardless of project timelines?
No

7.5 Will the funding allocated for this project include any contingency, in the event of cost over-runs or potential changes in scope?
No

8. TECHNOLOGY

8.1 Please indicate whether a statewide enterprise solution will be used or select the primary reason for not choosing an enterprise solution.
There is not a statewide enterprise solution available

8.2 Will the technology and all required services be acquired off existing State contract(s)?
No

8.3 Will any software be acquired through the current State value-added reseller contract?
Yes

8.3a Describe how the software was selected below:
Implementation vendor is expected to leverage existing state contracts where applicable

RFP -

Out of all the proposals of Delaware Transfer solutions, finalist's solution not only transfers Delaware system it also provides state of the art architecture powered by GovConnect accelerator built on Salesforce with low code to no code solution integrated with Mulesoft ESB enabling efficient internal and external data exchange which in turn enhances usability, maintainability, scalability, and interoperability.

The selected vendor's solution provides responsive web design for all user interfaces enabling the users to be able to access the application on various devices and browsers. In addition, their solution provides an out of the box native mobile app for iOS and Android giving unified mobile experience for the citizens, employers and staff. Optimal mix of SaaS & PaaS based solution reduces ongoing overhead of infrastructure and middleware maintenance.

The selected vendor's proposal provides all of this best of the breed solution for a highly competitive price within an impressive timeline delivering the solution quicker than any other proposals and the original expected duration in the feasibility study.

8.4 Does the project involve technology that is new and/or unfamiliar to your agency, e.g., software tool never used before, virtualized server environment?

No

8.5 Does your agency have experience with the vendor (if known)?
Yes

8.6 Does the vendor (if known) have professional experience with similar projects?
Yes

8.7 Does the project involve any coordination across multiple vendors?
Yes

8.8 Does this project require multiple system interfaces, e.g., APIs, data exchange with other external application systems/agencies or other internal systems/divisions?
Yes

8.9 Have any compatibility issues been identified between the proposed solution and the existing environment, e.g., upgrade to server needed before new COTS solution can be installed?
No

8.9a Describe below the issues that were identified and how they have been/will be resolved, or whether an ADOA-ASET representative should contact you.

8.10 Will a migration/conversion step be required, i.e., data extract, transformation and load?
Yes

8.11 Is this replacing an existing solution?
Yes

8.11a Indicate below when the solution being replaced was originally acquired.
April 1996

8.11b Describe the planned disposition of the existing technology below, e.g., surplused, retired, used as backup, used for another purpose:
The existing technology which is not part of the new solution will be retired within a year from the implementation of the new solution

8.12 Describe how the agency determined the quantities reflected in the PIJ, e.g., number of hours of P&OS, disk capacity required, number of licenses, etc. for the proposed solution?
It's based on vendor responses on their proposal.

8.13 Does the proposed solution and associated costs reflect any assumptions regarding projected growth, e.g., more users over time, increases in the amount of data to be stored over 5 years?

Yes

8.14 Does the proposed solution and associated costs include failover and disaster recovery contingencies?
Yes

8.14a Please select why failover and disaster recovery is not included in the proposed solution.

8.15 Will the vendor need to configure the proposed solution for use by your agency?
Yes

8.15a Are the costs associated with that configuration included in the PIJ financials?
Yes

8.16 Will any app dev or customization of the proposed solution be required for the agency to use the project in the current/planned tech environment, e.g. a COTS app that will req custom programming, an agency app that will be entirely custom developed?
Yes

8.16a Will the customizations inhibit the ability to implement regular product updates, or to move to future versions?
No

8.16b Describe who will be customizing the solution below:
DES will acquire (no cost) the DECSS solution and related documentation from State of Delaware. The selected implementation vendor will customize and maintain the solution to meet the DES business needs until DES is ready to take over the maintenance and operations of the implemented solution.

Implementation vendor will provide all the services from requirements elaboration, design, construction, testing, deployment, warranty, operations and finally knowledge transfer/transition to DES staff. During all these phases selective members of DTS (Architect, Security Analyst, Sr., Developer) will be embedded into the project team to collaborate jointly and oversee/review deliverables time to time and also take knowledge transition in the end from the IM Vendor.

8.16c Do the resources that will be customizing the application have experience with the technology platform being used, e.g., .NET, Java, Drupal?
Yes

8.16d Please select the application development methodology that will be used:
Agile/Scrum

8.16e Provide an estimate of the amount of customized development required, e.g., 25% for a COTS

application, 100% for pure custom development, and describe how that estimate was determined below:

The implementation vendor will complete approximately 22% of customization after transferring the Delaware DECSS solution to meet the DES business needs.

8.16f Are any/all Professional & Outside Services costs associated with the customized development included in the PIJ financials?

Yes

8.17 Have you determined that this project is in compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, policies, standards & procedures, incl. those for network, security, platform, software/application &/or data/info found at aset.az.gov/resources/psp?

Yes

8.17a Describe below the compliance issues that were identified and how they have been/will be resolved, or whether an ADOA-ASET representative should contact you:

8.18 Are there other high risk project issues that have not been identified as part of this PIJ?

No

8.18a Please explain all unidentified high risk project issues below:

9. SECURITY

9.1 Will the proposed solution be vendor-hosted?

Yes

9.1a Please select from the following vendor-hosted options:

Commercial data center environment, e.g AWS, Azure

9.1b Describe the rationale for selecting the vendor-hosted option below:

During the previously completed feasibility study project, DTS Enterprise Architect provided direction that the solution need to be hosted in the cloud environment.

ATLAS Replacement system will be hosted in FedRAMP certified Azure Cloud and will leverage existing state contracts where applicable.

9.1c Has the agency been able to confirm the long-term viability of the vendor hosted environment?

Yes

9.1d Has the agency addressed contract termination contingencies, e.g., solution ownership, data ownership, application portability, migration plans upon contract/support termination?

Yes

9.1e Has a Conceptual Design/Network Diagram been provided and reviewed by ASET-SPR?
Yes

9.1f Has the spreadsheet located at https://aset.az.gov/arizona-baseline-security-controls-excel already been completed by the vendor and approved by ASET-SPR?
Yes

9.2 Will the proposed solution be hosted on-premise in a state agency?
No

9.2a Where will the on-premise solution be located:

9.2b Were vendor-hosted options available and reviewed?

9.2c Describe the rationale for selecting an on-premise option below:

9.2d Will any data be transmitted into or out of the agency's on-premise environment or the State Data Center?

9.3 Will any PII, PHI, CGIS, or other Protected Information as defined in the 8110 Statewide Data Classification Policy be transmitted, stored, or processed with this project?
Yes

9.3a Describe below what security infrastructure/controls are/will be put in place to safeguard this data:
•   Application will be hosted in a FedRAMP certified government cloud environment

•   DES's data is segregated and isolated from other client's data

•   Proposed solution consumes SAML 2.0 tokens for federated Single Sign On and can integrate with Okta Identity and Access Management solution using SAML 2.0 federation for user authentication and Single Sign On (SSO). In addition, solution integrates with the State's existing enterprise-wide Access Management solution for coarse-grained authorization. The fine-grained authorization using role-based access control (RBAC is handled within the application hosted on GovConnect Cloud platform.

•   Proposed solution enables encryption to provide security of data at rest and security of data in transit. The solution uses GDE to encrypt the data at rest in the database tables. TLS 1.2 is utilized to encrypt the data in transit.

•   Complete data, main application, supporting applications and their respective backups will be hosted within the US

10. AREAS OF IMPACT

Application Systems
Internal Use Web Application;Mobile Application Development;New Application Development

Database Systems

Data Warehouse/Mart;Database Consolidation/Migration/Extract Transform and Load Data;MySQL;MS SQL Server

Software

COTS Application Customization;Other

Transfer of Delaware child support system, DECSS and customized to meet the DES business needs

Hardware

Hosted Solution (Cloud Implementation)
Microsoft Azure

Security

Encryption;Firewall;Intrusion Detection System (IDS);Intrusion Prevention System (IPS)

Telecommunications

Enterprise Solutions

Business Intelligence System;E-Signatures;Document Management/Imaging;Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity

Contract Services/Procurements

11. FINANCIALS

Description	PIJ Category	Cost Type	Fiscal Year Spend	Quantity	Unit Cost	Extended Cost	Tax Rate	Tax	Total Cost
Professional & Outside Services	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1	$18,189,039	$18,189,039	0.00 %	$0	$18,189,039
Software	Software	Development	1	1	$1,731,150	$1,731,150	860.00 %	$148,879	$1,880,029
Facilities	Facilities	Development	1	1	$1,570,811	$1,570,811	0.00 %	$0	$1,570,811
Professional & Outside Services	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	1	$17,594,740	$17,594,740	0.00 %	$0	$17,594,740
Software	Software	Development	2	1	$1,485,310	$1,485,310	860.00 %	$127,737	$1,613,047
Facilities	Facilities	Development	2	1	$948,987	$948,987	0.00 %	$0	$948,987
Professional & Outside Services	Professional & Outside Services	Development	3	1	$5,255,725	$5,255,725	0.00 %	$0	$5,255,725
Software	Software	Development	3	1	$1,485,310	$1,485,310	860.00 %	$127,737	$1,613,047
Facilities	Facilities	Development	3	1	$948,987	$948,987	0.00 %	$0	$948,987
Professional & Outside Services	Professional & Outside Services	Development	4	1	$3,171,372	$3,171,372	0.00 %	$0	$3,171,372
Software	Software	Development	4	1	$1,485,310	$1,485,310	860.00 %	$127,737	$1,613,047
Facilities	Facilities	Development	4	1	$948,987	$948,987	0.00 %	$0	$948,987
Professional & Outside Services	Professional & Outside Services	Development	5	1	$1,619,335	$1,619,335	0.00 %	$0	$1,619,335
Facilities	Facilities	Development	5	1	$158,165	$158,165	0.00 %	$0	$158,165
Software	Software	Development	5	1	$1,485,310	$1,485,310	860.00 %	$127,737	$1,613,047
Software	Software	Operational	5	1	$1,858,166	$1,858,166	860.00 %	$159,802	$2,017,968

Base Budget (Available)	Base Budget (To Be Req)	Base Budget % of Project
$0	$0	0%
APF (Available)	**APF (To Be Req)**	**APF % of Project**
$0	$0	0%
Other Appropriated (Available)	**Other Appropriated (To Be Req)**	**Other Appropriated % of Project**
$20,657,153	$0	34%
Federal (Available)	**Federal (To Be Req)**	**Federal % of Project**
$40,099,180	$0	66%
Other Non-Appropriated (Available)	**Other Non-Appropriated (To Be Req)**	**Other Non-Appropriated % of Project**
$0	$0	0%

Total Budget Available	Total Development Cost
$60,756,333	$58,738,364
Total Budget To Be Req	Total Operational Cost
$0	$2,017,968
Total Budget	Total Cost
$60,756,333	$60,756,332

12. PROJECT SUCCESS

Please specify what performance indicator(s) will be referenced in determining the success of the proposed project (e.g. increased productivity, improved customer service, etc.)? (A minimum of one performance indicator must be specified)

Please provide the performance objective as a quantifiable metric for each performance indicator specified.
Note: The performance objective should provide the current performance level, the performance goal, and the time period within which that performance goal is intended to be achieved. You should have an auditable means to measure and take corrective action to address any deviations.
Example: Within 6 months of project completion, the agency would hope to increase "Neighborhood Beautification" program registration by 20% (3,986 registrants) from the current registration count of 19,930 active participants.

Performance Indicators

ATLAS Replacement System implemented statewide as per the schedule

ATLAS Replacement System gets Federal OCSE Certification

Increase in current child support collections by 7.8% by the 3rd year of statewide implementation

Increase in cost effectiveness ratio by 10% by the 3rd year of statewide implementation

13. CONDITIONS

Conditions for Approval
1. Should development costs exceed the approved estimates by 10% or more, or should there be significant changes to the proposed technology scope of work or implementation schedule, the Agency must amend the PIJ to reflect the changes and submit it to ADOA-ASET, and ITAC if required, for review and approval prior to further expenditure of funds.
2. Prior to moving any State data into the vendor-hosted environment and/or spending of funds, the Agency must work with the Department of Administration (ADOA) Security to ensure the vendor successfully completes the Arizona Risk and Authorization Management Program (AZRamp) and is AZRamp Authorized to access, transmit, process or store state data.

14. OVERSIGHT SUMMARY

Project Background
DES Division of Child Support Services (DCSS) has 21 child support officers that are responsible for the managing, tracking, collecting and distributing over $691 million in child support for over 300,000 children in Arizona. DCSS is providing these services through their ATLAS system that was implemented in 1996.

Users of the current ATLAS system are experiencing issues with usability, efficiency, flexibility, system security, data reliability and reporting.

Business Justification
By implementing this solution with the automation of technologies, DES will modernize their technology that will result in cost savings. The agency will have the ability to increase efficiency and collections by having an enhanced tracking system with secure information, and improve customer service relations. The system will avoid delays in payments by automating the complex debt calculations and this project will allow DES the ability to move to a cloud based environment.

Implementation Plan
The project will have a four year duration in which the vendor is responsible for completing major implementation tasks such as design, development, testing, training, implementation, federal certification, warranty, knowledge transfer, operations, and maintenance.

The agency is responsible for management of the project and budget. DES will work with the contractors to ensure the ATLAS Replacement System is built to meet the identified requirements and functioning efficiently.

The project management contractor is responsible for assisting in the following: development and implementation of additional project control plans and structures, monitoring and updating the project management plan and schedule, Program in coordination between entities, ensuring that other contracted staff stay on schedule or otherwise mitigate project delays.

Vendor Selection
DES DCSS utilized the procurement RFP process and identified four vendors. Deloitte is the selected vendor for their ability to provide an advanced and cloud ready solution based on the system transferred from Delaware with various upgrades to UI, Integrations, Batch, Security and infrastructure that are on par with latest industry trends. The solution will meet 100% of the requirements from ADES DCSS.

Budget or Funding Considerations
Funding for this project is made up of 66% Federal and 34% Other Appropriated.

15. PIJ REVIEW CHECKLIST

Agency Project Sponsor
Heather Noble

Agency CIO (or Designee)
Mark Darmer

Agency ISO (or designee)
Mark Darmer (Acting)

OSPB Representative

ASET Engagement Manager
Soody Saed

ASET SPR Representative

Agency SPO Representative

Agency CFO
Roberta Blythe