

Project Investment Justification

Access Voter Information Database ("AVID")

ST18001

Secretary of State

Contents

1. General Information	2
2. Meeting Pre-Work	2
3. Pre-PIJ/Assessment	3
4. Project	4
5. Schedule	4
6. Impact	5
7. Budget	6
8. Technology	6
9. Security	9
10. Areas of Impact	10
11. Financials	12
12. Project Success	13
13. Conditions	14
14. Oversight Summary	14
15. PIJ Review Checklist	14

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

PIJ ID: ST18001

PIJ Name: Access Voter Information Database ("AVID")

Account: Secretary of State

Business Unit Requesting: Election Services Division

Sponsor: Michele Reagan

Sponsor Title: Arizona Secretary of State

Sponsor Email: mreagan@azsos.gov

Sponsor Phone: (602) 542-4285

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...):

"The Arizona Secretary of State (AZSOS) is operating its current voter registration system, VRAZ-II, on an aging platform that is based on a core technology (PowerBuilder) provided by Election Systems & Software (ES&S), a technology that reached its peak use in the late 1990's. Within this context, it is critical to note that the Department of Homeland Security has designated all States' elections and voter registration systems as critical national infrastructure. The State's voter registration system was also the recipient of an aggressive foreign intrusion attempt in 2016. Given the need to address a system that is based on decades-old technology and no longer able to meet the current and emerging needs of our County partners and citizens, combined with the need to ensure Arizona is operating a modern and secure voter registration system, the Secretary of State is seeking to replace the current VRAZ II system.

Additionally, Secretary of State contracted with an independent and objective outside party to assess the current capabilities of VRAZ II and the underlying technology. This contractor also noted that the base platform of the current VRAZ II system (written in PowerBuilder code base) could be considered viable for another 3 years, but after that, would be increasingly difficult to maintain and not meet the growing cybersecurity and business requirements of a 21st century Arizona."

2.2 How will solving this issue or addressing this need benefit the State or the Agency?

An updated voter registration system would reduce user frustration in the Counties and achieve efficiencies such as a platform that will continue to be stable past 3 years, more efficient integration with county partners, reduce duplicate voter registrations, and provide a smart front-end system that will perform data checks.

2.3 Describe the proposed solution to this business need.

The landscape of current vendors capable of implementing a Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) Voter Registration solution is quite small. The Secretary of State determined that it was not an acceptable risk to procure the services of a technology vendor with limited experience in this arena, thus we did not seek bids from the system integrator community. Through a deliberative, 9-month long process, Secretary of State identified current-state challenges and inefficiencies, followed by assessing solution alternatives, and then completed future-state business and technical requirements for the new voter registration solution. This led to the development and release of an RFP to procure a new solution - this solution will be a modern and secure VR system that is cloud-based (consistent with the State CIO's 'Cloud First' policy) and the new solution will be the future voter registration solution for the next two decades. It is based on a flexible N-tier architecture that will be able to more easily meet emerging needs and legislative changes in the years ahead.

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?

Yes

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

Yes

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).

Agency = Provide subject matter experts

Vendor = Implementation, Training, Software Procedures

Third Party = Project Management, Contract oversight

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?

No

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

Est. Implementation Start Date

Est. Implementation End Date

11/1/2017 12:00:00 AM

6/30/2019 12:00:00 AM

5.3 How were the start and end dates determined?

Other

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
------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

5.4 Have steps needed to roll-out to all impacted parties been incorporated, e.g. communications, planned outages, deployment plan?

No

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?

Yes

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

No

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

Yes

6.2a Please identify the projects or procurements.

In 2018, the statewide primary and general election are occurring along with jurisdictional elections. This prohibits any changes to the current voter registration system and limits the amount of time available on training.

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?

Yes

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)?

Yes

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

No

8.3a Describe how the software was selected below:

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?

Yes

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

No

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?

Yes

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.

The compatibility issues identified do not involve ADOA-ASET; the issues lie with the current voter registrations system integrating with those systems of Pima and Maricopa County. The interfaces required were identified in the future state analysis and have been integrated into the RFP. It is anticipated that there will be some changes required (such as table names, etc.) if migrating to a new system.

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.

The original solution (VRAZ) was acquired through RFP on 11/10/2005.

8.11b Describe the planned disposition of the existing technology below, e.g., surplus, retired, used as backup, used for another purpose:

The hardware has almost met the end of useful life and will be retired through surplus once all proper 'cleaning' has occurred.

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?

N/A

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:

The awarded vendor will be customizing the solution and providing updates during the life of the system.

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:

Other

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 percentage of customization will depend on the awarded vendor's solution meeting the needs of Arizona.

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:

The rationale for selecting the vendor-hosted option was the greater security provided, less exposure to liability, and wanting a cloud based solution.

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?

No

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:

The security controls required have been outlined in the RFP.

10. AREAS OF IMPACT

Application Systems

Application Enhancements;Internal Use Web Application;New Application Development

Database Systems

Software

COTS Application Customization;COTS Application Acquisition

Hardware

Hosted Solution (Cloud Implementation)

Amazon (AWS) GovCloud;Microsoft Azure

Security

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

Two-Factor Authentication

Telecommunications

Enterprise Solutions

Geographic Information Systems;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
Implementation - Project Management	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1698	\$128	\$217,344	0.00 %	\$0	\$217,344
Implementation -Testing	Software	Development	1	2454	\$128	\$314,112	0.00 %	\$0	\$314,112
Implementation -Testing	Software	Development	1	1636	\$128	\$209,408	0.00 %	\$0	\$209,408
Implementation - System Development and Config.	Software	Development	1	4004	\$128	\$512,512	0.00 %	\$0	\$512,512
Implementation - System Design	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1718	\$128	\$219,904	0.00 %	\$0	\$219,904
Implementation - Data Migration	Software	Development	1	2136	\$128	\$273,408	0.00 %	\$0	\$273,408
Implementation - Development and Validation	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1696	\$128	\$217,088	0.00 %	\$0	\$217,088
Implementation - Project Management	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	2547	\$128	\$326,016	0.00 %	\$0	\$326,016
Implementation - Development and Validation	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	2544	\$128	\$325,632	0.00 %	\$0	\$325,632
Implementation - System Design	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	2577	\$128	\$329,856	0.00 %	\$0	\$329,856
Implementation - System Development and Config.	Software	Development	2	6006	\$128	\$768,768	0.00 %	\$0	\$768,768
Implementation - Data Migration	Software	Development	2	3204	\$128	\$410,112	0.00 %	\$0	\$410,112
Implementation - Deployment	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	4160	\$128	\$532,480	0.00 %	\$0	\$532,480
Ongoing - Maintenance and Operations	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	2	1	\$577,000	\$577,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$577,000
Ongoing - Hosting	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	2	1	\$86,000	\$86,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$86,000

Ongoing - Maintenance and Operations	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	3	1	\$577,000	\$577,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$577,000
Ongoing - Hosting	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	3	1	\$86,000	\$86,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$86,000
Ongoing - Maintenance and Operations	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	4	1	\$577,000	\$577,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$577,000
Ongoing - Hosting	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	4	1	\$86,000	\$86,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$86,000
Ongoing - Maintenance and Operations	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	5	1	\$577,000	\$577,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$577,000
Ongoing - Hosting	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	5	1	\$86,000	\$86,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$86,000

Base Budget (Available)	Base Budget (To Be Req)	Base Budget % of Project
\$0	\$3,263,000	45%
APF (Available)	APF (To Be Req)	APF % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Other Appropriated (Available)	Other Appropriated (To Be Req)	Other Appropriated % of Project
\$2,000,000	\$0	27%
Federal (Available)	Federal (To Be Req)	Federal % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Other Non-Appropriated (Available)	Other Non-Appropriated (To Be Req)	Other Non-Appropriated % of Project
\$0	\$2,045,640	28%

Total Budget Available	Total Development Cost
\$2,000,000	\$4,656,640
Total Budget To Be Req	Total Operational Cost
\$5,308,640	\$2,652,000
Total Budget	Total Cost
\$7,308,640	\$7,308,640

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

13. CONDITIONS

Conditions for Approval

1. Should the final costs exceed the estimated costs 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 for review and approval prior to further expenditure of funds;
2. The Arizona Baseline Security Controls document must be approved by the ADOA-ASET Security, Privacy & Risk officer, or the Agency must complete a Risk Acceptance form, prior to any State information being hosted by the Awarded vendor, in order to ensure that the selected solution will provide an appropriate level of protection for State data.
3. Once the Award for the Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued for the proposed solution, the Agency may not proceed with further development efforts until a change request for the PIJ reflecting the final costs, scope of work, technology, and implementation schedule for the proposed solution has been submitted to ADOA-ASET for review.

14. OVERSIGHT SUMMARY

Project Background

Business Justification

Implementation Plan

Vendor Selection

Budget or Funding Considerations

15. PIJ REVIEW CHECKLIST

Agency Project Sponsor

Michele Reagan

Agency CIO (or Designee)

Bill Maaske

Agency ISO (or designee)

OSP Representative

ASET Engagement Manager

ASET SPR Representative

Agency SPO Representative

Agency CFO
