

Corporations Software Replacement	
Agency Requesting The Project:	
Corporation Commission	
Business Unit Requesting The Project:	
Corporation Commission	
Sponsor Of the Project:	
Jodi Jerich	
Sponsor Title:	
Executive Director	
Sponsor Phone Number:	Extension:
602-542-3931	
Sponsor Email Address:	
jjerich@azcc.gov	

Has a Project Request been completed for this PIJ?	N
--	---

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 Corporations Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission must approve and maintain all corporation and limited liability company records, and, by statute, make those records available to the public via the internet. The main entity record database, known as STARPAS, is more than 20 years old and is no longer supported. It requires constant maintenance, and cannot be further expanded to allow customers to file all types of business entity documents electronically rather than by paper. The database must be replaced to handle the volume of transactions that electronic filing will add. The old system causes extensive rework of registration filings due to the lack of field validation. The system work Queue which is used to examine filings requires manual processes, and does not allow the Commission to accurately track the amount of time to examine.

The current system in use, called STARPAS, is not upgradable and is limited in number of licenses. As a result, the agency cannot move to 100% online registration offerings until the system is upgraded. Because of the age, there is risk of outages, and risk of failure in restoring the application because it is not possible to do any Windows upgrades on the server. It is on Windows 2003, which is no longer supported by Microsoft. In its current state, periodic outages, speed reductions, and transaction confirmations occur when too many users are on the system.

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

Service enhancement:
 Electronically submitted documents will result in enhanced service and value to the public, based on data. The ACC implemented online filings for LLCs in September of 2015, resulting in a 50% reduction in filing rejections that result in rework. This is because customers are prevented from entering incorrect data or failing to complete data entry by incorporating data checks and implementing required fields. It is expected that rework for all document types will be cut in half. Since rework rates can be as high as 28%, these savings are significant. It is also expected that improved work queue functionality will make the assigning and completion of document examination more efficient.

Problem and Risk Avoidance:
 The new proposed system will no longer be limited in the amount of registrations that are received online. The current risk of outages and inability to restore data will be reduced as the solution will be utilizing current and supported technologies.

Describe the proposed solution to this business need:

The proposed solution is to purchase COTS software called Cenuity. Based on prior RFI and RFPs in this subject domain, there are working solutions that have been implemented in 8 states total for corporation registration using this product. This product has been implemented most recently in states such as Georgia and Indiana, with practices very similar to our own. This product uses an SQL database and is developed in ASP.NET, hence the platform is complimentary to other software used or developed by the Corporation Commission.

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

Y

Indicate where that documentation can be found, or provide the information under separate cover before the meeting, otherwise describe below:

The system will be housed within Corporation Commissions Microsoft AZUREs GovCloud , and the configuration required is described in the Statement of Work.

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

Y

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?

N

Will you be completing an assessment/Pilot/RFP phase, i.e., an evaluation by a vendor, third party or your agency, of the current state, needs, and desired future state, in order to determine the cost, effort, approach (RFP or otherwise) and/or feasibility of a project before submitting the full PIJ?

N

Does the project fall into one of the following categories:

- hardware technology refresh/expansion, e.g., replacement/more laptops, radios, peripherals, etc.?
- software version refresh/additional licenses, e.g., MS Office 2013 replacing 2010, extra software licenses needed for additional PCs?

N

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

N

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

Y

Does your agency have a formal project methodology in place?

Y

Describe the high level make-up and roles/responsibilities of the Agency, Vendor(s), and other third parties below: (i.e. ...agency will do...vendor will do...other third parties will do..)

The Corporation Commission Corporations Division will supply business subject matter experts to work with the vendor to configure the system and determine any modifications needed, as well as test the system. The Information Technology Division will supply technical expertise in the data migration from the old system to the new. In addition, the IT Division will supply project management oversight on the project from the business perspective. The software vendor will supply consulting services that will include project management, business analysis, configuration, enhancement of the software if required, and data migration.

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

Y

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

The vendor will provide a PM, and the Corporation Commission will also PM the project. The Commissions PM does not have official certifications, and has more than 20 years PM experience.

Is a project plan available that reflects the estimated start date and end date of the project, and the supporting milestones for the project?

Y

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

Y

Will any physical infrastructure improvements be required prior to the implementation of the proposed solution. e.g., building reconstruction, cabling, etc.?	N
Are there any known resource availability conflicts that could impact the project?	N
Does your schedule have dependencies on any other projects or procurements?	Y
Will the implementation involve major end user view or functionality changes?	Y
Will the proposed solution result in a change to a public-facing application or system?	Y
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.?	Y
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.?	Y
Have all required funding sources for the project and ongoing support costs been identified?	Y
Will the funding for this project expire on a specific date, regardless of project timelines?	Y
Provide the dates for the funding availability below:	
Estimated Start	07/01/16
Estimated Finish	06/30/18
Will the funding allocated for this project include any contingency, in the event of cost over-runs or potential changes in scope?	N
Please indicate whether a statewide enterprise solution will be used or select the primary reason for not choosing an enterprise solution:	
No Statewide Enterprise Solution Available	
Will the technology and all required services be acquired off existing State contract(s)?	Y
Will any software be acquired through the current State value-added reseller contract?	Y
Describe how the software was selected below:	
The software selected is called Cenuity, from the PCC Technology Group. The Corporation Commission previously released an RFI to gather information on available solutions, and also released an RFP in 2015 (that had to be cancelled due to lack of funding). In addition to the information acquired in previous efforts, the Commission conducted market research in May and June 2016 and selected the COTS solution based upon this market research. This research included discussions with Georgia and Indiana about their implementations, both of which were completed in 14 months or less. PCC has also implemented solutions in Connecticut, Vermont, New Mexico, Louisiana, and Washington.	
Does the project involve any technology that is new and/or unfamiliar to your agency, e.g., software tool never used before, virtualized server environment?	N
Does your agency have experience with the vendor (if known)?	N
Does the vendor (if known) have professional experience with similar projects?	Y

Does the project involve any coordination across multiple vendors?

N

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

Y

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?

N

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

Y

Is this replacing an existing solution?

Y

Indicate below when the solution being replaced was originally acquired?

The original solution called STARPAS uses Progress 9.1 and was originally acquired in 1993. Document management has been under Docuware.

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

The existing servers have been virtualized over the last year on Hyper-V, so the capacity/storage freed up will be used for other applications. Note: The servers are on un-supported Windows 2003 as required by the 32-bit architecture of the STARPAS software, hence they must be replaced.

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?

The requirements are based on internal users of the application within the Corporations Division and IT Division. The external use requirements are that there is no licensing or additional cost required based on volume of public users.

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?

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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

Y

Will any application development or customization of the proposed solution be required for the agency to use the product in the current/planned technology environment, e.g., a COTS application that will require custom programming, an agency application that will be entirely custom developed?

Y

Will the customizations inhibit the ability to implement regular product updates, or to move to future versions?

N

Describe who will be customizing the solution below:

It is hoped the customization required will be minimal, but some customization of the external website and in the area of financials is expected. The customization will be done by the software supplier, PCC Technology Group, since they are the experts in their product.

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

Y

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

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:

It is expected that 10% to 15% customization would be required for a COTS application. The estimate is determined based upon the proposed vendors response to requirements and from demonstrations held, and reviews done with two of their existing customers. These changes are expected to be in the website and in the area of accounting.

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

Have you determined that this project is in compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, policies, standards, and procedures, including those for network, security, platform, software/application, and/or data/information found at <https://aset.az.gov/resources/psp>? Y

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

Will the proposed solution be vendor-hosted? Y

Please select from the following vendor-hosted options:
The application will be hosted in the Corporations Commissions MS Azure GovCloud account.

Describe the rationale for selecting the vendor-hosted option below:
Leveraging the existing Commissions cloud allowed for a cost savings for the project. Additionally, hosting the software in the cloud means no infrastructure will need to be purchased, managed, or maintained by the State, and disaster recovery is part of the hosted service.

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

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

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

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? N

Will the proposed solution be hosted on premise in a state agency? N

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

Summary of PJJ Financials	
Total of Development Costs:	\$ 1,593,618
Total of Operational Costs:	\$ 636,188
Total Costs:	\$ 2,229,806

Project Cost - Itemized

Item	Description	Category	Development (Implementation) or Operational (Ongoing)	Fiscal Year Spend	Qty or Hours	Unit Cost	Extended Cost	Enter Tax Rate if Applicable (Generally 8.6% for PHX)	Tax	Total Cost
1	Cenuity Corporations Perpetual	Software	Development	1	1	\$255,755	\$255,755	8.60%	\$21,995	\$277,750
2	Professional Services- Cenuity Installation and Configuration	Prof & Outside Services	Development	1	1	\$1,076,619	\$1,076,619	0.00%	\$0	\$1,076,619
3	Professional Services- Cenuity Installation and Configuration	Prof & Outside Services	Development	2	1	\$239,249	\$239,249	0.00%	\$0	\$239,249
4	5 year maintenance agreement- year 2-5	License & Maint Fees	Operational	2	1	\$430,896	\$430,896	8.60%	\$37,057	\$467,953
5	Hosting services	Other	Operational	1	1	\$33,647	\$33,647	0.00%	\$0	\$33,647
6	Hosting services	Other	Operational	FY2-5	1	\$33,647	\$33,647	0.00%	\$0	\$134,588
7		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
8		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
9		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
10		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
11		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
12		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
13		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
14		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
15		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
16		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
17		[-Select-]	[-Select-]	[-Select-]						
									Total Development Cost	\$1,593,618
									Total Operational Cost	\$636,188
									Total Itemization of Costs:	\$2,229,806

Summary of Funding Sources			
Fund Type	% of Project	\$ of Project (Available)	\$ of Project (To Be Requested)
Base Budget	100.00%	\$2,229,806.19	
APF			
Other Appropriated			
Federal			
Other Non-Appropriated			

PII Development & Operational Cost Summary

Description	Type	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Extended Cost
Professional & Outside Services	Development	\$1,076,619	\$239,249	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,315,868
	Operational	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hardware	Development	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Operational	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Software	Development	\$277,750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$277,750
	Operational	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Communications	Development	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Operational	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities	Development	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Operational	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Licensing & Maintenance Fees	Development	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Operational	\$0	\$467,953	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$467,953
Other	Development	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Operational	\$33,647	\$33,647	\$33,647	\$33,647	\$33,647	\$168,235
	Development Cost:	\$1,354,369	\$239,249	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,593,618
	Operational Cost:	\$33,647	\$501,600	\$33,647	\$33,647	\$33,647	\$636,188
	Total Cost:						\$2,229,806

Areas of Impact

1 Application Systems

- Application Enhancements
- Internal Use Web Application
- Mobile Application Development
- Arizona Enterprise Solution Platform (AESP) based Application
- New Application Development
- az.gov Web Portal Application
- Other: (Please specify below)

2 Database Systems

- Data Warehouse/Mart
- Database Consolidation/Migration/Extract Transform and Load Data
- Database Products and Tools:
 - Oracle
 - MySQL
 - DB2
 - MS SQL Server
- Other: (Please specify below)

3 Software

- COTS Application Customization
- COTS Application Acquisition
- Mainframe Systems Software
- Open Source
- PC/LAN Systems Software
- Virtualization
- Other: (Please specify below)

4 Hardware

- LAN/WAN Infrastructure
- Mainframe Infrastructure
- Storage Area Network Devices
- Public Safety Radios, Systems
- PC Purchases, Peripherals
- Tape Libraries/Silos
- UPS Devices
- Other: (Please specify below)

5 Hosted Solution (Cloud Implementation)

- State Data Center
- Commercially Hosted:
 - Amazon (AWS) GovCloud
 - Century Link - I/O Data Center
 - AWS (non-government) cloud
 - Microsoft Azure
- Vendor Hosted
- Other: (Please explain below)

6 Security

- Encryption
- Security Appliances:
 - Firewall
 - Intrusion Detection System (IDS)
 - Intrusion Prevention System (IPS)
- SecurityControls/Systems - Other: (Please specify below)
- Physical Controls (Badging Systems, Iris Scanners, Other: (Please specify below)
- Other: (Please specify below)

7 Telecommunications

- Network Communications Infrastructure
- Telephone Upgrade-Business-Specific
- Cabling
- Wireless Access Points
- Telephony Upgrade-EIC Solution
- Trenching
- Videoconferencing
- Other: (Please specify below)

8 Enterprise Solutions

- Business Intelligence System
- E-Signatures
- Geographic Information Systems
- Other Imaging - Photos, Fingerprints, etc.
- Document Management/Imaging
- eLicensing
- Management Systems - Financial, Grants, Asset
- Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity
- Other: (Please specify below)

9 Contract Services/Procurement

- Contracted Project Management
- Contractor Support Services
- Install/Configuration Contract Services
- State Contract
- Vendor provided
- Procurement (RFP, IFB, DPR, etc.)
- Other: (Please specify below)

PIJ Review Checklist

Role	Name	Email Address	Date Reviewed
Agency Project Sponsor*	Jodi Jerich	jjerich@azcc.gov	07/13/16
Agency Chief Information Officer (CIO) (or designee)*	Letty Butner	lbutner@azcc.gov	07/13/16
Agency Information Security Officer (ISO) (or designee)*	Letty Butner	lbutner@azcc.gov	07/13/16
ADOA-ASET Engagement Manager *	James Dean	james.dean@azdoa.gov	07/18/16
ADOA-ASET Security, Privacy & Risk (ASET-SPR) representative	Tim Guerriero	Tim.Guerriero@azdoa.gov	07/19/16
Agency CPO or State Procurement Office (SPO) representative	Kim Battista	kbattista@azcc.gov	07/13/16
Agency CFO or Finance representative (if different from CPO)	Peter Vasquez	pvasquez@azcc.gov	07/13/16
Others to Review (if applicable):			
Agency Corporations Director	Patricia Barfield	pbarfield@azcc.gov	07/13/16

* Required Attendee

Official ADOA-ASET Use Only

✓	Has the value of the IT project to the public and the State been identified?
✓	Does the proposed solution address the stated problem or situation?
✓	Has the budget unit demonstrated competency to carry out the project successfully?
✓	Have all applicable questions in the PIJ been addressed?
✓	Have the Areas of Impact associated with the project been identified?
✓	Is sufficient sponsorship and support by budget unit leadership evidenced in the meeting?
✓	Has the compatibility of the proposed solution with other budget unit solutions been addressed?
✓	Has a reasonable Project Plan been provided?
✓	Has the compliance of the proposed solution with all applicable statewide standards been confirmed?
✓	Have any potential risks or issues associated with the project or the proposed solution been identified and appropriately addressed to minimize unintended consequences?
✓	Have the cost estimates for the project been vetted for accuracy?
✓	Have the PIJ Financials been completed?
✓	Have any/all of the following startup costs to implement the project been included under Development in the financial tables, if applicable - tax; shipping; upfront maintenance and support; professional services (P&OS); ancillary software to run on equipment; ancillary hardware to install equipment, e.g., cables; other associated costs, e.g., training, travel, documentation, etc.?
✓	Have any/all of the following ongoing/5-year support costs, once the project is implemented, been included under Operational in the financial tables, if applicable - ongoing vendor hosting costs, including any projected increase over time; annual maintenance and support not acquired upfront; extended costs after warranty expiration; P&OS commitments beyond implementation?
✓	Have you confirmed that no Full Time Employee (FTE) related costs have been included in the project costs?
✓	Have quotes been provided for all itemized costs in the PIJ, e.g., professional services, hardware, software, licensing, etc.?
✓	Do the quotes match the itemized list and only reflect those items and costs (within 5%) associated with this project?
	If not, describe below how the costs in the PIJ differ from the quotes, e.g., if quantities are different, costs are comprised of portions of multiple quotes provided, etc.:

If any of the above are not complete, the PIJ cannot be approved at this time.....

PIJ Disposition	
------------------------	--

✓

ITAC Recommendation
ITAC Recommendation with conditions
Not ITAC Recommended

Strategic Program Manager Analysis

The Corporation Commission is currently using an old and unsupported platform from 1993 to process and maintain corporation and limited liability records. Not only is the application out of date, but it can no longer scale to the needs of the business as there is a limited number of licensees it can track. In order to improve its ability to serve the needs of the State, a Commercial Of the Shelf (COTS) product is being proposed that can be installed and configured to the needs of the Commission. Some customization will need to occur in the website, but it will not interfere with maintenance patches or upgrades of the product throughout the maintenance agreement and further into the future. The application will be hosted in the Commission's current Microsoft Azure Government Cloud to for security and disaster recovery. There are no outstanding issues or concerns. Recommended to ITAC without conditions via delegated authority.

Authorized Approver:	James Dean	Approval Date:	7/19/16
----------------------	------------	----------------	---------

Condition (If Applicable)
