

NCCSD Systems Modernization Committee

Systems Modernization States Lessons Learned Webinars

Pre-Planning and Planning – 10/8/2021

Arizona

Heather Noble, IVD Director, HNoble@azdes.gov

Tammy Fogle, Systems Administrator TFogle@azdes.gov

The Arizona IV-D Program

- Under the Health and Human Services Umbrella Agency- Department of Economic Security
- DCSS is State Administered / State Operated within all 15 counties
- Judicial State, limited administrative process
- Collaboration with the Arizona Attorney General’s Office and Clerks of Court
 - Navajo Nation operates their own IV-D Program
- Caseload: 141,592 (Rural 22% / Urban 77%) - As of 8/31/21
- Staffing: 525 FTE - 97% work remotely with rotating cohorts for client-facing office coverage
- 21 client facing offices, with an emphasis on limited and virtual services



Project Details, Assumptions and Constraints

- Feasibility Study (2017) - Delaware Transfer
- State IT mandated an “updated” technology platform
 - This occurred post feasibility
- Other prior system projects in AZ have not been successful, requirements added / additional oversight
- Project was required to use an agile approach
- No GF or Automation Project Funds (APF)- Internally Funded
- DDI - Awarded to Deloitte / QA Awarded to Maximus / IV&V Awarded Public Consulting Group / PMO and OCM = Contractors



DELAWARE SYSTEM TRANSFER

- ✓ Functional Efficiency & Technical Scalability
- ✓ Time to Implement
- ✓ Risk Avoidance
- ✓ Cost Effectiveness

Executive/Key Stakeholder Support: Strategy for Ensuring Support & Supporting Documentation

Governor/Legislature/Fiscal/Other key agency executives:

Stakeholder Groups:

- Those that govern, approve, fund, monitor, regulate the program.
 - Since our Feasibility Study in 2017, we had 4 different Directors and CIOs and State CIO. We had state commitments for funding / support...BUT
 - Document everything, including decision makers and justification at each phase!
 - **Important:** Understand who is involved in the contractual processes (not just federally, but locally)
 - E.g. In AZ, systems projects over \$1M require an IT Authorization Committee (ITAC) through the AZ Strategic Enterprise Technology (ASET) which connects to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee(JLBC) - Meetings, Reports, Qtr. Briefings
 - Understand all of these governing bodies processes, meeting cadence, who sits on these committees, who represents the project
 - ASET = CIO and IV-D Director / JLBC = Department Director(s) (Umbrella agency heads) / CFO
 - Observe meetings in advance (other state projects / types of questions / what and how to prepare)
- Those that administer or are involved in the operation of the program (Tribes, County Clerks of Court, Attorney General, IT, Budget)
 - **Expectations-** What are the stakeholder groups regulations, requirements, processes? Important to know timelines, funding, systems options

Statistics and Presentation Materials: Almost all of which can be synthesized straight from your feasibility study

- Project Journey Map - A visual tool that highlights the timelines of the go/no go funding decisions, reviews, timelines of ea. procurement & approval
 - Decision Points, Pros & Cons, Budget Considerations, Impacts of not moving forward
- Distribution At A Glance- Now available (this would have been extremely helpful to state executives)
- Project Technical Review and Outlook - Business case, alternative options, goals, timeline, full project cost forecasts, national outlook / snapshot
 - Technology, approach, cost, timeframe, implementation year, challenges (*Plug: Cynthia Longest's state repository)
- Q&As / Talking Point Documents- Recommended for each audience and explains importance, complexity, why Child Support is "different"
 - Enterprise IT Q&A - Code Repository, challenges with Cloud, integration with G-Suite and other enterprise applications, rules engine, technical platform, security, readiness activities. Plans to bring the proposed technical architecture to the latest technical advancements
 - Important Point: if feasibility study did not align with enterprise IT direction
 - Governor's Office of Strategic Planning and Budget Q&A - Costs; forecasts; projections; sources (general fund, automation project funds); risk avoidance; training; IT and PM skill sets; staffing (during and post) and ongoing operations post implementation
- "1 pager" for the Executives, not in the IV-D program, provides knowledge and understanding to navigate and champion the cause
- Lessons Learned Document - start at the beginning / start now; repository for lessons learned (for other IT projects in your agency, other CSE states)
- **NOTE:** The length of time and changes in leadership will dictate how much you need to do/prepare.

IAPD Planning: Who, Timeline, How, Planning

Who: DES/Umbrella Agency APD Analyst

- Collaborative effort with Division and Department's Budget Office, APD Analyst, Division and Procurement teams, Project Director
- Gather IAPD points of contact from other states - lessons learned, best practices, tips/tricks

OCSE Expectations

- Time to create and formalize
 - 14 months total from creation to submission. This timeline includes three question intervals with OCSE
- Other APDs in the Department may overlap

Risk Management: How much risk we were willing to take ourselves vs. putting things out to bid?

Hired as contractors: Allowed for selecting the the right fit for the project and state and provided state with direct oversight & control

- **Project Management Office (PMO)**
 - Project Director; Project Administrator; Project Scheduler / Controller; Organizational Change Manager (OCM)
 - Lesson learned - should have on-boarded our Project Controller 6 months prior to QA, so that all plans would have been done for QA review - we brought on our Controller 1 month prior to QA. All plans were complete in 6 months.
 - Senior Business Analysts (3) - Include prior CSE modernization experience (South Carolina - System Certification and WV)

DDI Scope: The OCM work, in house or vendor? If a vendor, part of the DDI contract, or procure a separate OCM vendor?

- Arizona did not go with a vendor for OCM nor did we have OCM under the DDI Vendors scope.
- Instead we hired a contractor that has decades worth of experience in OCM / provides OCM strategy, approach, and guidance
- OCM is part of state established PMO team and work collaboratively with the Implementation Team and the Training Team
- State recruited around 40 change champions from various offices to be part of the OCM to perform the OCM activities
- More cost effective option to obtain this independently, a little more control

Pre-Planning: QA and IV&V Strategy: Differences, Roles, Options, Timing

Quality Assurance (not mandatory / AZ recommends)

- Nationwide Experience; serves as a trusted advisor
 - If your project team does not have the breadth of experience, this may be a true value add
- Risk identification and mitigation; objective, clear, documented
- Increase visibility for all project leaders
- AZ onboarded QA 6 months prior to IV&V to conduct initial risk assessment
 - Overall project health, project plans and resources
- Enable decisions based on unbiased assessment and metrics
 - Has been extremely beneficial having an objective third party on our project
 - Observations and Monthly Status Reports are helping to keep stakeholders and executives informed
 - Drive decision making, feedback on change requests
 - Provides insight into how other states handle similar challenges
- Assist in early detection of issues, prioritizing issues, identifying critical risks and recommending realistic mitigation strategies
- Help increase the success of the project / daily active involvement in project activities / understanding of the activities w/ staff new or unaware

Independent Verification & Validation

- AZ contracted through our Statewide Contract - onboarded 90 days prior to the DDI Vendor
- National IV&V Leaders with Child Support Enforcement Modernization Experts (CSE IT modernization projects and system certifications)
- Successful in Arizona with over 10 AZ agencies over the last two decades with reports to local governing bodies
- Reporting entity to federal OCSE
- Important to understand who is involved in the IV&V process with your state
 - In AZ, IV&V works with our AZ Strategic Enterprise Technology (ASET) and reports quarterly to Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC)
 - Knowing who will need to be part of meetings, who will receive reports. Not just federally, but locally.
 - Until completion of the project, AZ shall submit quarterly progress reports from the third-party consultant to JLBC pursuant to A.R.S
 - A favorable review by the Committee does not constitute endorsement / Supplemental funding request that may be required for project costs or any operational costs when the project is complete
 - Although the project is funded internally, the project is still being treated as one that would have received APF

DDI Planning: When to start Design, Development, and Implementation ("DDI") steps in more detail in preparation for procurement documents

Pre-Award

- AZ elected to use an optional task that we had added into our Feasibility Study RFP to create a SOW for DDI
- Security Reviews of the top three vendors by the Enterprise IT Organization (ASET) - understanding timing or if additional reviews needed
- Formal Presentation to the State's Information Technology Authorization Committee - Approval with Conditions
 - 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 Project Investment Justification (PIJ) to reflect the changes and submit it to ASET, and ITAC if required, for review and approval prior to further expenditure of funds.
 - Prior to moving any State data into the vendor-hosted environment and/or spending of funds, the Agency must work with ASET
- "New" interfaces planning activities such as initial contact with the new interfacing partner to understand their willingness and ability, having a DSA in place prior to onboarding the DDI vendor - depending on how many, this takes months/years
- One of the key issue we are facing is around the elaboration of requirements and use cases. Would be beneficial to have a Business Process Reengineering (BPR) effort to create business process models and use cases as part of the requirements elaboration scope of DDI

Implementation Strategy: Arizona is going with an incremental approach / Pilot

- Importance of understanding the strain this could have on the technical side vs. program/business
- Training, expectations, and communication on Agile processes for all project team members. Note: RFPs can be heavily deliverable based which does not always coincide with the Agile methodology. Suggest seeing if your RFP can be written to support or aligned with this methodology
- More upfront training on user testing and really conveying the importance to state staff about this. Testing is occurring in each sprint
- Level set on definitions / ensure you are speaking the same language
- Size of groups / sessions need to be the right mix to ensure the sessions need to move at the correct pace and that associated documentation is available. Ensuring the original "author" is in the sessions to help clarify requirements. Visibility of participants that identify the role/office they represent
- If you think you have enough, you don't. Plan for more. Have back-ups and have the back-ups have back-ups (IT and Program)

Office / Vendor Space:

- Optional task built into the RFP as dictated by AZ / DCSS providing project facility space - to date we are working completely remote due to pandemic. At AZ discretion we may require the vendor to provide a project facility. The pandemic created a lot of available space

DDI Planning Cont...

Equipment for IM Resources - State provided

- Due to security and logistical constraints this approach has been challenging
- IM vendor needs access to the department's network- know what options exist, if providing equipment, what sort of package is needed, how much lead time is needed. Conflicted with our Department's IT refresh strategy (supply chain issues). This number kept changing. Our project is fully virtual due to the pandemic, knowing what other options exist, the cost of all of those options

Tools - State provided (weigh the risk, cost, effort, capacity)

- BIG DEAL! - Large lesson learned, STRONGLY encourage writing these requirements in your DDI SOW / RFP - Have the vendor be responsible & procure while covering the potential transition of licenses to the state up front. Amount of tools, licenses, software is in the dozens
- Security reviews for all of these services by your IT or Umbrella IT (competing priorities, length of time, resources)
- Procurement teams effort, resources and capacity - in AZ we should have started this two months sooner
- Backup / contingency planning is needed if tools are delayed or cannot be approved - risk project delays

Staff training approach

- IM Vendor proposal is "Just In Time" training approach. Vendor will train staff within 20 days of system implementation using the ADDIE Training approach (Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate)
- Instructor Led Training approach in a virtual environment -Train the Trainer
- Training materials will include; Instructor guide, student guide, quick reference guide, Web-based training, and online help.
- IM vendor partnering with AZDES Training Department (~10 resources)

Data Quality Issues - Data cleanup activities should be accomplished in workgroups to identify any cleanup activities to case files - Level 1 should be handled by caseworkers on a daily basis when they touch a file and Level 2 should be handled as part of data conversion or adhoc jobs for one time clean up if applicable

Data Conversion - Mock conversion using a full load of production data with pre-approval from the IRS. Allows us to resolve any issues before moving ahead to full deployment

- **Approach:** Identify selection criteria for cases by designated counties and/or zip codes for pilot and subsequent regions, consider scenarios where a participant is associated to multiple cases across different regions of the state, consider the transition period in which some cases will need to be maintained or created in the legacy system until all regions are converted

Testing - We are using a Pilot Phase - SLAs in place with vendor that have enter & exit criteria as well as a zero tolerance for defects before moving to the next phase. All issues will be addressed in the Pilot Phase. This may increase /extend the timeline of this phase but will ensure we are successful in full implementation / go live phase

Pre-Planning - Resource Management Planning: How to balance operations with project work, staff augmentation, level of time commitment from stakeholders...

Project Staff Expectations

- Discussion about what to expect in each phase of the project (Design, Data Conversion, Construction, User Acceptance Testing, Training, System Rollout)
 - Not all resources are dedicated the same way or percentage of time
- Prior to procurement of the vendors, AZ met with staff / again after procurement
 - Responsibilities, timeline and time commitment, number of resources, expertise needed - 80% of time
- Met with program SMEs, Tribal Program, Courts, and AGO staff to review these expectations
- No staff augmentation yet - likely getting to that point in the project (10 months into development)
- Data Clean Up - All hands on deck
- Change Champions are being leveraged for User Acceptance Testing along with project SMEs

Planning for the unplanned - It will happen

- Major Initiatives driven by outside entities, law changes, enterprise strategies
- Identify the resources that can be dedicated to “keeping the lights on”, with back-ups

Commitment from Stakeholders

- Amended Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Navajo Nation to ensure contributions and commitment
- IGA already in place with all Clerks of Court and AG’s Office
- 15 Counties; Non-IVD - Larger counties supporting the smaller counties (data clean up, training, design)

IT Pre-Plan: When and how did you start to research and discuss your State's requirements for software/hardware, the Information Technology ("IT") resources needed for planning and project?

Software/Hardware Requirements

- Discussed originally pre-feasibility study and during feasibility study
 - "Umbrella IT" guidance
- Leadership Changes - Documentation or justification of the business reasons of decisions and direction
- State Enterprise IT Strategy was made clear post feasibility study (length of time, clarity of IT roadmap)
- RFP Process
 - Clarification and responses from the vendors were sought on this area

IT Resources

- Feasibility Study and Post Feasibility Study
 - **What we knew:** We had an aging workforce / limited skill sets to work in both worlds; this was a reason for modernizing
 - Mainframe resources for "keeping the lights on" and data conversion activities, interfaces
- System Implementation - What we wish we knew then...
 - Since Project Kick-off in Jan. 2021, IT resources discussions are constantly happening, are part of active project risks and issues
 - What you think you need, is likely not enough. Planning for retirements, resignations, skill sets, and capacity of unplanned work
- Under the Business/Functional Manager - Brought on three additional Senior Business Analysts to support the work
- Under the Technical Manager - Dedicated IT resources vs. Umbrella IT resources (e.g. security, architecture, etc.)
 - Ensuring resources are prioritizing their work for the project, if supporting other lines of business
- Struggling with the "keep the lights on" and unplanned activities (Sports Betting legislation / EPC Transition) - Dedicated resources needed in IT
- Note: IT Resources have been discussed at every phase of our project

Pre-Planning: Examples/Demonstrations from Other Jurisdictions- How did you determine and what did you ultimately decide regarding:

What information we needed from other states?

- Target states that are similar / relevant
- System Technical Architecture and components
- Functional differences between the transfers
- Technical differences between the transfers
- System Design, Development, Implementation Schedules (high level)
- System Roll Out Strategy
- Data Conversion Strategy
- Costs (Broken down by category)
- Challenges/Lessons Learned
- Details that would be helpful (e.g. tips for OCSE Analyst, Status Reports, APDs)

Whether to set these up, and if so, with whom, when, and virtual or on-site given the pandemic?

- Feasibility Study - In person - California, New Jersey, Delaware / Virtual - Florida
- Post Contract Award - Recommend Monthly (if other state willing) - AZ meets with Nevada and Indiana regularly - all virtual
- Throughout each and every phase there are states that were so supporting in meeting with the AZ team - Oregon, South Carolina, Delaware

Planning: IT Discussion: Q: Were there changes required to the state's infrastructure to support your new system or did the selected solution have to fit within the State's IT roadmap/plans?

- The AZ solution needed to fit within the enterprise IT roadmap
- Feasibility Study did not give the decision making executives or enterprise IT confidence in the transfer solutions technical architecture
- AZ sought clarification from DDI vendors during the RFP process:
 1. Elaborate on how the proposed solution would allow for ease of configurability within the platform
 2. Describe the capability of the proposed solution to allow for mobile accessibility and usability by the customer
 - AZ solution has a mobile first approach
 3. Describe how the proposed platform would provide the most cost effective method from a hardware/software perspective
 4. Provide the level of effort from technical staff and dependency post implementation for the ongoing maintenance of the proposed architecture solution
 - Two year O&M phase, an integrated team supports training and knowledge transfer to the AZ IT personnel in year 1 and then shadows, observes, supports in year 2
 5. Describe how the proposed architecture could leverage the SaaS, PaaS, or IaaS solutions
 - Our solution leverages all three elements
 6. Describe how the solution would interface with disparate other systems in the agency, that are built or to be build on various new technology using SaaS or PaaS solutions.
 - Solution is built with MuleSoft which is providing this integration
 7. Explain how the architecture would satisfy the defined Response Time Performance Standards as AZ defined
 - The time it takes for a user interacting with the system and the time the system takes to respond to the request.
- After all of these clarifications, AZ was able to make the best decision and was in alignment with the states enterprise IT strategy
- Due to length of time from feasibility study, we also did an RFI to learn about new features, enhancements, and upcoming technology advancements to ensure our solution would be relevant and modern. Although we were doing a transfer system, we still wanted to ensure we were getting the latest/greatest advancements in technology and to see if there should be any added requirements for the project above what the transfer solution would provide.