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# Read Me First

* Throughout this document the terms Streamlined Feasibility Study (FS) [*a.k.a., Streamlined Feasibility Study (FS) document (2020)]*, 2020 FS, FS/AoA/CBA, and FS are used interchangeably; each is generally referred to as FS.
* Throughout this document the terms legacy FS [*a.k.a., traditional, rigorous, or comprehensive Feasibility Study (FS), Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), and Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) document (July 1993)]*, 1993 FS, FS/AoA/CBA, and FS are used interchangeably; each is generally referred to as FS.
* The 1993 FS process will be retired on September 30, 2021. Effective October 1, 2021, the 2020 FS process will become OCSE’s primary reference for CSES modernization.
* Until September 30, 2021, a state may choose to follow the more traditional, rigorous, or comprehensive 1993 FS process described in the HHS/ACF Feasibility, Alternatives, and Cost Benefit Analysis Guide (July 1993) in lieu of the 2020 FS process described in this document (also known as a Streamlined FS Guide). That is, using this 2020 FS process for child support enforcement system modernization is optional, until the 1993 FS process is no longer recognized by OCSE.
* Results from either the 2020 FS or the 1993 FS for a CSES modernization project will require that a state’s CSES be certified or re-certified.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* For states selecting either the replatforming/refactoring or enhancement alternative, a FS is not required. These alternatives should be addressed as a ‘development project’ contained within a state’s annual advance planning document update (AAPDU), which is submitted to OCSE for consideration.
	+ For replatforming/refactoring efforts (i.e., no function, capability, feature enhancements, or modifications are integrated during the replatforming/refactoring process), a compliance visit or re-certification of the state’s CSES may not be required.
	+ For enhancement efforts (i.e., minor or minimal function, capability, or feature modifications are integrated during the enhancement process), a compliance visit or re-certification of the state’s CSES may not be required.
* A state *may* decide to change its CSES acronym from the current/legacy CSES acronym to a new/modernized CSES acronym. For states that choose to keep their current CSES’s name, replace references to < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > with < *State’s (legacy* *CSES Acronym)* > when preparing its FS documentation.
* For software development methodology, a state may use any methodology it chooses (e.g., Waterfall, Agile, or Hybrid). Currently, many states have adopted the agile methodology. However, waterfall is still being employed by some states.
* Hereafter, states, territories, and tribes are collectively referred to as ‘states.’

# Notes to the Author

[This document is a guide that may be used in conjunction with the Streamlined FS template to aid the author with preparing Streamlined FS artifacts for a child support enforcement system (CSES) modernization project. As such, it includes numerous boilerplate examples (statements, paragraphs, tables, and figures) that may be inserted into the state’s streamlined FS…by inserting text related to the state’s project.

* Text enclosed in square brackets ( [text] ) provides guidance to the document author, or describes the intent, assumptions and context for content included in this document.
* Text enclosed in angle brackets ( < text > ) indicates a field that should be replaced with information specific to a particular project.
* Text and tables are provided as boilerplate examples of wording and formats that may be used or modified as appropriate to a specific project. These are offered only as suggestions to assist in preparing project documents; they are not mandatory formats.
* See Figure in Section 1.1 in the Streamlined FS Guide for the Child Support Enforcement System Modernization Decision Points.
* Note: Text enclosed in parentheses (Estimated Length: number of pages/paragraphs) provides an estimated length or amount of content typically associated with preparing a particular section or subsection. This is an estimate only; the author determines the level of detail and amount of information and data to include.

When using this template, the following steps are recommended:

1. Replace all text enclosed in angle brackets (e.g., < Project Name >) with the correct field document values. These angle brackets appear in both the body of the document and in headers and footers.
2. As desired, use and/or modify boilerplate text for the specific boiler plate language.
3. To add new sections to the document, ensure that the appropriate header and body text styles are maintained. Styles used for the Section Headings are Heading 1, Heading 2 and Heading 3. Style used for boilerplate text is Body Text.
4. To update the Table of Contents, right-click on it, select “Update field” and choose the option - “Update entire table”.
5. Before submission of the first draft of this document, delete this instruction section “Notes to the Author” and all instructions to the author throughout the entire document.
6. Delete all references to section or subsection length (Estimated Length: pages/paragraphs). ]
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# Executive Summary

[The Executive Summary provides a high-level overview of key points that are supported by information and data included within the body of the Streamlined Feasibility Study (FS). As such, summarize key points in this Streamlined FS. Outline what this modernization investment (hereafter referred to as “project”) is about, benefits it will provide, and how it aligns with the goals and objectives of the organization. No new or unsupported information or data should be included within the Executive Summary. Avoid ambiguous acronyms, terminology, and concepts. Include a statement for readers desiring more detail – that additional information, data, and descriptions may be found within the body of this FS.]

*[Estimated Page Count: 1-5 pages)*

# Introduction

*< State’s >* FS documents our approach, analyses, and justification to modernize the *< child support enforcement system (CSES) (acronym) >.* This streamlined FS has been prepared by *< State >* in lieu of the more traditional, rigorous, or comprehensive FS as described in the Department of Health and Human Services/Administration for Children and Families (HHS/ACF) Feasibility, Alternatives, and Cost Benefit Analysis Guide (1993) (and related documents). Upon reviewing this document, the reader should be able to understand what the project is about, the role of the project in the *< State’s department/agency/ enterprise* *>* modernization plan, and the business justification for this project. The reader should also appreciate how the project improves the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the *< State’s (CSES acronym) >*. Following completion of this FS, *< State >* will submit it – along with supporting artifacts – to the OCSE for consideration*.*

*(Estimated Length: 1 paragraph)*

## How to Use this Guide

*[See Figure in Section 1.1 in the streamlined FS Guide for the Child Support Enforcement System Modernization Decision Points.]*

*[Describe the state’s CSES modernization and how it will satisfy modernization requirements associated with federal IV-D regulations, policies, and guidance. What state and federal requirements does the state anticipate that this FS documentation will satisfy? How and where does the state anticipate using this FS documentation to aid in preparing other required state and federal documentation (e.g., IAPD and subsequent AAPDUs).]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 paragraph)*

## Mission Statement

*[Insert the state’s child support mission statement(s), relative to IV-D services. This statement may also include the state level family or human services mission, of which the state’s IV-D mission is a subset. Note that this information typically may be found on the state’s web site, in reports to state leadership, child support requests for proposals and contracts, and/or possibly within annual planning document submissions to OCSE. For example: “The mission of the < State’s CSES > is to provide timely child support services that are in the best interest of the child….”].*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Background

*[The state’s Background provides a brief history of the state’s CSES from inception through the current system. Information to include is as follows:*

* *Information regarding the current CSES’s history and lifecycle, the dates that it was certified, the remaining time period – number of years through CY20## – that the state plans to continue to use the current CSES.*
	+ *Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA-88) certification date.*
	+ *Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) certification date.*
	+ *Subsequent system modernization efforts with corresponding re-certification dates. Include the type of alternative selected for each modernization effort (e.g., Transfer from South Carolina).*
* *Describe the current status of the state’s CSES.*
* *An example is provided in the FS guide.]*

The Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA-88) was the first major piece of legislation mandating that Title IV-D programs develop and operate a single, statewide computer system. On *< date >* OCSE certified *< State’s CSES acronym >* as fully meeting the automation requirements in FSA-88. Since that time, federal legislation – such as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) and the Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005 – mandated additional requirements for state automated computer systems. That is, all state computer systems must meet all federal certification requirements mandated under FSA-88 and PRWORA. PRWORA requirements mandated that states develop various automated enhancements and incorporate them into their respective Title IV-D child support enforcement systems. PRWORA development activity for *< State >* ensued from *< start date >* to final certification for the *< State’s CSES acronym >* on *< date >*.

Since the *< State’s CSES acronym >* certification on *< date >*, it has not been significantly upgraded, enhanced, or modernized. To date, minor enhancements that have been integrated into *< State’s CSES acronym >* have not required it to be recertified.

*…or…*

Since initial certification, the *< State’s CSES acronym >* has been significantly upgraded or modernized using the *< \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ alternative. >* The *< State’s CSES acronym’s >* most recent modernization project was initiated on *< date >* and completed on *< date >.* Since *< State’s CSES acronym’s >* architecture, requirements, functionality, and/or capabilities *< were/were not > < significantly enhanced …or… changed >,* re-certification *< was/was not >* required; it ensued from *< start date >* to final certification on *< date >.*

*…and/or…*

More recently, the *< State’s CSES acronym >* has been *< replatformed/refactored or enhanced. >* The *< State’s CSES acronym >* replatforming/refactoring or enhancing began on *< start date >* and was completed on *< date >.* Since overall requirements, functionality, and capabilities *< remained constant …or… significantly changed >,* re-certification *< was/was not >* required*.*

*…and…*

*< State’s current operational CSES acronym >,* which has been operational since *< date, >* is expected to reach end of useful life on *< date. >* That is, its useful life is estimated to be in *< ‘x’ >* years*. [Briefly describe the status of the current operational CSES; include high-level information that will be supported with more detail in the remainder of this FS.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## Modernization Methodology

*[Briefly describe the state’s modernization methodology, vision, goals, and recent and/or ongoing planning efforts. For example, include brainstorming and/or discussions towards evolving the state’s CSES (e.g., to take advantage of technologies such as service oriented architecture (SOA) or migration to the cloud or open source standards/technologies.). Topics for consideration may include the following:*

* *Initial/ongoing modernization meetings and discussions.*
* *Initial/ongoing technology refresh roadmap preparation and update efforts.*
* *Identification and/or assignment of a PMP certified, modernization project manager.*
* *Preparation and formal approval of a modernization project charter.*
* *Preparation of a high level modernization vision and goals statement.*
	+ *What are the state’s near/mid/long term modernization goals? For example, does the state plan to continue as a federated IV-D CSES that is developed, enhanced, maintained, and operated separately from other state human service systems? What are the advantages and disadvantages towards remaining a federated IV-D CSES relative to the state’s IV-D mission?*
	+ *Is the state considering a time frame in which it plans to integrate with or consolidate its federated IV-D CSES into the state’s human service’s enterprise architecture, which may include multiple Human Service Program components (e.g., IV-B, IV-E, and Title XIX)? If yes, what are the estimated target dates to (1) begin planning for consolidation and (2) complete consolidation & migration into the state’s enterprise architecture? If no, provide a brief explanation.*
	+ *What is the modernization target completion date (development + certification) and projected date to retire its current CSES?*
	+ *Is the state requesting FS funding through a PAPD, ANAPD or AAPDU?]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Purpose

*[Define the purpose of the state’s FS effort, including its preparation effort, analyses to be conducted, documentation to be prepared, and estimated timeline to complete.]*

*[Note: A FS assists organizational stakeholders in making decisions regarding the viability of a proposed project effort. Use of a FS is considered standard practice throughout private and public industry.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Scope

*[Describe the state’s FS modernization scope, anticipated timeframe and level of effort to complete the FS, and documentation that the state plans to prepare for during the FS activity.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Intended Audience

*[Describe the audience for which state’s FS /CSES modernization documentation is intended; some examples may include state preparers, reviewers, approvers; and federal reviewers/approvers.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Document Authors

Table 1 summarizes the *< State’s >* government and contractor personnel who participated in preparing the < *new* *CSES acronym > FS*.

Table 1: Streamlined Feasibility Study Authors and Contributors

| **Name** | **Office Symbol** | **Position or Role** | **Gov or Ctr** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*[Insert a table showing the < State’s > authors and contributors to the FS effort.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## Document Organization

The balance of this Streamlined FS is organized as follows, such that each topic is addressed and documented. Note that each section depends upon information provided in one or more of its predecessors:

* Section 1 is the Project Introduction.
* Section 2 provides General Project Information.
* Section 3 presents an overview of the Status Quo CSES.
* Section 4 captures the Statement of Need/Problem Statement.
* Section 5 captures the Desired Benefits and Objectives.
* Section 6 provides the Requirements Analysis.
* Section 7 provides the Analysis of Alternatives.
* Section 8 provides the Cost Benefit Analysis.
* Section 9 presents the Risk Assessment.
* Section 10 identifies the Preferred Solution.
* Appendix A provides the Streamlined FS Approval Form.

*[Briefly identify the topics for each section and appendix/appendices in the state’s FS.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

# General Project Information

*[Add a brief overview of the state’s modernization* *project.]* Table 2 capturesproject information for the *< State’s (new CSES acronym) >* modernizationproject.

Table 2: General Project Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Name** | *< Enter a name for the proposed project >* |
| **Submission Date** | *< mm/dd/yyyy >* |
| **Desired Start Date** | *< Enter a desired start date for the requested project >* |
| **Requested By** | *< Enter full name >* |
| **Business Owner** | *< Enter Business Owner/Manager supporting this document >* |
| **Contact Information** | *< Enter email address and phone number of primary contact >* |
| **Project Charter Approved By** | *< Enter full name >* |
| **Project Charter Date** | *< mm/dd/yyyy >* |

*[Insert a table showing the < State’s > general modernization project information.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 paragraph)*

## < *State’s* > Project Stakeholders

Table 3 summarizes the *< State’s >* significant organizations, offices, and/or individuals directly and indirectly impacted by the *< State’s (new* *CSES acronym) >* modernizationproject.

Table 3: Project Stakeholders

| **Name** | **Office Symbol** | **Position or Role** | **Gov or Ctr** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*[Insert a table showing the < State’s > significant organizations, offices, and/or individuals directly and indirectly impacted by the < State’s (new CSES acronym) > modernization project.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## *< State’s >* Organizational Relationships

The < *State’s* > IV-D Services Organization (Figure 1) shows the hierarchical relationships between the child support services office and pertinent state offices (including local, county, and/or judicial), federal offices, the < *State’s (current/legacy CSES Acronym)* > operations and operations (O&M) support services team, the anticipated < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > modernization project team(s) [e.g., [program management office (PMO); Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI); Quality Assurance (QA); and Training], and the anticipated independent verification and validation (IV&V) team. Only significant positions/roles are identified; contractor positions/roles are highlighted with an asterisk.

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 1: < State’s > IV-D Services Organization

*[Insert an organization chart showing the high-level framework above, lateral, and below the state’s IV-D child support services office. Include blocks showing relative relationships between and among the state’s (1) IV-D office, (2) current/legacy child support services O&M team, (3) modernization project team(s) (e.g., PMO, DDI, QA, and Training), and (4) the IV&V team. Include only significant positions/roles; as appropriate, differentiate between state and contractor positions/roles.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## < *State’s* > ModernizationProject Timeline

Figure 2 shows the < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > modernization project modernization project timeline, while Figure 3 decomposes the state’s planning phase into its various activities.

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 2: < State’s > Modernization Project Timeline

*[Insert a figure of the state’s overall CSES modernization project timeline showing the planning and development phases, ongoing* current/legacy *CSES O&M/Enhancements phase, and the first three years of the modernized CSES’s O&M/Enhancements phase. Provide a description of the significant tasks that the state plans to conduct during each phase.]*

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 3: < State’s > Modernization Project Planning Phase Timeline

*[Insert a figure of the state’s CSES modernization project planning phase timeline showing significant activities, along with corresponding subtasks/activities.]*

The< *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > Modernization Project Timeline (Figure 2) provides an overview of the CSES modernization project phases (planning, development, plus the first three years of the modernized CSES O&M/Enhancement timeline), as well as ongoing < *State’s (Current/Legacy CSES Acronym)* > O&M/Enhancement Phase until the < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > is operational.

* The **Planning Phase** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
	+ **Preliminary Activities** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
	+ **Streamlined FS** **Activities** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
	+ **IAPD Activities** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
	+ **Procurement Activities** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
* The **Development Phase** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
* The **< current CSES Acronym >** **Legacy System O&M/Enhancements Phase** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >
* The **< new CSES Acronym > Modernized System O&M/Enhancements Phase** includes < ……*insert description of significant tasks/efforts conducted during this phase* ……. >

*[Briefly describe significant tasks/efforts conducted during each phase* *of the CSES project modernization effort. A state’s interpretation my may be different than tasks/efforts described in the FS Guide.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

## *< State’s >* Streamlined Feasibility Study Methodology

*[Describe the state’s methodology and evaluation criteria that will be applied during the AoA, Cost and Benefits Analyses, and Down-Select steps presented in the workflow below. This methodology should address foundational information and data described in the statement of need, desired benefits, system objectives, and requirements analysis to reinforce this methodology. Because the streamlined FS methodology is anticipated to be tailored and unique to an individual state, it needs to be defined clearly, defensible, repeatable, and subsequently applied consistently across all candidates under consideration. As an example, this methodology may be very brief, such as the following:*

* *Was the Transfer candidate certified within the Last 10 Years? –The state may not necessarily select the most recently certified system.*
* *Is the Transfer candidate system scalable, and easily accommodate small, medium, and large caseloads?*
* *Does the transfer candidate fit into the state’s agency-wide modernization plan?*
* *Is there a build from scratch that costs less than the Transfer system and has a well-defined development methodology that our state can consider?]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

## *< State’s >* Streamlined Feasibility Study Workflow

The workflow for this streamlined FS is comprised of a sequence of 10 topics where the outputs from one topic sequentially feeds the next topic, until the last topic yields the FS’s underlying objective – the state’s preferred alternative. Figure 4 shows an overview of the < *State’s* > streamlined FS workflow process, while Table 4 includes the < *State’s* > description of each topic. Together, the workflow and activity descriptions define the < *State’s* > tailored analysis methodology that will be followed throughout this FS document.

**

Figure 4: < State’s > Streamlined Feasibility Study Workflow Processes

*[If the < State’s > workflow process diagram is different from that shown in the FS Guide, insert a figure showing the < State’s > workflow process to be followed for the remainder of their FS document.]*

Table 4: < State’s > Workflow Step Descriptions

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table that briefly describes activities associated with each step in the state’s workflow process; that is, the steps that the state will follow throughout this FS document. A state’s interpretation may be somewhat different than workflow described in the FS Guide.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

# Status of the < *State’s (Current CSES Acronym)* > System

*[Provide an overview of the state’s currently operational CSES.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 paragraph)*

## < *State’s* > Project Organizational Structure

The < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > Modernization Project Organization Chart (Figure 5) shows key state and contractor positions/roles and their hierarchical relationships within the < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > modernization project team. Included are the IV-D Director, State’s Modernization Program Manager (Gov PM), Vendor’s Modernization Program Manager (Ctr PM) position, and key state and contractor positions for each team (e.g., PMO, DDI, QA, Training, IV&V, follow-on O&M/Enhancement service teams; other teams may include security, network, and database). Where known, names are included for significant positions/roles; contractor positions/roles are highlighted with an asterisk.

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 5: < State’s (New CSES Acronym) > Project Organizational Structure

*[Insert an organization chart showing an overview of the state’s modernization project. As appropriate, differentiate both state and contractor positions/roles for the PMO, DDI, QA, IV&V, Training teams, as well as a place holder for the follow-on O&M/Enhancement service team. At a minimum, include the IV-D Director, State’s Modernization Program* *Manager (Gov PM), Vendor’s Modernization Program Manager (Ctr PM) position, as well as key state and contractor leadership positions for each team (e.g., PMO, DDI, QA, Training, IV&V, Training, follow-on O&M/Enhancement service teams; other teams may include security, network, and/or database).]*

*[Note: The only names that may be known – at the time that this FS is prepared – may be the primary IV-D office points of contact (e.g., government and contractor staff who participated in the planning phase, are participating in the preliminary and FS activities, and potentially expect to participate in the subsequent IAPD activity).]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## *< State’s (Current CSES Acronym) >* System Architecture

The < *State’s (current CSES Acronym)* > system – generically referred to as the current, “As-Is,” legacy, or Status Quo system – has been operational since *< date >* and will continue to be maintained and enhanced (as needed) until the < *State’s (new CSES Acronym)* > system is completed, certified, and approved for operations. Note that the currently operational < *(current CSES Acronym)* > system is expected to reach end of life on *< date. >*  The < *State’s (current CSES Acronym)* > system architecture diagram shown in Figure 6 is based upon < *technologies* > and < *software >………….< insert text description of the current CSES architecture. >*

*[Include an overview of the technologies employed, significant business and technical capabilities, features, and system performance. Briefly describe significant components, interfaces, and other features and capabilities shown in this figure. In addition, identify the skill sets required to maintain and enhance it, as well as skills that a typical caseworker, user, and client must possess in order to use this system.] [Add a statement regarding service delivery model employed; that is, how it is administered and the judicial processes that are employed.]*

* *Judicial*
* *Administrative*
* *State Administered*
* *County Administered*
* *Contractor Operated and State-Administered]*

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 6: < State’s (current CSES Acronym) > “As-Is” System Architecture

*[Insert a figure(s) that summarizes the state’s “As-Is” system’s architecture diagram(s); add a diagram that shows interoperability with external systems. Briefly describe the significant elements in each diagram.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

## *< State’s (Current CSES Acronym) >* Data and Information

Table 5: < State’s (current CSES Acronym) > Data and Information

| **Category** | **Year****1** | **Year****2** | **Year****3** | **Year****4** | **Year****5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total Caseloads for Five Consecutive Years |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Caseloads for Current Assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Caseloads for Former Assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Collections |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paternity Established |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Cases Open at the End of the Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Cases and Caseloads |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Orders Established |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Case Workers/Full Time-Staff Equivalent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Customers/Users  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Children in IV-D Cases |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Collections |  |  |  |  |  |
| Payments to Families |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arrears |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Help Desk Tickets |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Walk-Ins for Help Desk Support |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Call-Ins for Help Desk Support |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of O&M System Support Staff |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of O&M Customization/Enhancement Staff |  |  |  |  |  |

*[State needs to refine the list of metric categories in this table to be categories for which the state gathers information/metrics/data.]*

Table 5 summarizes the < *state’s (current CSES Acronym)* > general data and information for the last five (5) years*. [Summarize various information and data that pertains to the current CSES, including but not limited to the number of cases, case workers, and users/customers for last five years. Also, summarize the number of O&M resources/staff for the last five years – subdivided into two groups:*

1. *Staff who maintain and patch the underlying system infrastructure, network, servers, as well as hardware, firmware, and software (e.g., security patches to the operating system). Tasks and activities conducted by these staff have no direct impact upon the CSES application. These staff also provide Tier I Help Desk support. That is, this group of individuals typically includes network engineers, database engineers, security engineers, and help desk technicians.*
2. *Staff who customize, enhance, and/or maintain the CSES application. These staff also provide Tier II/III/IV issue resolution support. That is, this group of individuals typically includes an architect, requirements engineers, software programmers, database engineers, testers, and technical document writers directly associate with the CSES application.*

*Example questions that a state may wish address include, but are not limited to the following:*

* *With this modernization project, does the state expect to realize any improvement to the above metrics?*
* *Does this modernization improve the technology stack to be more in tune with the latest technology trends?*
* *What other significant metric improvements does the state anticipate from this modernization effort? ]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## *< State’s (Current CSES Acronym) >* Requirements Related Artifacts

Table 6: “As-Is” Requirements Related Artifacts

| **Artifact** | **Version** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Status Quo Systems’ Functional Requirements Specification (FRS) [*Note that the FRS is a living document that includes met, partially met, and unmet requirements, candidate enhancements, and more.*] |  |  |
| System Design Document (SDD) or the General Systems Design (GSD) |  |  |
| Use Cases (UC) |  |  |
| Interface Control Document (ICD) |  |  |
| System Security Plan (SSP) |  |  |
| System Administration Guide (SAG) |  |  |
| Database Administration Guide (DAG) |  |  |

Table 6 lists the < *State’s (current CSES Acronym)* > “As-Is” requirements related artifacts with their most recent review/update date.

*[Note: Encourage the state to include the functional requirements document, requirements specifications, and system design documents with architecture diagrams, use cases, interface control document, and system security specification. Typically, change requests are captured in a ‘living’ system or functional requirements specification (FRS) and system requirements document (SRD); and include ‘met,’ ‘partially met,’ and ‘unmet’ requests for improvements and changes. These artifacts are stored and controlled via various techniques, such as stand-alone documents in shared or common folders, folders utilizing access control lists (ACL) to manage who can read or modify them, or via software configuration management tools [e.g., application lifecycle management (ALM) tools] employing roles and privileges to control access.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

# Statement of Need/Problem Statement

*[Provide an overview of the statement of need and/or problem statement.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Technical and Business Problems

*[Capture the problems that need to be resolved by summarizing significant system problems, challenges, deficiencies, limitations, and/or issues with current/legacy CSES’s capabilities, performance, and/or maintainability.] [Note: Within the CBA section of the FS, significant or key limitation/issue will need to be addressed/assessed relative to how each alternative addresses the significant or key limitations/issues identified here.]*

* + *Business Perspective on Problems/Needs?*
	+ *Technology Perspective on Problems/Needs?*
	+ *Security Considerations?*
	+ *Other?*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

## Constraints

*[Capture the state’s CSES modernization constraints.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

## Assumptions

*[Capture the state’s CSES modernization assumptions.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

# Desired Benefits and System Objectives

*[Provide an overview of the State’s effort to capture desired CSES benefits and system objectives.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Desired Benefits

*[Using the current system’s known problems, challenges, deficiencies, limitations, and/or issues, list and characterize benefits that the state desires from the investment of organizational resources into this project – the state’s next-generation CSES. Group these desired benefits under the categories of tangible/quantifiable and in-tangible/qualitative. For reference, definitions for tangible, intangible, quantitative, and qualitative are provided in the FS Guide. Within these benefits, prioritize this list or identify those objectives that are key; that is, the modernized CSES must address these in order to be a viable long term solution for the state. This prioritized list or key benefits may be used within the analysis of alternatives as go/no go discriminators for a candidate alternative.]*

* *[Quantitative/Tangible Benefits*
	+ *]*
* *[Qualitative/In-Tangible Benefits*
	+ *]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

## System Objectives

*[Using the statement of need/problem statement and desired benefits as a reference, derive and characterize system objectives that the state desires from the investment of organizational resources into this project – the state’s next-generation CSES. Group these objectives under the categories of tangible/quantifiable and in-tangible/qualitative. For reference, definitions for tangible, intangible, quantitative, and qualitative are provided in the FS Guide. Within these objectives, prioritize this list or identify those objectives that are key; that is, the modernized CSES must address these in order to be a viable long term solution for the state. Note that this prioritized list or key objectives may be used within the analysis of alternatives as go/no go discriminators for a candidate alternative.]*

* *[Quantitative/Tangible Objectives*
	+ *]*
* *[Qualitative/In-Tangible Objectives*
	+ *]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

# Requirements Analysis

*[Provide an overview of the state’s functional requirements definition and documentation process.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Notional “To-Be” System

The *< State’s (CSES Acronym) >* next-generation CSES’s notional architecture diagram shown in Figure 7 is based upon < technologies > and < software > ….

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 7: < State’s (new CSES Acronym) > Notional “To-Be” System Architecture

*[Insert a figure(s) that summarizes the state’s notional “To-Be” system architecture. Briefly describe the significant, desired elements in this diagram(s).]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## High Level Business Impact

The *< State’s (CSES Acronym) >* next-generation child support enforcement system’s high level impacts include, but are not limited to the following: ….

*[Outline, at a high level, the business functions/processes that may be impacted and how the project can be successfully implemented. Describe plans for addressing ongoing operations, future growth, new technologies, best practices, open source standards, and how this will be addressed and managed. Consider not only the requirements for additional hardware, software, and space, but also where financial funding for these plans will come from, additional resource requirements, staffing, training, and other expenditures. Also describe how investment performance will be measured. Identify specific performance indicators that may be used to measure investment outcomes and progress towards addressing the particular business needs.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

# Analysis of Alternatives

*[The Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) section should identify options and alternatives to the proposed project and the strategy used to identify and define them. Further analysis of these potential options should be performed to identify a preferred solution. Include a description of the approach(es) for the identification of alternatives and an outline/description of each alternative considered. Include at least two viable alternatives: keeping the “Status Quo” or “As-Is” alternative (i.e., reusing existing people, equipment, and/or processes) plus at least one additional alternative. Subsequent sections of the FS will include the cost benefit analysis and risk assessment in order to identify one specific candidate as the preferred solution.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## AoA Methodology

*[Define/describe the state’s analysis of alternatives (AoA) methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria. If the state desires evaluation or scoring criteria, it is up to the state to define their respective criteria. It is recommended that these criteria be simple, concise, and easy to apply. Although this ‘tailored’ or ‘lite-weight’ AoA methodology encourages simplicity and ease of use, the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation and/or scoring criteria must still be defensible, repeatable, and applied consistently across all candidates that were considered.*

*(Estimated Length: 2-3 paragraphs)*

## Pool of Candidate Alternatives

*[Identify all of the candidate alternatives that the state considered. The state’s pool of candidates and alternatives may be smaller or larger than the candidates listed in the guide; also, a state may consider multiple transfer candidates or no transfer candidates at all.[[2]](#footnote-2)]*

*(Estimated Length: 2-3 paragraphs)*

## Down-Select

*[Down-select to at least two but no more than five viable alternatives, one of which is the Status Quo alternative; that is, keeping things “As-Is” (reusing existing people, equipment, and/or processes). For each chosen alternative, apply the state’s ‘defined’ or ‘tailored’ or ‘lite-weight’ AoA methodology and conduct a more extensive analysis and comparison versus the information developed in the statement of need, desired benefits and objectives, and requirements analysis. [Note: For simplicity and efficiency, a state may decide to use only selected or key information described in the statement of need, desired benefits and objectives, and/or requirements analysis – instead of requiring that this methodology address all aspects of this information.] Identify at least two — one of which is the Status Quo system — as the candidates and provide supporting information relative to the state’s alternatives analysis methodology and evaluation criteria. Following this down-select process, proceed with the cost benefit analysis.]*

*(Estimated Length: 2-3 paragraphs)*

### Status Quo

*[For the* ***Status Quo alternative****, briefly summarize why this alternative is being retired; that is, provide information relative to the state’s alternatives analysis methodology and evaluation criteria that disqualify it as one of the state’s modernization candidate solutions. In addition, state why it will be used as the baseline reference system for the subsequent cost benefit analysis and risk assessment.]*

*[Example Language: The < State’s (current CSES Acronym) > Status Quo (“As-Is” system; to continue to use existing system) is/is not a viable option for modernization, because………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

### Enhance Existing Solution Architecture

*[Describe the* ***Enhancing the Existing Solution Architecture alternative****………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification.]*

*[Example Language:* ***Enhancing*** *the < State’s (current CSES Acronym) > system’s* ***Existing Solution Architecture*** *(i.e., enhancing the Status Quo system) is/is not being considered as a viable option for modernization, because ………../*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### New Development

*[Describe the* ***New Development alternative****………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification.]*

*[Example Language:* ***New Development*** *(Custom Build from Scratch) is/is not being considered as a viable option for modernization, because ………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### Commercial-Off-The-Shelf/Government-Off-The-Shelf

*[Describe the* ***COTS or GOTS alternative****………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification.]*

*[Example Language:* ***Commercial-Off-The-Shelf*** *(COTS) or* ***Government-Off-The-Shelf*** *(GOTS) is/is not a viable option for modernization, because ………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### Transfer

*[If no Transfer candidates meet this macro criteria …or… none are being considered in this FS, then the state will need to provide an explanation.]*

*[Example Language: The reason is that no transfer candidates are feasible, because < …insert text[[3]](#footnote-3)…. > ]*

*[Delete Sections 7.3.5.1 through 7.3.5.3.]*

For example:

*< State >* *has determined that it will build from scratch; that is, proceed with the New Development alternative.*

*< State > has determined that it will employ a COTS product-based solution that is not currently being used by any* other state.

***…or…***

*[Transfer candidates that satisfy this macro criteria are summarized in Table 7; each is further evaluated and/or scored in Sections 7.3.5.1 through 7.3.5.3 below.]*

Table 7: Transfer Candidates Satisfying Macro Criteria

| **Alternative**  | **Macro Criteria Satisfied** |
| --- | --- |
| Transfer *< State #1’s CSES Acronym >* System | * Certified on *< date. >*
* Expected end of life on *< date. >*
* Built upon SOA ( *< server type, database type, primary software type >* ).
* Employs *< service delivery model type. >*
* Scalable to accommodate *< number >* or more cases and *< number >* or more caseworkers and users.
 |
| Transfer *< State #2’s CSES Acronym >* System | * Certified on *< date. >*
* Expected end of life on *< date. >*
* Built upon SOA ( *< server type, database type, primary software type >* ).
* Employs *< service delivery model type. >*
* Scalable to accommodate *< number >* or more cases and *< number >* or more caseworkers and users.
 |
| Transfer *< State #3’s CSES Acronym >* System | * Certified on *< date. >*
* Expected end of life on *< date. >*
* Built upon SOA ( *< server type, database type, primary software type >* ).
* Employs *< service delivery model type. >*
* Scalable to accommodate *< number >* or more cases and *< number >* or more caseworkers and users.
 |

*[Using the high-level AoA methodology criteria associated with transfer candidates (e.g., a system was certified within the last ‘x’ years, utilizes service delivery model type ‘y’, is employing specific technologies, and/or is a COTS-based system), identify all of the transfer candidates that fit within this AoA criteria. In each subsection below, describe each Transfer alternative…………..and qualify or disqualify each transfer candidate using the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation criteria.]*

*[Note: If no Transfer alternatives are considered, include an explanation of why such a transfer is not feasible if another alternative is identified.*[[4]](#footnote-4) *]*

*[Note: Travel to other states is not required to evaluate a Transfer Candidate(s). While evaluating another state’s CSES as a candidate ‘transfer’ alternative, a state may still consider seeking an on-site visit(s) with the ‘transfer’ candidate state’s representatives. However, an on-site visit(s) is not required for a FS. That being said, it is up to each state to determine the optimal approach towards gathering information and evaluating candidate transfer solutions. That is, states may decide to eliminate the time commitment to schedule multiple trips and meetings, which require considerable effort and time to plan, coordinate, conduct, and follow-up; as well as the level of effort to conduct detailed comparative analyses. In lieu of an on-site visit(s), a state may choose to evaluate a candidate transfer system’s capabilities and features during demonstrations via teleconference(s) or webinar(s); exchanging requirements and performance information/data via email or secure file transfer; or by using other communication tools.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

#### Transfer *< State #1’s CSES Acronym >* System

*[Describe the Transfer < State #1’s CSES Acronym > System alternative………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification. Briefly summarize communications, meetings, demonstrations, and/or trips that were conducted with candidate transfer system’s states; if none of these events occurred, then document this fact.]*

*[Example Language: Transferring < State #1’s CSES Acronym > for potential use by the < State > is/is not a viable option for modernization, because ………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

#### Transfer *< State #2’s CSES Acronym >* System

*[Describe the Transfer < State #2’s CSES Acronym > System alternative………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification. Briefly summarize communications, meetings, demonstrations, and/or trips that were conducted with candidate transfer system’s states; if none of these events occurred, then document this fact.]*

*[Example Language: Transferring < State #2’s CSES Acronym > for potential use by the < State > is/is not a viable option for modernization, because ………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

#### Transfer *< State #3’s CSES Acronym >* System

*[Describe the Transfer < State #3’s CSES Acronym > System alternative………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification. Briefly summarize communications, meetings, demonstrations, and/or trips that were conducted with candidate transfer system’s states; if none of these events occurred, then document this fact.]*

*[Example Language: Transferring < State #3’s CSES Acronym > for potential use by the < State > is/is not a viable option for modernization, because ………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### Hybrid

*[Describe the* ***Hybrid alternative****………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification.]*

*[Example Language: The Hybrid alternative – based upon < State #1 components, State #2 components, and State #3 components > – is being considered for potential use by the < State > is/is not a viable option for modernization, because ………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### Multi-State Consortium

*[Describe the* ***< State #1/State #2/State #3 > Multi-State Consortium alternative****………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification.]*

*[Example Language: The* ***< State #1/State #2/State #3 > Multi-State Consortium*** *– based upon < \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ > – is being considered for potential use by the < State >**is/is not a viable option for modernization, because**………../*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### Enterprise-Wide System Framework

*[Describe the* ***Enterprise-Wide System Framework alternative****………….. If this alternative is not considered, very briefly state why. If this alternative is considered, then provide information relative to the state’s AoA methodology and evaluation/scoring criteria that qualify or disqualify it as one of the state’s viable modernization solutions. If it is a qualified alternative, then state whether it will or will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis. If the state determines that it will not be further evaluated in the cost benefit analysis, then provide justification.]*

*[Example Language: The < State’s >* ***Enterprise-Wide System Framework*** *is being considered for potential use by the < State >**is/is not a viable option for modernization, because**………..]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

# Cost Benefit Analysis

*[Provide an introduction to the state’s cost and benefits analyses methodology.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Cost Analysis

*[Provide an overview of the state’s cost analysis approach.]*

*(Estimated Length: 2-3 paragraphs)*

### Cost Analysis Timeline and Schedule

*[Provide an overview of the state’s cost analysis timeline and schedule. In the Alternative #1 and Alternative #2 examples below, the modernization project timeline is presented graphically in Figure 8, with the start and end dates delineated in Table 8.]*

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 8: < State’s (new CSES Acronym) > Modernization Project Timeline

*[Insert a figure of the state’s overall CSES modernization project timeline showing the modernization phases, ongoing current/legacy* *CSES O&M/Enhancements phase, and the first three years of the modernized CSES’s O&M/Enhancements phase. Provide a description of the significant tasks that the state plans to conduct during each phase.]*

*< Insert Figure Here >*

Figure 9: < State’s > Modernization Project Planning Phase Timeline

*[Insert a figure of the state’s CSES modernization project planning phase timeline showing significant activities, along with corresponding subtasks/activities.]*

Table 8: < State’s (new CSES Acronym) > Modernization Project Schedule

| **Phase or Activity** | **Start and End Dates** | **EstimatedDuration** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Budget Year defined asFederal Fiscal Year( *< start day > – < end day >* ) | Q1 = *< start day > – < end day >*Q2 = *< start day > – < end day >*Q3 = *< start day > – < end day >*Q4 = *< start day > – < end day >* |  |
| Preliminary Activities | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |
| Streamlined FS Activities | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |
| IAPD Activities | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |
| Procurement Activities | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |
| Alternative #x System’s Development Phase | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |
| Alternative #x System’s O&M Phase | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |
| Status Quo System’s O&M Phase | *< start date > – < end date >* | *< start Qtr > – < end Qtr >* | # Months |

*[Insert a table listing the start and end dates for each phase and significant activity of the state’s overall CSES modernization project. Provide a description of the significant tasks that the state plans to conduct during each phase.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-2 pages)*

### Alternative #1 Cost Analysis

*[Provide a prose description of key aspects of the state’s cost analysis for Alternative #1 shown in Table 9. Include pros and cons for these entries, as appropriate. Note that the Status Quo system’s O&M costs are included in the cost summary table, so the state shows the total CSES costs for a given year.]*

Table 9: < Alternative #1 > Cost Summary (Example)

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table showing the state’s cost analysis for Alternative #1. Attach the corresponding spreadsheet to the FS and submit it to OCSE.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

### Alternative #2 Cost Analysis

*[Provide a prose description of key aspects of the state’s cost analysis for Alternative #2 shown in Table 10. Include pros and cons for these entries, as appropriate. Note that the Status Quo system’s O&M costs are included in the cost summary table, so the state shows the total CSES costs for a given year.]*

Table 10: < Alternative #2 > Cost Summary (Example)

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table showing the state’s modernization cost summary for Alternative #2. Attach the corresponding spreadsheet to the FS and submit it to OCSE.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## Benefits Analysis

*[Provide an overview of the state’s benefits analysis approach.]*

*(Estimated Length: 2-3 paragraphs)*

### *< Alternative #1 CSES Acronym’s >* Benefits Analysis

*[Provide a description of Alternative #1’s quantitative and qualitative benefits (Tables Table 11 and Table 12, respectively), relative to objectives stated in Section 5.2.]*

Table 11: < Alternative #1 > Quantitative Benefits Summary

*< Insert Table Here >*

Table 12: < Alternative #1 > Qualitative Benefits Summary

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[For Alternative #1, insert tables that identify significant and/or key quantitative and qualitative benefits associated with implementing this alternative, along with a brief description of why each is a benefit and how it addresses one or more objectives stated in Section 5.2.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

### *< Alternative #2 CSES Acronym’s >* Benefits Analysis

*[Provide a description of Alternative #2’s quantitative and qualitative* *benefits (Tables Table 13 and Table 14, respectively), relative to objectives stated in Section 5.2.]*

Table 13: < Alternative #2 > Quantitative Benefits Summary

*< Insert Table Here >*

Table 14: < Alternative #2 > Qualitative Benefits Summary

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[For Alternative #2, insert tables that identify significant and/or key quantitative and qualitative benefits associated with implementing this alternative, along with a brief description of why each is a benefit and how it addresses one or more objectives stated in Section 5.2.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

### *< Status Quo CSES Acronym’s >* Benefits Analysis

*[Provide a description of the Status Quo system quantitative and qualitative benefits (Tables Table 15 and Table 16, respectively), relative to objectives stated in Section 5.2.]*

Table 15: < Status Quo CSES Acronym’s > Quantitative Benefits Summary

*< Insert Table Here >*

 Table 16: < Status Quo CSES Acronym’s > Qualitative Benefits Summary

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[For the Status Quo system, insert tables that identify significant and/or key quantitative and qualitative benefits associated with continuing to use the Status Quo system, along with a brief description of why each is a benefit and how it addresses one or more objectives stated in Section 5.2.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 pages)*

# Risk Assessment

*[Provide a summary of the state’s risk management and mitigation strategy.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Alternative #1 Risks and Mitigation Strategy

*[For the Alternative #1, identify basic business and technical risks and issues associated with executing the project, along with the strategy to mitigate each risk shown in Table 17. OMB risk areas include: Schedule, Initial Costs, Life-cycle Costs, Technical Obsolescence, Feasibility, Reliability of Systems, Dependencies/Interoperability, Surety Considerations, Future Procurements, Project Management, Overall Project Failure, Organizational/Change Management, Business, Data/Information, Technology, Strategic, Security, Privacy, and Project Resources.]*

Table 17: Project Risks Associated with < Alternative #1 CSES Acronym >

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table delineating risks associated with selecting this alternative as the state’s CSES modernization system. Provide a prose description of the information delineated in this table.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Alternative #2 Risks and Mitigation Strategy

*[For the Alternative #2, identify basic business and technical risks and issues associated with executing the project, along with the strategy to mitigate each risk shown in Table 18. OMB risk areas include: Schedule, Initial Costs, Life-cycle Costs, Technical Obsolescence, Feasibility, Reliability of Systems, Dependencies/Interoperability, Surety Considerations, Future Procurements, Project Management, Overall Project Failure, Organizational/Change Management, Business, Data/Information, Technology, Strategic, Security, Privacy, and Project Resources.]*

Table 18: Project Risks Associated with < Alternative #2 CSES Acronym >

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table delineating risks associated with selecting this alternative as the state’s CSES modernization system. Provide a prose description of the information delineated in this table.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Status Quo Risks and Mitigation Strategy

*[For the Status Quo system, briefly summarize significant business and technical risks and issues associated with continuing to use the Status Quo system, along with the strategy to mitigate each risk shown in Table 19. OMB risk areas include: Schedule, Initial Costs, Life-cycle Costs, Technical Obsolescence, Feasibility, Reliability of Systems, Dependencies/Interoperability, Surety Considerations, Future Procurements, Project Management, Overall Project Failure, Organizational/Change Management, Business, Data/Information, Technology, Strategic, Security, Privacy, and Project Resources.]*

Table 19: Project Risks Associated with Continuing to Use the < Status Quo CSES Acronym > System

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table delineating risks associated with continuing to use the Status Quo system. Provide a prose description of the information delineated in this table.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

# Preferred Alternative

The final step in *< State’s >* streamlined FS selecting the most cost-effective, viable, and/or optimal alternative, which is supported by analyses performed within this FS. Following selection of the modernization alternative, *< State >* will finalize this FS document and the supporting artifact(s), then forward it to OCSE for review.

*[Provide an overview of the state’s preferred alternative decision process.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

## Summary Comparison

Recap each alternative based on its Business & Operational Impact, Project Risk Assessment, and Cost Benefit Analysis. Table 20 summarizes the alternative(s) considered by the state. Based upon information, data, and analyses in this FS, Table 21 ranks this alternative(s) versus the Status Quo system.

*[Provide a summary of the state’s comparison and ranking results.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1-3 paragraphs)*

Table 20: Summary of Alternatives Considered

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table summarizing key objectives, significant points from the cost benefit analysis, and an overall risk assessment associated with each candidate alternative versus the Status Quo system.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

Table 21: Ranking

*< Insert Table Here >*

*[Insert a table ranking the candidate alternatives versus the Status Quo system.]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

## Alternative Selected

*[Explicitly identify the alternative that the state selected, and explain why this is the optimal solution that meets the state’s requirements, missions, and customer needs*

*[Example: Based on these results, the < alternative > is selected by the state…< insert text >….]*

*(Estimated Length: 1 page)*

# Appendix A: Streamlined FS Approval Form

The undersigned acknowledges that each person has reviewed the ***< Modernization Project Name’s >* Streamlined** **Feasibility Study (FS)** and agrees with the information presented within this document. Changes to this  **Streamlined FS** will be coordinated with, and approved by, the undersigned, or their designated representatives.

*[List the individual(s) whose signatures are required to approve this FS. Examples of individuals may include Business Owner, Project Manager (if identified), and any appropriate stakeholders. Add additional lines for signature as necessary.]*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: |  | Date: |  |
| Print Name: |  |  |  |
| Title: |  |  |  |
| Organization: |  |  |  |
| Role: |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: |  | Date: |  |
| Print Name: |  |  |  |
| Title: |  |  |  |
| Organization: |  |  |  |
| Role: |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: |  | Date: |  |
| Print Name: |  |  |  |
| Title: |  |  |  |
| Organization: |  |  |  |
| Role: |  |  |  |

1. *Automated Systems for Child Support Enforcement: A Guide for States – Updated 2017 (AT-17-11) [A Certification Guide for the States]* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Per 45 CFR §95.610(b)(3), the IAPD/IAPDU shall include … “a statement of alternative considerations including, where appropriate, the use of service-orientated architecture and a transfer of an existing system and an explanation of why such a transfer is not feasible if another alternative is identified.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Per 45 CFR §95.610(b)(3), the IAPD/IAPDU shall include … “a statement of alternative considerations including, where appropriate, the use of service-orientated architecture and a transfer of an existing system and an explanation of why such a transfer is not feasible if another alternative is identified.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *Per 45 CFR §95.610(b)(3), the IAPD/IAPDU shall include … “a statement of alternative considerations including, where appropriate, the use of service-orientated architecture and a transfer of an existing system and an explanation of why such a transfer is not feasible if another alternative is identified.”* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)