

State of Colorado
Department of Human Services



Child Care Automated Tracking System (CHATS)
Assessment Project

D.3: Options Analysis, Impacts, and Recommendations Report

Final Delivered: October 14, 2014

Submitted by:

Charles K. Leadbetter, Principal
Kristan Drzewiecki, Manager
BerryDunn

100 Middle Street

Portland, ME 04104

Phone: (207) 541-2200

cleadbetter@berrydunn.com

kdrzewiecki@berrydunn.com



Table of Contents

Section	Page
1 Executive Summary.....	4
2 Introduction.....	9
2.1 Project Background and Purpose.....	9
2.2 Report Objectives.....	9
2.3 Approach and Work Performed.....	9
2.3.1 Work Performed	9
2.3.2 Analysis Methodology.....	10
2.4 Project Influences.....	11
2.4.1 Assumptions	11
2.4.2 Constraints	12
2.5 Report Format.....	12
3 Options Analysis Results.....	13
3.1 Statement of Need	13
3.2 Descriptions of Options	14
3.2.1 Option 1: “Do Nothing”.....	14
3.2.2 Option 2: Enhance CHATS.....	14
3.2.3 Option 3: Hybrid Solution.....	15
3.2.4 Option 4: Replace CHATS.....	15
3.3 Assessment of Evaluation Factors	16
3.3.1 Meets State Objectives.....	16
3.3.2 Alignment with Industry Trends and Best Practices.....	18
3.3.3 Impact on Stakeholders	19
3.3.4 Long-term Viability	20
3.3.5 Time to Implement.....	22
3.3.6 Estimated Total Cost of Ownership	23
3.3.7 Technical Feasibility	24
3.3.8 Overall Risk	25
3.4 Summary of Options Analysis Results	27
3.4.1 Weighting Factor	27
4 Conclusions.....	29
4.1 Summary of Results.....	29

4.2 Next Steps..... 29

4.3 Additional Recommendations..... 30

Appendix A: Acronymns.....32

Appendix B: Gap Analysis34

Table 1: Revision History

Version	Date	Description
v.01	9/8//2014	Draft for Discussion submitted to State Advisory Group for review prior to 9/11/2014 Work Session.
V1.0	10/14/2014	Final submitted to Project Manager with changes based on Advisory Group comments; updated Recommendation 2 to say “OIT and OEC”; revised Evaluation Factor 1 to “Meets User Objectives” from “Meets State Objectives” throughout; and changed weighting factors for “Impact on Stakeholders” from 2 to 3 and for “Estimated Total Cost of Ownership” from 1 to 2. Updated Appendix B to reflect changes requested to the D1 deliverable.

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Colorado Child Care Automated Tracking System (CHATS) 2.0 was a \$14.9 million system replacement project fully deployed state-wide in December 2010, based on an RFP that was released in December 2007. The “full deployment” did not include mission critical scope that users were expecting, including the provider portal, robust reporting capabilities, and a fully-resourced operations and maintenance team. When development of current work-in-progress initiatives such as the CHATS Stabilization Project and Provider Self-Service Portal (PSSP) are complete, the State will have invested at least \$16.5 million in the development of CHATS 2.0, excluding operations and maintenance costs.

The purpose of the 2007 CHATS replacement project was to migrate the legacy system off the mainframe environment and address unmet business needs including (but not limited to) reducing manual processes related to tracking attendance and payment reconciliation, improving accounts receivable functionality, and reducing fraud. At the time, the CCCAP policy priorities were focused on welfare reform and promoting access to childcare choices. Today, with the passage of HB14-1317, CCCAP policy priorities have shifted to streamlining policies to make it easier for families to access and retain services, making child care more affordable, emphasizing children’s needs for quality early learning programs on a continuous and consistent basis, and restructuring provider reimbursement rates. Moreover, technology options have increased since CHATS 2.0 was conceived in 2007.

Despite the changes in CCCAP policy, the core CCCAP business functions remain the same: determine eligibility, perform case management, manage providers, manage county policies, manage payments to providers, prevent and detect fraud, and manage information to administer the program. The questions being considered today include (but are not limited to):

1. Does the current CHATS system have the capacity, with upgrades or other enhancements, to meet user needs and the requirements of the new policies? Or should CHATS:
 - a. Be replaced with a full rebuild in order to meet the requirements.
 - b. Pursue other options that meet CCCAP requirements and support an innovative technical systems approach that takes into consideration costs and the dynamic nature of the CCCAP program.
2. What are the consequences of not making changes to CHATS to meet new CCCAP program requirements?

The Office of Early Childhood (OEC) engaged BerryDunn in July 2014 to assist in providing information to help OEC answer these challenging questions. This report, Deliverable 3: Options Analysis, Impacts and Recommendations Report, provides our assessment of four options for the future of CHATS:

- ◆ Option 1: “Do Nothing”
- ◆ Option 2: Enhance CHATS
- ◆ Option 3: Hybrid (Enhance CHATS + replace some components)
- ◆ Option 4: Replace CHATS

Based on work completed for Deliverable 1: Needs Assessment and Gap Analysis and Deliverable 2: Best Practices Report, and the analysis contained within this report, our recommended approach is to pursue Option 2: Enhance CHATS or Option 3: Hybrid Solution. Both Options 2 and 3 are rooted in continued enhancement of CHATS. Our recommendation is largely based on the fact that much of the CHATS technical environment appears worth retaining. For example:

- The architecture design and construction of the overall system is sound. It is reported to be extensible and reusable, and with the completion of planned and in-progress OIT initiatives will meet many technology best practices.
- CHATS is designed to be able to manage variations in county policies with efficiency and accuracy, a system requirement that will continue to be a strategic policy, operational, and system priority.
- Many of the stakeholder-identified issues with CHATS are training, user support, and/or system maintenance related, which can be addressed with additional training and operations and maintenance resources.
 - We found that formal CHATS training opportunities are limited in the current environment and in many cases the training content and user guides are not sufficient to enable state and county users to perform core business functions effectively and efficiently.
 - The CHATS operations and maintenance team and help desk support have been under-resourced since initial system deployment.
 - In-progress CHATS fixes and enhancements through the CHATS Stabilization Project should address many user-identified bugs and improve correspondence functionality.
- The HB14-1317 change delinking child care from parents’ work schedules should alleviate some of the CHATS deficiencies county users reported related to entering parent and child schedules.
- State-wide OIT strategic initiatives in progress to improve the current technology environment such as the Cloud First Initiative, Database-as-a-Service project, and Data Insights initiative should benefit CHATS’s long-term viability and enable improvements in reporting functionality.
- Four years after the bumpy CHATS 2.0 deployment, original planned functionality is still being delivered. CCCAP lost many providers in the time period immediately following the

POS system roll-out. The system is now relatively stable and users are wary of another long transition with a new system.

Our recommendation is consistent with the responses received from the CHATS User Survey conducted as part of Deliverable 1:

Q21: Please pick the statement that best reflects your opinion:

- *2.2% of respondents (2/89) liked CHATS and believed it should be left as it is.*
- *55% of respondents (49/89) liked CHATS but thought it could use a few changes.*
- *34% of respondents (30/89) mostly liked CHATS but believed it should see a major overhaul.*
- *9% of respondents (8/89) disliked CHATS enough to believe that it should be completely replaced.*

Future CHATS enhancements should focus on:

- Improving the user interface/user experience (UI/UX)
- Improving ad hoc querying and reporting capabilities
- Upgrading or replacing the POS machines
- Increasing operations, maintenance, and user support resources
- Exploring the addition of workflow management and electronic document management functionality
- Redesigning the Parent Fee module

Option 4, Replace, is expensive, time-consuming, and unnecessary. It would likely be at least three years from the writing of this report for a full replacement to be procured, design, developed and deployed. While a replacement could be designed to take advantage of best-in-class technology and equipment, the existing system possesses enough modern components to build on to meet current and future user and program needs. Moreover, system changes to support HB14-1317 implementation need to begin immediately, and these investments would be discarded in a replacement scenario.

Option 1, doing nothing more than completing the in-progress and planned initiatives, is not a viable option for the future of CHATS. The *status quo* technology environment, even with the many enhancement activities in progress, will not be able to support stakeholder needs in the short or long term. The consequences of not taking any further action beyond the work in progress include the following:

- Counties will continue to not be able to correctly assess parent fees or calculate the correct provider reimbursement rate.

- Counties will continue to be challenged to implement certain county options such as hold days and drop-in days.
- Counties and the state will continue to lack access to critical program data needed for budgeting and policy-making.
- Counties and the state will continue to spend an unwarranted amount of time locating information needed to meet state and federal reporting requirements.
- Counties and the state will continue to be limited in their ability to identify fraudulent activities in a timely manner and to use data to guide the development of fraud prevention activities.
- Key features of HB14-1317 such as the new tiered parent fee structure and tiered provider reimbursement rate structure will not be supported by an automated system.
- A mobile environment will not be possible.
- Manual workarounds and paper-based and parallel monitoring and tracking systems at the county-level will continue, which introduce opportunities for data entry and other human errors, are not easily auditable, add to user workload, and cause user frustration.
- Potential further loss of providers participating in CCCAP due to frustration with the POS system.
- Help Desk tickets will continue to accumulate faster than they can be resolved.
- “Technical Debt”¹ will continue to grow.

In addition to the recommended technology path, we provide these non-system recommendations for consideration:

Recommendation 1: OEC and OIT should work together to improve CHATS governance, starting with creation and adoption of a joint vision statement and objectives to guide the planning for the future CCCAP automated system.

Recommendation 2: Add OIT and OEC operations, maintenance, and user support resources to CHATS immediately.

Recommendation 3: Ensure adequate user testing and training are conducted for PSSP and CHATS stabilization project fixes. The PSSP roll-out is an important opportunity for CCCAP to score a “win” with providers; if not successfully deployed, relationships with providers could be further damaged.

¹ According to Martin Fowler, a recognized industry thought leader in software quality, Technical Debt is a metaphor for understanding the long-term costs resulting from poor software architecture and development. “Like a financial debt, the technical debt incurs interest payments, which come in the form of the extra effort that we have to do in future development because of the quick and dirty design choice.” In other words, this future interest is the work that needs to be redone before a particular set of software can be considered complete. Like financial debt, if the technical debt is not repaid, it can continue to accumulate interest, making it more costly to repair.¹

The remainder of this report contains the analysis to support our recommendation and findings. Section 2, Introduction, provides background information on the project and describes our approach. Section 3, Option Analysis Results, defines the four options in detail and analyzes each based on the eight Evaluation Factors. Section 4, Conclusions, summarizes our analysis of each option and describes our suggested next steps. Two appendices, Acronyms and Gap Analysis, provide supporting information.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Project Background and Purpose

The purpose of the CHATS Assessment project is to assess CCCAP program requirements with a technical feasibility assessment of CHATS relative to supporting CCCAP needs. The Assessment will produce four primary deliverables:

- Deliverable 1: Needs Assessment and Gap Analysis
- Deliverable 2: Best Practices Report
- Deliverable 3: Options Analysis, Impacts, and Recommendations Report
- Deliverable 4: Total Resource Assessment and Action Plan

When all four deliverables have been provided, the CHATS Assessment project will address each of the following questions and help the State develop a roadmap for the future of CHATS:

- Does the CHATS system have the capacity, with upgrades or other enhancements, to meet the requirements in the Overview? Or,
- Should CHATS:
 - a. Be replaced with a full rebuild in order to meet the requirements.
 - b. Pursue other options that meet CCCAP requirements and support an innovative technical systems approach that takes into consideration costs and the dynamic nature of the CCCAP program.
- What are the consequences of not taking action on CCCAP program requirements?

2.2 Report Objectives

This report represents Deliverable 3 Options Analysis, Impacts, and Recommendations Report. The purpose of this report is to provide a high level summary that describes a recommendation to enhance CHATS, replace CHATS or other options, including the consequences of not taking action – and provide pros and cons for the recommendation.

2.3 Approach and Work Performed

2.3.1 Work Performed

The team undertook the following activities to develop this deliverable:

- Developed detailed descriptions of the four options set forth in the CHATS 2.0 Assessment RFP for the future path of the CCCAP automated system.
- Conducted additional research on related State system development initiatives in progress: OIT state-wide strategic technology initiatives, Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS), CBMS (Colorado Benefits Management System) Eligibility Determination Enhancements, and the Western States EBT Alliance (WSEA).

- Further analyzed the business and technical gaps identified in Deliverable 1.
- Reviewed the results of the best practices research.
- Created a framework for evaluating the four options with input from the Project Manager.
- Assembled technical and subject matter experts to collaboratively review the Evaluation Factors and rank the four options based on each Factor.
- Developed recommendations for the State.

2.3.2 Analysis Methodology

2.3.2.1 Ranking and Scoring Process

Based on our experience conducting similar projects, we selected a relative ranking approach to score the options. Using this approach, the options are compared to each other and ranked 1 through 4, with a 4 being the most desirable rank for each Evaluation Factor described below.

The recommended option is the option with the highest total score. We recognize that the State may not consider each Evaluation Factor to be equally important, thus the total scores in Section 3.4 include a weighting factor. Section 3.4.1 defines the weighting factors and their use, and identifies our suggested weighting factor for each evaluation factor.

2.3.2.2 Evaluation Factors

To analyze the four options, we identified eight evaluation factors based on best practices for conducting alternatives or options analyses and experience from previous projects. The evaluation factors were reviewed with the state Project Manager and revised. The table below provides a definition of each evaluation factor and scoring criteria.

Table 2.1: Definitions of Evaluation Factors

	Evaluation Factor	Definition	Scoring
1	Meets User Objectives	<i>Which option is most likely to meet the most user (state, county, parent and provider) strategic, operational, business, and technical objectives? (see section 3.1)</i>	4 - Addresses the most objectives 3 - Addresses the second most objectives 2 - Addresses some objectives 1 – Addresses the fewest objectives
2	Alignment with Technical Industry Trends and Best Practices	<i>How well is the built/likely to be build and how aligned to state of the art is it? (i.e., open, networked, secure, cloud-enabled, leverages SaaS, mobile-enabled)</i>	4 - Most state-of-the-art 3 - Second most state-of-the-art 2 - Third most state-of-the-art 1 – Least state-of-the-art
3	Impact on Stakeholders	<i>What is the option's impact on each stakeholder group's (counties, providers, parents, state program and technical teams) current practices and operations?</i>	4 - Most positive/fewest negative impacts 3 - Second most positive/second fewest negative impacts

	Evaluation Factor	Definition	Scoring
		<p><i>How much training, revision of materials and business process realignment will be necessary?</i></p> <p><i>Will the option enhance or diminish stakeholders' experience with CCCAP?</i></p>	<p>2 - Third most positive/second fewest negative impacts</p> <p>1 – Fewest positive impacts/most negative impacts</p>
4	Long-term Viability	<p><i>How well can the option adapt to changes in business and technology?</i></p> <p><i>How long is the technology platform likely to be supported?</i></p> <p><i>Is it easy to find vendors with the skills to support the system?</i></p>	<p>4 - Most viable</p> <p>3 - Next most viable</p> <p>2 - Third most viable</p> <p>1 – Least viable</p>
5	Time to Implement	<p><i>How long would procurement take?</i></p> <p><i>How long would design, development, and implementation take?</i></p>	<p>4 - Fastest to begin delivering needed functionality to users.</p> <p>3 - Second fastest</p> <p>2 - Third fastest</p> <p>1 – Slowest</p>
6	Estimated Total Cost of Ownership	<p><i>What is the total cost of ownership over the system life cycle (analysis, design, development, implementation, operations, and maintenance)?</i></p>	<p>4 - Least expensive</p> <p>3 - Next least expensive</p> <p>2 - Next most expensive</p> <p>1 – Most expensive</p>
7	Technical Feasibility	<p><i>How easy is it to implement and/or modify the system based on the current technical environment?</i></p> <p><i>How adaptable, extensible, and flexible is the option? Is it loosely or tightly coupled?</i></p>	<p>4 – Most feasible</p> <p>3 - Next most feasible</p> <p>2 – Third most feasible</p> <p>1 – Least feasible</p>
8	Overall Risk	<p><i>How likely is the option to meet user needs with the quality expected within budget and the timeframe required?</i></p> <p><i>Is a phased approach feasible?</i></p>	<p>4 - Most likely</p> <p>3 - Next most likely</p> <p>2 - Next least likely</p> <p>1 – Least likely</p>

2.4 Project Influences

2.4.1 Assumptions

Assumptions are premises about the business, policy, technical, and/or project environment that, for the sake of assessment and reporting, are taken as fact. The following assumptions influenced the development of this report:

- The scope of work for this deliverable is to recommend a general option (enhance, replace, or “other”), not a specific solution or product.

- This is the third of four deliverables that are part of this project. This report is not intended to contain detailed cost or schedule data. Deliverable 4, Total Resource Assessment, will provide cost and schedule ranges for the state-selected option.
- The following in-progress or planned OEC and OIT initiatives are considered part of the current environment and will be completed as planned:
 - Addition of two OEC training resources
 - CHATS Stabilization Project to fix bugs and improve functionality
 - Provider Self Service Portal (PSSP)
 - CCCAP integration with Universal Application (PEAK)
 - Database-as-a-Service Project
 - Data Insights Platform Initiative
 - Cloud First Initiative
- The scope of work, approach, and timeline for CHATS changes needed to comply with HB14-1317 has not been agreed upon by OEC and OIT.

2.4.2 Constraints

Constraints are known conditions in the project environment over which there is limited or no control. These can affect the direction, planning, and implementation of the project, as well as assessment and reporting activities. The following constraints must be taken into account when reading this report:

- The schedule is the primary CHATS 2.0 Assessment project constraint. The timeline for this engagement was determined by CDHS in the RFP and is driven by the Department's need to complete budget request documentation for the 2015 legislative session.
- Information requested from OIT on August 25, 2014 regarding the scope and timeline of the CHATS Stabilization Project and other OIT initiatives was not received as of September 5, 2014.
- HB14-1317 rule-making is incomplete.

2.5 Report Format

This report consists of four major sections: Section 1, Executive Summary; Section 2, Introduction; Section 3, Options Analysis Results; and Section 4, Recommendations. Two appendices provide materials in support of our results and recommendations: Acronyms and Gap Analysis.

3 OPTIONS ANALYSIS RESULTS

3.1 Statement of Need

The Colorado Child Care Assistance Program's (CCCAP) current business and technical environments are based on the state and federal CCCAP policies and regulations currently in place, which focus on welfare reform and promoting access to child care choices for children in CCCAP. New state legislation passed in May 2014, HB14-1317, redefines many aspects of CCCAP for the future, streamlining policies to make it easier for families to access and retain services, making child care more affordable, emphasizing children's needs for quality early learning programs on a continuous and consistent basis, and restructuring provider reimbursement rates. This shift in state policy and program objectives necessitates changes to CCCAP business processes, operations, and supporting automated systems.

The future CCCAP automated system will need to support the following *strategic policy objectives (SO)* for CCCAP established by HB14-1317:

Table 3.1: Suggested CCCAP Strategic Policy Objectives

ID	Objective
SO.1	Streamline policies to make it easier for families to access and retain services.
SO.2	Make childcare more affordable.
SO.3	Emphasize children's needs for quality early learning programs on a continuous and consistent basis.
SO.4	Restructure provider reimbursement rates.
SO.5	Reward high-performing counties with greater flexibility in determining local CCCAP operations.

Based on our gap analysis and best practices research, we recommend the State consider establishing these *operational (OO)*, *business objectives (BO)*, and *technical objectives (TO)* for the future CCCAP automated system to meet CCCAP operational and user needs.

Table 3.2: Suggested CCCAP Operational Objectives

ID	Objective
OO.1	Improve project governance.
OO.2	Enhance collaboration, communication, and exchange of information with providers, between counties, between counties and OEC, and between OEC and OIT.
OO.3	Maintain the appropriate quantity and quality of staff, partners, knowledge, and materials to operate and maintain the system and support users.
OO.4	Increase county staff productivity and efficiency through system improvements such as UI/UX enhancements, automated interfaces with other state systems, workflow management, and electronic document management.

ID	Objective
OO.5	Improve real-time access to program and financial data and reports to enhance program operations and support program decision-making at both the county and state levels.

Table 3.3: Suggested CCCAP Business Objectives

ID	Objective
BO.1	Enhance provider and parent satisfaction with CCCAP by providing a new means of electronically tracking subsidy utilization.
BO.2	Enable accurate execution of all current and future federal requirements, state-wide policies and rules, and county policy options.

Table 3.4: Suggested CCCAP Technical Objectives

ID	Objective
TO.1	Allow for a mobile workforce and constituency.
TO.2	Ensure scalable, available, maintainable, and agile technology and systems.

Together, these 14 objectives address the majority of the gaps identified in Deliverable 1: Needs Assessment and Gap Analysis. Appendix C maps these objectives as well as the seven planned or in-progress initiatives listed in Section 2.4.1 and the three Additional Recommendations in section 4.2 to the gaps. OEC and OIT should work together to adopt a joint vision statement and objectives to guide the planning for the future CCCAP automated system.

3.2 Descriptions of Options

3.2.1 Option 1: “Do Nothing”

In Option 1, CHATS, supporting technologies (EPPIC and POS system), interfaces, and other aspects of the technical environment remain as-is. Option 1 assumes no further changes to CHATS beyond the successful completion of the planned and in-progress initiatives listed in Section 2.4.1. In Option 1, no changes are made to the CHATS operations and maintenance team capacity or structure.

3.2.2 Option 2: Enhance CHATS

Option 2, Enhance Existing System, consists of continuing to modify, enhance, and/or add to core CCCAP technologies (CHATS and POS/EPPIC), interfaces, and/or the technical environment to meet user and business needs. In this option, CHATS OIT operations and maintenance team structure and capacity may be modified and/or enhanced.

Examples of additional system enhancements that could be undertaken include:

- Overhaul of the Parent Fee module

- Upgrade or replacement of the POS machines
- Addition of workflow management to CHATS
- Addition of an interface to Colorado Benefits Management System (CBMS) for TANF and SNAP referrals
- User interface/user experience upgrades
- Addition of a Complaints & Investigations module with enhanced interfaces to CCCLS (licensing system)
- Addition of an Electronic Document Management System (EDMS)

3.2.3 Option 3: Hybrid Solution

Option 3 represents an innovative technical systems approach that retains and enhances selected CHATS functionality and replaces other selected functionality with new or leveraged systems. As in Option 2, in Option 3, the CHATS operations and maintenance structure and capacity may be modified and/or enhanced.

For example, CCCAP could explore replacement of the POS cards and machines with the same EBT card used by Food Stamps and Child Support (“Quest” card) through the Western States EBT Alliance (WSEA). Colorado is the lead procurement agency for this program. CCCAP already participates in WSEA for paying providers.

Another example is exploring opportunities to leverage planned enhancements to the CBMS, the State’s core eligibility system which supports eligibility determination for multiple state programs. CCCAP is already participating in a major component of the CBMS enhancement effort, PEAK.

3.2.4 Option 4: Replace CHATS

Option 4 is a full replacement of CHATS, EPPIC, and POS with an entirely new system, hardware, and software. It could consist of a Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) solution, transfer from another state or a custom-developed system. In this option, the current technical environment would remain in place until the new system is complete. Option 4 assumes a new operations and maintenance staffing approach.

3.3 Assessment of Evaluation Factors

The following eight sub-sections present our findings of the assessment of each Evaluation Factor. Each option is ranked for each Evaluation Factor.

3.3.1 Meets User Objectives

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Addresses the most user objectives	Option 4: Replace
3	Addresses the next most user objectives	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Addresses the third most user objectives	Option 2: Enhance
1	Addresses the fewest user objectives	Option 1: Do Nothing

The business and technical gaps identified in Deliverable 1 have been aggregated and consolidated into the nine operational, business and technical objectives in the table below (see Appendix C for mapping of gaps to objectives). Table 3.6 indicates if each of the four options would be likely to meet, partially meet, or not meet the objective, using the symbols in the table below.

Table 3.5: Definitions of Symbols

Symbol	Definition
●	Likely to meet the objective
◐	Likely to partially meet the objective
○	Not likely to meet the objective

Table 3.6: Likely Ability to Meet User Objectives by Option

ID	Objective	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
		Do Nothing	Enhance	Hybrid	Replace
SO.1	Streamline policies to make it easier for families to access and retain services.	○	●	●	●
SO.2	Make childcare more affordable.	●	●	●	●
SO.3	Emphasize children's needs for quality early learning programs on a continuous and consistent basis.	○	●	●	●
SO.4	Restructure provider reimbursement rates.	○	●	●	●
SO.5	Reward high-performing counties with greater flexibility in determining local CCCAP operations.	●	●	◐	●

ID	Objective	Option 1 Do Nothing	Option 2 Enhance	Option 3 Hybrid	Option 4 Replace
OO.1	Improve project governance.	●	●	●	●
OO.2	Enhance collaboration, communication, and exchange of information with providers, between counties, between counties and OEC, and between OEC and OIT.	●	●	●	●
OO.3	Maintain the appropriate quantity and quality of staff, partners, knowledge, and materials to operate and maintain the system and support users.	○	●	●	●
OO.4	Increase county staff productivity and efficiency through system improvements such as UI/UX enhancements, automated interfaces with other state systems, workflow management, and electronic document management.	○	●	●	●
OO.5	Improve real-time access to program and financial data and reports to enhance program operations and support program decision-making at both the county and state levels.	○	●	●	●
BO.1	Enhance provider and parent satisfaction with CCCAP by providing a new means of electronically tracking subsidy utilization.	○	◐	●	●
BO.2	Enable accurate execution of all current and future federal requirements, state-wide policies and rules, and county policy options.	○	●	●	●
TO.1	Allow for a mobile workforce and constituency.	○	●	●	●
TO.2	Ensure scalable, available, maintainable, and agile technology and systems.	○	●	●	●

Option 4, Replacement and Option 3, Hybrid, are both likely to meet all of the user's objectives. Because a replacement affords the opportunity to provide all new, state-of-the-art functionality, it received the higher rank over Option 3. Moreover, in Option 3, leveraging CBMS for CCCAP eligibility could result in less flexibility for counties than they have in CHATS. Leveraging CBMS and/or the Quest EBT card aligns well with HB14-1317 goals of streamlining eligibility and integrating benefits for families.

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, received one "likely to partially meet" for the business objective related to replacing the POS system. In Option 2, the POS system could be upgraded to a more modern machine, but this option does not contemplate replacement of POS and EPPIC with new technology.

Option 1, “Do Nothing” is unlikely to meet ten of the fourteen user objectives listed above and therefore received the lowest ranking for this factor.

3.3.2 Alignment with Industry Trends and Best Practices

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Most aligned	Option 4: Replace
3	Next most aligned	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third most aligned	Option 2: Enhance
1	Least aligned	Option 1: Do Nothing

The criteria Alignment with Industry trends and best practices is primarily focused on the alignment of the option to generally accepted best practices. Some of the major areas of interest include:

- Does the system leverage “desktop-like” web applications, enabling faster and more powerful browser based applications? Does it utilize Rich Internet Application frameworks and/or responsive website design frameworks to produce adaptable web experiences that render on a diversity of devices used?
- Is the application easily understandable on a variety of consumer form factors such as smartphones and tablets? Does it leverage these different devices, as a thin client, or does it restrict the users’ choice of devices and browsers?
- How well does this application integrate with other applications and services? Does it use Restful invocation of external services or leverage formats like JSON to send/receive data? Are those data packets secured and encrypted?
- Do the development strategies embrace mobile devices? Has the application been architected/ designed in “layers” where some components can be deployed on any device, and other services could be hosted anywhere inside a public or private cloud?
- To what degree is the application cloud ready? Has a SaaS strategy of application deployment, licensing, and billing been leveraged? Are data able to be stored in a NoSQL or “big data” format?
- Does the application integrate the latest coding standards, such as HTML5?
- Have industry standards for mobile and cloud-based apps been incorporated (such as security, privacy, payments, and others)? Have appropriate tooling (individual development environments, frameworks, platforms, etc.) been used to build and deploy the application? Is it running on modern platforms (Azure, MEAP, others)?
- Is the application Service-Oriented and following the main tenants of SOA (discrete services, decoupling, technology-agnostic, others)?

Option 4, Replace CHATS, receives the best score for alignment with trends and best practices. A new development effort would highly leverage new standards and technologies, including HTML5, mobile device development and virtualization technologies. This close alignment to industry standards would result in an application that is more powerful and flexible. For these reasons, this option received the top ranking in this area.

Option 3, the Hybrid Solution, scores the next best of the four options. The Hybrid Solution starts with existing components, but extends CHATS to include newer technologies. These new technologies would likely align with industry standards. The components that would not be updated result in this option being ranked in the second position.

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, is ranked third. The current system does align well with many standards. It is based upon a Service Oriented Architecture, and integrates with a significant variety of internal and external systems. A significant number of system components are currently cloud ready.

Option 1, Do Nothing, is ranked last for this criterion. Due to the time lapse between the development of CHATS and today, CHATS does not naturally line up with current best practices.

3.3.3 Impact on Stakeholders

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Most positive/fewest negative impacts	Option 2: Enhance
3	Second most positive/second fewest negative impacts	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third most positive/third fewest negative impacts	Option 4: Replace
1	Fewest positive impacts/most negative impacts	Option 1: Do Nothing

The “Impact on Stakeholders” criteria is primarily focused on the impact that each of the options will have on the stakeholder group’s current practices and operations. Stakeholder groups include counties, providers, parents, and state program and technical teams.

- Counties are the primary CHATS users. CHATS is used by eligibility workers/case managers and business office staff.
- Providers are users of the POS machines. They will become users of CHATS through the Provider Self-Service Portal (PSSP).
- Parents are users of the POS machines. They do not have access to CHATS.
- State CCCAP and OIT staff are users of some CHATS functionality.

This evaluation factor considers:

- What is the impact on each stakeholder group’s current practices and operations?

- How much training, revision of materials and business process realignment will be necessary?
- Overall, will the option enhance or diminish stakeholders' experience with CCCAP?

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, receives the highest ranking for this factor. Further enhancements to CHATS can be deployed in phases to minimize disruptions to operations and allow for incremental training.

The Hybrid Solution, Option 3, scores the next best of the four options with the second most positive and second least negative impacts to stakeholders. Like Option 2, this option and related training can also be phased in over time, easing the transition to new functionality. If the State opted to leverage the existing Quest EBT card, the positive impacts on parents could be significant, as this card can be distributed and activated at the county office and will be familiar to parents who participate in other state programs such as SNAP and TANF.

Option 4, Replace CHATS with a new system, scores the second lowest for this factor because the transition would likely be disruptive to all stakeholder groups. Although a long-term goal of a new system would be to improve efficiency, the transition will require extensive training and business process redesign for all stakeholder groups. The rocky transition to CHATS 2.0 is still fresh in many county users' and providers' memories, and two new sizeable initiatives, PSSP and PEAK, are set to roll out over the next six months or so.

Option 1, Do Nothing, is ranked last for this criteria. Without further changes to the system, stakeholders will continue to be negatively impacted by gaps.

3.3.4 Long-term Viability

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Most viable	Option 4: Replace
3	Next most viable	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third most viable	Option 2: Enhance
1	Least viable	Option 1: Do Nothing

The criteria Long-term Viability is primarily focused on the viability of the suppliers of the technologies and their products. Some of the major areas of interest include:

- Do the core building blocks of the application have a proven track record in the marketplace, and are there significant numbers of installations of these technologies to ensure they remain supported by the suppliers/vendors of those technologies or third parties? If not, is the architecture of the solution open enough to minimize the impact of these building blocks becoming obsolete, or replace those components with more modern equivalents?

- Are the suppliers of these building blocks commercially viable and stable from a business standpoint with a record of supporting and maintaining their products? If not, are there significant technical resources available on the market to help maintain or transition from the component to an alternative? Has the client taken steps to obtain source code or place the source in escrow to protect their investment?
- Are any core technologies reaching their end of life, have they been taken off the market by the vendor, or have announcements been made by the vendor that the technologies will no longer be supported?

Option 4, Replace CHATS with a new system, receives the best score for Long-term Viability. A new system is a blank slate; each component is evaluated, selected, and procured. This process normally results in selecting suppliers and components that are proven to be viable and suitable for the defined purpose. It is highly unlikely that a vendor will survive the selection process if they are unable to provide support for multiple years, or if the company is unstable financially. For these reasons, the Replace CHATS option has been deemed the best in this area.

Option 3, the Hybrid Solution scores the next best of the four options. The hybrid option involves replacing some existing components of CHATS, and enhancing other components. Because some components are being replaced, the replacement process will trigger the same selection and procurement processes.

Option 2, Enhance CHATS is ranked in the third position. While this option could retain a significant amount of technology that originated up to five years ago, it also has the possibility of introducing some newer technologies. Based on this, it receives a lesser ranking than the hybrid option and a greater ranking than the status quo option. CHATS recently improved in this area when OIT created a tool for viewing and modifying the proprietary rules engine.

Option 1, Do Nothing, is ranked last for this criteria. This option will result in most of the system remaining in the current state. There are two major technical gaps related to long-term feasibility that this option will not address:

- [T8] CHATS is currently running on the original hardware and software platform and regular maintenance and upgrades are needed. There are no funds budgeted for software or hardware upgrades.
- [T11] POS does not support digital phone lines.

This score should not be interpreted as the current system is not viable over the long-term. It simply receives this rank relative to the merits of the other options.

3.3.5 Time to Implement

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Fastest to begin delivering needed functionality to users.	Option 2: Enhance
3	Second fastest to begin delivering needed functionality to users.	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third fastest to begin delivering needed functionality to users.	Option 4: Replace
1	Slowest to begin delivering needed functionality to users.	Option 1: Do Nothing

The procurement, design, development, and implementation timeline is an essential element with any system and its implementation, whether or not it involves maintaining the status quo, enhancing the current system, adapting it into a hybrid structure, or replacing the information system altogether in favor of an alternative. The “Time to Implement” Evaluation Factor assesses the four options based upon the estimated time they will take to implement. Each option was ranked according to how quickly it could begin delivering needed functionality to users.

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, received the highest score for this Evaluation Factor. Retaining and enhancing the core CCCAP technologies and refining them to better serve their users would be faster than a partial or wholesale system replacement, could be deployed in phases, and could begin immediately using existing technical resources. Procurement may not be necessary if additional resources can be obtained through existing contracting vehicles.

The third option involves developing a hybrid system which moves beyond CHATS enhancements. More ambitious upgrades to particular subsystems like EPPIC or POS would be more time consuming. In addition, staff will need to be trained to use new systems that now interface with the CHATS structure. For these reasons, this option was found to be the second best for time to implement. Option 3: Hybrid could also be deployed in phases to deliver new features incrementally, and could begin immediate using existing technical resources. This option may require some procurement for new features, but enhancement work could occur in parallel.

Option 4, Replace CHATS, is ranked third for time to implementation because procuring, designing, developing, and deploying an entirely new system is a multi-year undertaking. This process can encompass the development, design, and construction of a new product or the adaptation of a currently existing system to suit the State’s needs. Compounding the development timetable is the need to competitively procure the new system on the front-end, and on the back-end, comprehensively train staff at all levels on a new system. A full replacement from procurement to deployment would likely take at least 18 months (for a transfer or COTS system), but more realistically 24-36 months, assuming at least 6 months for procurement; and 18-24 months for design, development, testing, training, and implementation. CHATS 2.0 took 36 months to implement from the release of the RFP to state-wide deployment and was not implemented with the full scope expected.

Option 1, relying upon the current system as-is, while the quickest to implement because it is already in service, is not designed to provide needed functionality, so it received the lowest score.

3.3.6 Estimated Total Cost of Ownership

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Least expensive	Option 2: Enhance
3	Next least expensive	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third least expensive	Option 4: Replace
1	Most expensive	Option 1: Do Nothing

The criteria Estimated Total Cost of Ownership is focused on the total cost of ownership over the system life cycle; from analysis, design and development through implementation, operations and maintenance. Major areas of interest include:

- What are the current financial investments in CHATS, both in system development, maintenance and support as well as staffing resources?
- What is the current degree of system completeness?
- What are the estimated system, operational and training costs of replacement?

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, received the highest score of least expensive for this evaluation factor. Enhancing the existing system securely preserves the current financial investments in CHATS by maintaining the core integrity of the system design and supporting hardware. As a result, this option offers optimal future cost savings by leveraging existing infrastructure to resolve technology, system and operational bottlenecks. Additionally, Option 2 retains the investment (\$600,000) of the planned CHATS Stabilization project enhancements. Moreover, further changes to CHATS will be needed in the near-term (next twelve months) to enable implementation of provisions of HB14-1317. These changes are needed before a replacement system could be implemented (two to three years; see Section 3.4.5) and therefore will need to be made to CHATS. Investing further financial resources (up to \$1.2 million) in CHATS to meet the needs of HB14-1317 and then replacing the system is not an effective use of limited financial resources.

The next least expensive ranking is Option 3, Hybrid. This option mirrors the cost benefits of Option 2, by building upon existing CHATS infrastructure and planned updates. Hybrid development objectives however are more aggressive, exploring larger modifications or potential replacement of entire subsystems. Development and maintenance costs may increase with extended timeframes, which may result in multiple system releases and the need for more substantial user training and post-implementation system support resources.

The second most expensive option for this evaluation factor is Option 4, Replace CHATS. Replacing CHATS would discard the current/planned investment in CHATS of over \$16 million.² The estimated cost of a full system replacement to meet State objectives would be in the range of \$20-\$25 million dollars, factoring 10% for inflation since 2010 and additional scope needed to meet State objectives. In addition, duplicative investment would occur if this option were selected since CHATS needs to be enhanced in the short-term to meet user needs and state policy objectives.

Option 1, Do Nothing, received the ranking of most expensive. While the planned CHATS stabilization project and other planned initiatives should assist in alleviating some of the present system deficiencies, they will not resolve all current needs nor enable the system to accommodate future needs. Unmet needs will negatively impact operational and support costs. The expense of doing nothing is difficult to quantify but includes accrual of technical debt, opportunity cost, operational costs related to system inefficiencies, and continued program costs related to loss of providers, overpayments and fraud.

3.3.7 Technical Feasibility

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Most feasible	Option 2: Enhance
3	Next most feasible	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third most feasible	Option 4: Replace
1	Least feasible	Option 1: Do Nothing

The criteria Technical Feasibility is primarily focused on the feasibility of the technologies employed. Some of the major areas of interest include:

- Are the technologies used appropriate for the application?
- Do the technologies used have the ability to grow and scale to meet anticipated transaction loads and performance requirements? Do they have the ability to adapt to meet anticipated functional requirements or required enhancements?
- Are there resources readily available internally or for hire to design, develop, test, migrate, configure, and otherwise extend the life of the technologies with low cost and risk?
- Do they rely on current tooling, HW, and OS support to allow the ongoing maintenance and support of the technologies?
- Would they be chosen today as a potential solution if the system were to be built anew?

² \$14.9 million for initial design and development + \$600,000 for CHATS Stabilization + ~\$1 million for PSSP.

- Do the technologies follow current industry trends? Do they implement or support current industry standards, or do they force installations to rely on outdated technologies in order to run? If they are not using current technologies (HW, OS, SW, Integration/middleware, hosting), are the dependencies isolated?
- Where are the technologies in their lifecycle? Are any in their infancy? Are any nearing retirement?

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, receives the best score for Technical Feasibility. The architectural components of CHATS are generally sound; messaging and orchestration are good. The CHATS technical team is capable of performing component refreshes needed to update the component technologies. For the most part, the current technologies are adaptable to support the changing needs of the program.

Option 3, Hybrid Solution, scores the next best of the four options. The Hybrid option starts with existing components, but extends CHATS to include newer technologies. However, introduction of new technologies can potentially add complexity to the application. The CHATS support team is also likely to need additional skill sets to support the new components. These complexities cause this option to be ranked in the second position. Further research on market alternatives should be conducted to determine if the current Point-of-Sale (POS) machines and supporting software system should be enhanced or replaced.

Option 4, Replace CHATS, is ranked third for this criterion. While a complete application replacement will reset most technologies to current, it is also likely to create support gaps for the CHATS technical team. This option's score is also influenced by the high technical complexity that a complete system replacement represents.

Option 1, Do Nothing, is ranked last for the criterion. The CHATS technical team has acquired many of the skills required to support CHATS, but some of the underlying components have aged enough to cause this option to score low for this criterion. The system is running on original operating systems (Windows 2003), original applications (SQL 2005), and the original server hardware. The system hardware, operating systems, and application versions all contribute to this low score.

3.3.8 Overall Risk

Rank	Ranking Definition	Result
4	Least risky, most likely to meet expectations within the budget and timeframe	Option 2: Enhance
3	Next least risky	Option 3: Hybrid
2	Third least risky	Option 4: Replace
1	Most risky	Option 1: Do Nothing

The criteria Overall Risk is primarily focused on the likelihood of the option to meet the user need with the quality expected within budget and the timeframe required. Some of the major areas of interest include:

- What are the scope, schedule and budget constraints?
- Is a phased approach feasible?
- Is the technology proven and well-tested?

Option 2, Enhance CHATS, received the highest ranking of least risky. In this option current CHATS investments are optimized, and new scope can be incrementally developed and deployed to minimize risk and impact on end-users.

The next least risky option is assigned to Option 3, Hybrid. Potential risk is incurred as slightly more aggressive system and programmatic changes are put in place. As CHATS modifications increase in severity, costs and timelines are extended. User need versus quality expected becomes less secure as processes further deviate from current understanding, which may result in more significant protocol restructuring and workflow management. In addition, introducing external systems into an existing environment inherently adds risk.

Option 4, Replace CHATS, is second riskiest. The immense resource demands required for a complete system replacement, specifically in terms of budget and timeframe, from procurement through deployment and operations, give this option the section highest risk. A phased in approach may be feasible with this option, but requires extended implementation timelines and training resources. The CHATS 2.0 implementation was not completed on time or on budget with the scope expected.

Option 1, Do Nothing, is ranked most risky. Continuing with CHATS system and support capacity in its present state would yield ongoing compromises in required system quality, functionality and user experience. The current number of outstanding Help Desk tickets is evidence of its instability as-is.

3.4 Summary of Options Analysis Results

Based on the weighting factors assigned (see definition in Section 3.4.1 below), Option 2: Enhance is the recommended option, with Option 3: Hybrid, a close second. These two options are very similar, the major difference being that in Option 3 some functionality may be replaced instead of enhanced.

The table below shows the weighted and unweighted scores for each of the four options. The Excel template with the formulas for calculating the totals based on the weighting factors will be provided to the state Project Manager to facilitate recalculation based on different weighting factors.

Table 3.7 Summary of Options Analysis Results

		Meets User Objectives	Alignment with Industry Trends & Best Practices	Impact on Stakeholders	Long-term Viability	Time to Implement	Estimated Total Cost of Ownership	Technical Feasibility	Overall Risk	Total	Weighted Total
	Weighting Factor	3	1	3	2	1	2	2	2		
Option 1	"Do Nothing"	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	16
Option 2	Enhance	2	2	3	2	4	4	4	4	25	49
Option 3	Hybrid	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	25	51
Option 4	Replace	4	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	22	44

3.4.1 Weighting Factor

The weighting factor signifies the relative level of importance the State assigns to each evaluation factor. The Weighting Factors in Table 2.1 represent our team’s recommended weighting based on our prior experience with similar projects and our understanding of the State’s priorities. The State should review our rationale for each weighting factor and make adjustments as needed. We have provided an electronic version of Table 3.2, Summary of Options Analysis Results, with formulas so the State can adjust the weighting factors and view the impact on the total score for the option.

Table 2.2 Definitions of Weighting Factors

Weighting Factor	Definition
3	Most Important to the State
2	More Important to the State
1	Important to the State

Table 2.3 Rationale for Weighting Factors

	Evaluation Factor	Suggested Weighting Factor	Rationale
1	Meets User Objectives	3	The ability of the option to meet the user's (state, county, parent and provider) objectives, including state and federal requirements, is the most important evaluation factor.
2	Alignment with Industry Trends and Best Practices	1	Important criteria for assessing the options to ensure the system is positioned for optimizing opportunities that impact the technology environment.
3	Impact on Stakeholders	3	Stakeholder buy-in, maximizing positive impacts, and minimizing negative impacts are critical CHATS success factors.
4	Long-term Viability	2	Relatively more important consideration given the multi-million dollar investment at stake.
5	Time to Implement	1	This factor has a lower relative weighting factor because in-progress initiatives are addressing the most immediate pressing stakeholder needs.
6	Estimated Total Cost of Ownership	2	Important criteria for assessing the options, particularly given the relatively young age of and recent investments in CHATS.
7	Technical Feasibility	2	Relatively more important given the dynamic nature of state and federal CCCAP policies and priorities.
8	Overall Risk	2	Relatively more important given the dependency on the automated system for nearly all stakeholder business processes.

The total weighted score for each option is calculated as follows:

- For each evaluation factor, multiply the rank by the weighting factor.
- Add all of the weighted ranks.

4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Summary of Results

The table below summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of each of the four options for the future of CHATS. We recommend that the State retain and continue to build upon the existing CHATS system, and conduct further research and analysis to determine the feasibility of a Hybrid Solution leveraging an existing state system such as CBMS and/or WSEA.

Table 4.1: Summary of Pros and Cons of Each Option

	Option 1: Do Nothing	Option 2: Enhance CHATS	Option 3: Hybrid Solution	Option 4: Replace CHATS
PROS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no advantages of this approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low risk Can begin immediately and take a phased approach Stakeholders are familiar with the system Leverages existing technology Lowest cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can begin immediately and take a phased approach Opportunity to leverage other state systems Opportunity to integrate child care with other benefits Users familiar with the system Leverages existing technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to take advantage of best-in-breed technology Opportunity to align system design with new state vision at the outset
CONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder needs are not addressed and State objectives are not met Accumulation of technical debt 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unproven and more complex = more risky than a straight enhancement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most expensive, particularly if continue to enhance while planning and developing the new system Most time-consuming Most organizational change necessary More risky

4.2 Next Steps

BerryDunn will lead a Work Session with the CHATS Assessment Advisory Group on September 11, 2014 to discuss the findings presented in this report and facilitate selection of an option for the future of CHATS. Once the State has selected an option and provided direction, BerryDunn will develop Deliverable 4, Total Resource Assessment.

4.3 Additional Recommendations

In addition to planning for the future of the CCCAP system, we recommend OEC and OIT consider undertaking the following activities to immediately address non-system stakeholder needs identified during the course of work and state objectives.

Recommendation 1: OEC and OIT should begin immediately to work together to improve CHATS governance, starting with creation and adoption of a joint vision statement and objectives to guide the planning for the future CCCAP automated system.

- A supportive, collaborative relationship between business (OEC and counties) and technology (OIT) owners is essential to a successful system implementation.
- A common vision and objectives for the system should drive decision-making and planning for system changes. Technology needs to stay informed of business issues and changes, and business needs to be kept up-to-date with changes to the technology environment.
 - Review the objectives proposed in this report; revise as needed; adopt as part of a formal charter or other governance document.
- Regular and consistent communication among stakeholders and designated leadership are critical success factors.
- With stakeholder input, prioritize additional near-term system enhancements.
- Obtain the RFI responses from Virginia (due in early September) to see if there are any novel technologies or approaches to consider for a Hybrid approach.
- When HB14-1317 rule-making is complete, hold requirements planning sessions with stakeholders to plan for new functionality required.

Recommendation 2: Add OIT and OEC operations, maintenance, and user support resources to CHATS immediately.

- Addition of OIT and OEC resources to maintain the system, fix defects, and support testing and users should alleviate some user issues and frustration with the system.
- Ensure successful implementation of enhanced training through recently added OEC training resources should help alleviate some user issues with the system.
- Identify county best practices and lessons learned, communicate them state-wide, and take some of the promising county best practices to scale.
- Review user guides and other system support materials to ensure they are current and user-friendly.
- Start planning for hardware and software upgrades immediately.

Recommendation 3: Ensure adequate user testing and training are conducted for PSSP and CHATS stabilization project fixes. The PSSP roll-out is an important opportunity for CCCAP to

score a “win” with providers; if not successfully deployed, relationships with providers could be further damaged.

- By giving providers access to CHATS, the PSSP is expected to alleviate many provider issues with CCCAP related to billing, manual claims, verifying authorizations, and reviewing attendance data. Thorough user testing and training will help set expectations and support a smooth roll-out.
- Survey providers about their experience with CCCAP approximately six months after full PSSP roll-out (July 2015)

APPENDIX A: ACRONYMS

Acronym	Definition
ACF	Agency of Children and Families
CBMS	Colorado Benefit Management System
CCCAP	Colorado Child Care Assistance Program
CDHS	Colorado Department of Human Services
CFMS	Colorado Financial Management System
CHATS	Childcare Automated Tracking System
CI	Complaints & Investigations
CP	County Policy Management
CSTAT	CDHS management strategy that analyzes performance
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services
EBT	Electronic Benefits Transfer
EPPIC	Electronic Payment Processing and Information Control
PE	Parent Eligibility & Case Management business area
FM	Financial Management
FPL	Federal Poverty Level
FR	Fraud, Recovery & Administrative Controls business area
IPV	Intentional Program Violation
NPRM	Notice of Proposed Rule Making
OEC	Office of Early Childhood
OIT	Governor's Office of Information Technology
OS	Operating System
PEAK	Program Eligibility Application Kit
PM	Provider Management
PMBOK	Project Management Book of Knowledge
POS	Point of Service
PSSP	Provider Self-Service Portal
QRIS	Colorado Quality Rating and Improvement System
RFI	Request for Information
RFP	Request for Proposals

Acronym	Definition
RP	Reporting
SW	Software
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
TR	CHATS Training
UAT	User Acceptance Testing
WSEA	Western States EBT Alliance
WIC	Women, Infants & Children

APPENDIX B: GAP ANALYSIS

This table maps the Business and Technical gaps identified in Deliverable 1, Needs Assessment and Gap Analysis to Planned/In-progress state initiatives and/or Proposed Objectives identified in Section 3.1 and/or Recommendations presented in Section 4.2.

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
CI.1	The system does not provide a standardized component for counties to enter information on investigations and outcomes of complaints and does not link this information to the Licensing complaint tracking system (CCCLS).	The system must provide a standardized component for counties to enter information on investigations and outcomes of complaints. Link this information to the Licensing complaint tracking system (CCCLS).	Complaints and Investigations	N/A	OO.4
CI.2	The system does not provide an interface between Qualified Provider complaints and the existing web site on licensed providers.	The system must provide an interface between Qualified Provider complaints and the existing web site on licensed providers.	Complaints and Investigations	N/A	OO.2, OO.4
CP.1	Currently, the County Policy Management process relies on an email from county staff to state CCCAP staff to provide notification that a change in county policy needs to be approved.	System-generated notification when an updated County Plan is submitted for approval.	County Policy Management	N/A	OO.2, OO.4, OO.5
CP.2	State workers do not have a way to use CHATS to monitor county plan implementation. Currently do not know if counties are abiding by plans approved by state.	CHATS should have the ability to generate reports based on County policy options.	County Policy Management	N/A – unlikely to be part of initiatives related to reporting	OO.4, OO.5
CP.3	Currently, CHATS does not allow county staff to see case load utilization real time.	The solution must have the ability to show real-time information	County Policy Management	N/A – unlikely to be part of	OO.5

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	This might be an issue for budgeting and authorization. Parents may have authorization, and therefore are budgeted, for a year but are using it on and off.	regarding utilization of services against authorizations and county and state workers must be able to report on actual utilization versus authorization for budgeting and planning purposes.		initiatives related to reporting	
CP.4	Not enough space in free text fields in County Plan Management screens.	Provide the ability to attach documents. Provide additional space to describe county policies.	County Policy Management	N/A	OO.4, T.2
CP.5	There is no ability to compare information in county plans to identify similarities and differences between counties.	The system should have the ability to compare information in the county plans.	County Policy Management	N/A – unlikely to be part of initiatives related to reporting	OO.2, OO.4, OO.5
CP.6	There is no linkage between the County Plan and other areas of CHATS where the policies are executed. For example, changes to county rates must not only be entered in the County Plan in CHATS but then must be adjusted elsewhere in the system. Adjustments in the rate only in the County Plan module will not result in an actual change in the rate. This sometimes results in counties thinking they have made a change but the change has not actually been made in the system and therefore is not being actively applied.	There should be one "source" for any data entered in the system. If a new rate is entered, and approved by the state, it should automatically be applied everywhere in the system. One data element should not be housed in different locations.	County Policy Management	N/A	OO.4, TO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
CP.7	Information about policy and program changes does not always reach counties, providers, and parents in a timely manner.	The system must support an accurate, streamlined and timely process to inform counties, CCCAP families and child care providers of policy changes that will impact them.	County Policy Management	N/A	OO.2, OO.5 BO.2, Rec.3, So.1
CP .8	The county plan management in CHATS is not user friendly and doesn't provide the ability for the plan to be printed or to be converted/formatted for use on websites.	The system used for county plan management must be user friendly and provide the ability for the plan to be printed and also to be converted/formatted for use on websites.		N/A	OO.2, OO.4, OO.5
FM.1	Authorizations are described in 'full time/part time' units, but provider payments are based on hours; this causes confusion and inconsistencies.	Payments and authorization should be tracked using the same or both units of measure (FT/PT and/or hours).	Financial Management	N/A	SO.4,
FM.2	It is a time-consuming manual process to reconcile actual attendance and actual care paid.	System-generated reconciliation of actual attendance and actual care paid.	Financial Management	CHATS Stab (TBD)	OO.4, OO.5, BO.1, BO.2
FM.3	Parent fees can change when there is a change in income, and it is difficult for providers to track. They are informed via a copy of the new Authorization Notice. Sometimes providers do not notice the change until after the parent has paid the old fee for the month. This is usually when the parent fee increases and the provider has not collected the new higher amount from the parents. Providers	Providers should have access to real-time parent fee information. Providers should have the ability to track parent fees electronically and do quick and accurate reconciliations against what was owed and what was paid.	Financial Management	PSSP	OO.5, BO.1, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	report they tend to eat this loss rather than try to collect it from parents. A parent fee audit is manually intensive for both providers and counties.				
FM.4	CHATS does not support moving a parent fee when the parent changes providers. The result is the parent may have to pay the parent fee twice or, depending on the provider's policy, the provider may never receive the parent fee if a parent switches providers.	System must have the ability to transfer all or some of parent fee to a new provider. The system should be able to recognize if a Parent Fee was paid for a given month when the parent changes providers mid-month.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, SO.1, BO.2, TO.2
FM.5	Providers have paper sign-in sheets for parents in addition to the swipe machine.	The system should support electronic sign-in and integration with provider-based electronic sign-in systems to enable cross-checking of payments or swipes against attendance and minimize burden on parents.	Financial Management	N/A	BO.1, BO.2, TO.2, OO.5
FM.6	Many parents and providers struggle with the use of the POS machines, in particular those who are not technically-savvy, were distracted during trainings, do not speak English well, cannot read or have limited literacy, or did not receive training from the county. The screen and paper tapes are difficult to read for many.	Device should be more user-friendly. More program-specific (not just the machine vendor) Help Desk support should be available.	Financial Management	OEC Training	OO.3, BO.1, Rec.2, Rec.3
FM.7	While the POS machines provide some reports for providers, the more children the provider has, the more cumbersome	Enable providers to view real time daily swipes, current case information, attendance, case and	Financial Management	PSSP	BO.1, OO.2, OO.5, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>these reports are to utilize given the small print on the paper tapes, which are also prone to fading and tearing. In addition, for privacy reasons, the print-out only shows the child's first name. In a large center, this necessitates looking up manual records to reconcile attendance and identify and mis-swipes.</p>	<p>authorization notes and history screens, and payment history.</p>			
FM.8	<p>A system defect allows someone to not swipe out Friday, but swipe in Monday without an error telling them to swipe back in for a missed swipe. If the missed swipe is not corrected, the provider may not get paid for that day.</p>	<p>This defect must be fixed to prevent missed swipes and ensure providers are paid for services utilized.</p>	Financial Management	CHATS Stab	BO.1, BO.2
FM.9	<p>The POS devices require a dedicated analog land-line which is expensive, not always feasible to have installed (at a school gym, for example, for school-based after-school care), sometimes cannot be installed at check-in area, and not always reliable (goes out in remote areas a lot) for providers. Large centers require multiple lines to support multiple POS devices to prevent long lines at sign-in and sign-out. Some providers do not have analog lines and licensing no longer requires land lines. This is a particular challenge for school-based centers and has created the need for some elaborate workarounds to get</p>	<p>Ability to use the attendance tracking device without an analog line.</p>	Financial Management	N/A	BO.1, BO.2, TO.1, TO.2, SO.1

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	parents to swipe/back swipe within the nine-day period. Some providers in remote locations have to pay for long distance calls with each transaction.				
FM.10	There is stigma associated with use of swipe cards. They are bright orange. At providers that have some CCCAP and some private pay families, the different CCCAP sign-in and out process draws attention to them. Parents standing in line behind other parents can see the name, birth date, rate of pay, and other information for other parents on the thermal paper and this is a privacy concern. The families receiving assistance are easily known by both other families and providers due to the POS and card. There is a concern that it leads to children being treated differently and is a source of embarrassment for some families.	No obvious or easily identified means of identifying which family or child is receiving CCCAP assistance. No identifiable information should be visible to non-staff.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	BO.1, SO.1
FM.11	The POS card is often forgotten, lost, misplaced, damaged, etc. In addition, because many parents have varying schedules and transportation issues, people other than the CCCAP parent with the POS card frequently drop off and pick up children, and they may not have the card or may not know how to use it properly. POS cards and machines do	Many stakeholders would prefer an alternative to the current POS system. Several suggested programming the swipe card to work more like an EBT or debit card (i.e., load it with value). The system should support different approaches and methods for recording children's attendance.	Financial Management	N/A	BO.1

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	not always function as expected. These situations can result in the need to create manual claims, which can be denied, leading to providers losing revenue or the parent unable to access services.				
FM.12	POS cards are not identifiable; parents in the same family often switch them and if the PINs are different, they will not work if switched.	Make cards easily identifiable (1, 2) to track and set the same PIN for both cards.	Financial Management	N/A	BO.1, SO.1
FM.13	Due to training issues, some providers require parents to “back swipe” if a child stays past midnight. This is a problem for providers giving overnight care. They have to “swipe out” a child at 11:59 and swipe them back in at 12:01. It can also create the problem of making it look like two part-time visits instead of one full-time rate visit. The system is able to provide an overnight rate and accommodate overnight care, but additional training is needed for providers.	Additional training must be done related to accurately using the POS for overnight care.	Financial Management	OEC Training	OO.3, Rec.2, Rec.3
FM.14	Monitoring swiping, daily review of swipes against attendance record, and reconciliation of swipes and payment create a heavy workload for providers to participate in CCCAP. Some providers assign staff to monitor the machine, which is costly. Some providers have	Enable providers to view real time daily swiping, current case information, attendance, case and authorization notes, and payment history screens in CHATS.	Financial Management	PSSP	BO.1, OO.5, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	dropped out of CCCAP because of this additional workload.				
FM.15	Providers cannot view data by parent or by child. This makes finding missed or skipped swipes difficult.	Providers need the ability to view data by provider, by parent, and by child. These different groupings and ways to view information are important for different processes and users.	Financial Management	PSSP	BO.1, OO.2, OO.5, Rec.3
FM.16	<p>The provider payment system is based on the POS card swipe system that records the actual days and hours of child care services used by the parents. The system only pays for days and time authorized for the parents. The parents have nine days to ‘back swipe’ their card for days they missed swiping their card (forgotten or lost card, someone else picked up the child, POS machine issues, etc.). If the parent does not correct the missed swipe within nine days, the provider must submit a manual claim.</p> <p>There are other scenarios related to CHATS deficiencies and/or county worker use of CHATS that can trigger the need for a manual claim, such as the child turning five issue previously mentioned, and deficiencies with the parent fee tracking (see below).</p> <p>The state has set a target of 3% for</p>	<p>Policy change to allow back swipes to correct attendance records more than nine days.</p> <p>Change the 3% manual payments C-STAT performance indicator.</p> <p>The PSSP should help by giving providers access to more information in a more useable format in a timely fashion.</p>	Financial Management	N/A	OO.1, OO.5 SO.1, BO.1, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>manual claims as an indicator of CCCAP program management performance. Because of this, some counties are more strict in their allowance of manual claims. Providers complain that it often takes more than nine days to reconcile their attendance records and payments to determine if an error was made. In some of these cases the provider does not get paid. The counties have discretion in deciding when to pay manual claims. For example, some counties have a strict policy not to pay manual claims for missed swipes due to lost or damaged cards that were not corrected within the nine day correction period or the POS machine ran out of paper.</p>				
FM.17	<p>Processing manual claims is a time-consuming process; billing requires paper, Excel spreadsheets, access databases, and searching many locations in CHATS to collect the necessary information. The worker must enter the actual hours for each child and each day. There is no way to enter data for date ranges, etc.</p>	<p>The system should be able to pull all the data needed to process a manual claim based upon user-defined parameters (child, provider, date range) to support accurate and timely submission of manual claims by counties as prescribed in policies.</p>	Financial Management	CHATS Stab, DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
FM.18	<p>Payment detail only displays one week at a time. Manual claims are for a full month. To process a manual claim, payment detail data must be copied into</p>	<p>The system should allow the user to view Payment Detail for more than one week at a time and to set date parameters for viewing Payment</p>	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2, TO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	an Excel spreadsheet.	Detail.			
FM.19	CHATS does not keep a record of claims paid manually. There is no check in CHATS to prevent paying the same manual payment more than once. Counties track manual payments in external systems such as paper and Excel.	The system should track what days have already been paid (automatically or manually) and alert the user if there already appears to have been a manual bill for the date they are entering. The system should allow for an override if the second manual bill is correct.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
FM.20	The State will not approve reimbursement to the county for some manual claims. However, the system does not enforce state rules when a worker is processing a manual claim. If the State does not approve a manual claim and the county has already paid the provider, the funds come out of the county budget (not their CCCAP allocation) or the county must collect the funds from the provider.	The system should enforce the state rules regarding reimbursements for manual claims and warn the user about paying the provider for a manual claim that the State will not approve to support accurate and timely submission of manual claims by counties as prescribed in policies.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, BO.2
FM.21	There are some screens workers must remember to visit (by choosing on drop down) when doing a manual billing; but they do not have to enter information but they are required to save. If they do not go to the page and hit save (although no information is ever entered), it will create an error.	Erroneous screens should be removed and taken out of the error logic.	Financial Management	CHATS Stab.	OO.4, Rec.2
FM.22	PSSP development is underway; roll-out	End-user training for each planned	Financial	OEC Training	OO.3, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	plan is four phases between September and December 2014 with no end-user training planned.	PSSP roll-out phase.	Management		
FM.23	Financial offices in counties need a payroll register/summary in CHATS.	Financial office in counties needs a payroll register in CHATS. It should be organized by provider and have the ability to be exported to Excel, and to be de-identified. The register should identify the monthly amount paid to providers along with child specific payment information to share with providers to balance their business receivables when counties assess recoveries, thereby reducing the amount paid to providers.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
FM.24	CHATS cannot currently accommodate provider payments for the IT QA Grant program, which some counties participate in and offers enhanced reimbursement rates to providers for quality care to children ages 0-3.	CHATS must be configured to allow payment from the grant source.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
FM.25	Recoupments are very difficult and time consuming to complete, because the necessary information is not readily accessible. Data must be copied from several different screens in CHATS into Excel, and data pulled from CFMS. There are no templates for repayment/recovery agreements in CHATS. Each county	CHATS should be able to pull the data needed to manage recoveries in CHATS without having to use an external system. CHATS should have a template for a repayment/recovery agreement.	Financial Management	CHATS Stab, DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	makes their own in Word.				
FM.26	Recoupments in CHATS cannot be processed for a period of time; must be done by day and enter the hours recouped. This can be a very time-consuming process as it is often an entire month needing to be recovered and has to be done for each child in a case.	System should allow option to recoup funds for a user-defined period of time.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4
FM.27	When managing collected recoveries from parents or providers, it easy to enter a check more than once. CHATS does not show history of payments received, just remaining balance.	The system should display the history of payments.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
FM.28	The information in the weekly payroll summaries given to providers doesn't include enough specific information by family/child or provide reasons/rationale for differences in anticipated payments versus actual payments.	The system should provide up-to-date, accurate summaries for payroll that includes specific information that is/can be sorted by family or by child and there should be reasons/rationale provided for any instances where providers were anticipating a higher payment but the actual payment was lower.	Financial Management	CHAT Stab.	OO.5, BO.1, Rec.3
FM.29	The direct deposit system for provider payments does not reflect the county from which the payment originated. For large providers who work in multiple counties, they must wait for a hard copy of the payroll summary in order to identify where to post payments.	In the future, any direct deposits or payments to providers should include information identifying which county made the payment in order to allow providers to post payments accurately.	Financial Management	N/A	OO.5, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
FR.1	The system lacks a fraud investigation component that links investigation information and results conducted by Licensing, CCCAP, and other entities involved in investigations.	The system must provide a fraud investigation component that links investigation information and results conducted by Licensing, CCCAP, and other entities involved in investigations.	Fraud, Recoveries, Administrative Controls	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
FR.2	The system does not provide sufficient “red flag” reports that identify potential fraudulent activities.	The system must provide “red flag” reports that identify potential fraudulent activities.	Fraud, Recoveries, Administrative Controls	CHATS Stab, DaaS, Data Insights	OO.5
FR.3	There is no internal system check to prevent county rates from being set above the rates in the Market Rate Survey or the approved county rates.	Market rate survey results for each county should be included in CHATS and error should appear if county rates set above market rates from survey.	Fraud, Recoveries, Administrative Controls	CHATS Stab (TBD)	OO.4, OO.5
FR.4	The system does not support development of accurate State Tax Intercept Adjustments and Returns with clear procedures to support required policy.	The system must support development of accurate State Tax Intercept Adjustments and Returns with clear procedures to support required policy.	Fraud, Recoveries, Administrative Controls	CHATS Stab (TBD)	OO.4, BO.2
FR.5	The system does not enforce CCCAP county staff security access policies. For example, it does not currently prevent fiscal staff from also determining eligibility.	The system must support enforcement of CCCAP county staff security access policies. For example, fiscal staff cannot also determine eligibility.	Fraud, Recoveries, Administrative Controls	CHATS Stab (TBD)	BO.2
FR.6	The system does not check and cross-reference providers who have substantiated Intentional Program	The system must check and cross-reference providers who have substantiated Intentional Program	Fraud, Recoveries, Administrative	N/A	OO.2, OO.4, SO.3, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	Violations with current providers participating in CCCAP.	Violations with current providers participating in CCCAP.	Controls		
FR.7	In current environment there is no ability to track different child care funding sources, such as Race to the Top, QRIS, state Pre-K funds, etc. Currently all payments are designated as subsidy payments.	Must have ability to track and report on funding source and use of funding. Funding stream designations, attached to payments in CHATS for CCCAP children, need to be expanded. Currently all payments are designated as subsidy payments. The capacity to charge a portion of tiered reimbursements to other funding streams is needed.	Fraud, Recovery and Administrative Controls	N/A	OO.5, BO.2
G.1	Some alerts do not provide sufficient information to take timely action. For example, an alert will be received that says "You have two cases that are over income" but does not identify which cases.	Additional detail in Alerts to enable prompt action on Alert contents.	Multiple	N/A	OO.4, OO.5
G.2	Random alerts related to closed cases, or where there is no problem, are received. The user cannot clear the alerts, cluttering up the Alert box. Alert functionality is not always meaningful and there are no escalating levels of alerts.	Ability to delete Alerts. Alert functionality must be improved and alerts must be meaningful and there must be escalating levels of alerts.	Multiple	CHATS Stab.	OO.4, OO.5
G.3	In some counties, all case files are maintained in paper form; others are paperless, and use scanning and document management technology to	Scanning and document management system to allow for the storage of and electronic access to original documents such as birth	Multiple	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, TO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>maintain case files. In counties with paper-based case files, at redetermination and when a case needs to be re-opened, original documents such as birth certificates and immunization records must be presented again, which places additional burden on families. In counties with electronic case files, verification documents do not have to be presented again if they have been provided once, even if for another program such as TANF.</p>	<p>certificates, and sharing of original documents between programs.</p>			
G.4	<p>It is difficult for the person inputting the application into CHATS to know where they are in the process of entering all information required. For example, the eligibility determination can be “completed” even if certain “required” steps (such as requesting the POS card) are missed or certain information is missing (such as incomplete authorization). When steps are missed or information is missing, the family can experience a delay in receiving services and/or the provider can face challenges reconciling and receiving payments.</p>	<p>System displays application completion progress. System prevents completion of eligibility determination without completion of required fields and notifies user of incomplete actions.</p>	Multiple	N/A	OO.4
G.5	<p>Case managers can enter data that is illogical, for example, the start date of care before the application date.</p>	<p>System prevents entry of illogical data based on other data entered. System identifies potential errors when questionable or inconsistent</p>	Multiple	N/A	OO.4, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
		data is entered such as the start date of care and notifies the user.			
G.6	CHATS does not allow for corrections to errors such as typos to be made easily. In some situations, a case needed to be closed and then re-opened in order to correct a data entry error.	Allow typos and other data entry errors to be easily corrected.	Multiple	N/A	OO.4
G.7	There is no “source of truth” for data in many instances. The same data is often entered in multiple places, which creates opportunities for human data entry errors, adds time, and can create discrepancies if values are not kept in sync.	Certain recurring data elements, such as a child's birthday, should only be entered into CHATS once in one location and this should be the single source of record. If this data element occurs elsewhere in the application, the system should auto-populate those fields. The system should notify the user if designated equivalent fields do not match.	Multiple	N/A	OO.4, BO.2
G.8	The user must print each notice manually, create the envelope, stuff the envelope, and apply postage. For larger counties with larger case loads, this can be a time-consuming process.	Enable batch processing of Notices to a central mailroom for printing and mailing, with CHATS updated when the Notice is printed.	Multiple	N/A	OO.3, OO.4
G.9	Not all correspondence is available in Spanish or other languages. Some counties have translated some forms and notices into some other languages. Counties do not systematically share these documents.	The system should be able to generate forms and correspondence in other languages as defined by stakeholder needs.	Multiple	N/A	OO.2, OO.3, SO.1, SO.3, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
G.10	Some parents and providers are requesting to receive correspondence by email. There is no way to email directly from CHATS.	The system should allow the user to select the method for transmitting the notice (email or print and mail) and transmit the notice accordingly.	Multiple	PEAK	OO.4
G.11	Correspondence is not always released promptly; sometimes they get “stuck.”	Create an SLA for release of Notices that meets user needs. Monitor adherence at the system-level.	Multiple	CHATS Stab.	OO.4, BO.2, Rec.2
G.12	There is no true user testing. Testing must be done by actual users to ensure ease of use, and accuracy of changes.	User testing should be included before any CHATS releases and should be completed by actual CHATS users.	Multiple	N/A	OO.2, OO.3, Rec.3
G.13	<p>Various usability issues which result in extra work for the county worker and lost time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - User cannot delete data once entered - User cannot modify certain fields like Child Name - CHATS does not allow back-dating - Not enough characters in the Case Notes field - System does not display characters used/remaining in free text fields like Case Notes - System does not allow more than one absent parent to be entered - No field in CHATS for County Household number - System requires duplicate data entry 	Address these usability issues.	Multiple	CHATS Stab.(TBD)	OO.4, Rec.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>through a lengthy workflow process, which slows the process of entering pay stubs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System allows users the ability to view cases only one month at a time, and then reverts back to the most recent month when the user exits - CHATS only allows entry of whole hours - CHATS does not have any auto-formatting build-in; for example, must enter slashes for dates and must enter dashes for SSNs, which can lead to data entry errors and inconsistencies and extra key strokes/time. 				
G.14	System times out due to inactivity too quickly; can result in lost data and it is difficult to navigate to last screen.	Ability to allow each user to set the time out function	Multiple	N/A	OO.4
G.15	CCCAP lacks necessary operations, maintenance and user support resources. This staffing shortage impacts CCCAP's ability to support proper and timely testing efforts, analyze policy and rule changes in order to identify necessary business process changes, CHATS changes and training needs, and carryout other critical functions.	Secure funding for additional staff to support operations, maintenance and user support efforts.	Multiple	N/A	N/A
PE.1	When re-opening a closed case, user must clear "Redetermination Date" field	Provide clear definitions of Reason Codes and fix logic to make re-	Parent Eligibility and Case	CHATS Stab. (TBD)	OO.4, Rec.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>and use trial and error to get a Reason Code to allow case to be re-opened. There is no consistency to which Code will allow case to be re-opened. Sometimes, an old case cannot be re-opened, and opening a duplicate case is the workaround.</p>	<p>opening a closed case more user-friendly.</p>	<p>Management</p>		
PE.2	<p>CHATS does not recognize the 85% of state median income ceiling for CHATS eligibility, only the FPL entry and exit limits. County workers need to remember to do a manual override on these cases that exceed the entry income limit every two weeks but are within the 85% SMI to avoid the case being set to close based on being ineligible due to exceeding income eligibility.</p>	<p>The system must be able to recognize the 85% of SMI eligibility limit and apply it correctly to maintain accurate eligibility.</p>	<p>Parent Eligibility and Case Management</p>	<p>CHATS Stab. (TBD)</p>	<p>OO.4, BO.2</p>
PE.3	<p>CHATS re-calculates a family's eligibility every time that family file is touched regardless of if the change is related to an eligibility factor. For example, changing a family phone number or updating a case note will initiate an eligibility determination. Due to the SMI issue and other instances when CHATS does not correctly recognize different entry and exist eligibility limits, updating a family case may result in the need to manually enter overrides to keep the family eligible. In addition, the system</p>	<p>Allow typos and other data entry errors to be easily corrected. CHATS must be able to recognize and correctly apply different entry and exit income limits. Allow changes in family information to be entered without triggering a redetermination of eligibility, which is consistent with the CCCAP regulation of conducting redeterminations just once every 12 months.</p>	<p>Parent Eligibility and Case Management</p>	<p>CHATS Stab. (TBD)</p>	<p>OO.4, BO.2</p>

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>also allows only one change to be entered at a time, so if there are numerous changes needed, the staff person must go in each time, enter the data, and then manually correct the eligibility status. Staff have developed their own tracking systems outside of CHATS to remember which families fall into this category and other tracking and tickler systems to monitor families.</p>				
PE.4	<p>In certain situations a missed, incorrect, or incomplete field can prevent the eligibility process from finishing, but the system does not notify the user of the reason.</p>	<p>Any errors should include explicit instructions on how to fix them in the system without needing to refer to a manual. For example, if a field you enter is invalid, it should alert you to this fact before letting you move on and highlight the cell and describe the issue.</p>	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	OO.4
PE.5	<p>An applicant has to meet all eligibility criteria on the day they apply, including participating in an eligible activity, in order to get care authorized that day, even if they want the authorization to start in the future. The system prevents authorizing care if the eligible activity has not started; this prevents a parent who knows she is going back to school on September 1 from coming in today to complete the application and get her child care organized now. The</p>	<p>The system should allow authorization for services to proceed based on a future start state for an eligible activity.</p>	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	OO.4, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	workaround is to make the Primary Activity start on the day of application, even if it is known to be in the future. If a county worker does not falsify the Primary Activity start date, families cannot plan ahead for services. If a county worker does take this path, he or she must monitor the case to make sure services aren't being used prior to the actual start date of the parent's Primary Activity.				
PE.6	A parent cannot complete a CCCAP application online.	The system must support streamlining of the CCCAP application and link it with the PEAK self-assessment process through the web based portal.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	PEAK	SO.1
PE.7	Counties have the option to "hold spots" for "breaks in activity," but CHATS does not have functionality to support this policy option and track used hold days for the parents and track payments to providers for these days. Counties maintain manual systems, such as paper notes, to track this information. CHATS has been used in the past to track hold day payments, but the system was overpaying providers. The problem could not be fixed so even though policy allows "hold days," implementation is so difficult that in practice it is not utilized very often.	The new solution must be able to track and manage hold spots for breaks in activities. The solution must have the ability to pay providers to hold spots for CCCAP children without overpaying providers.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	BO.2, SO.1, SO.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	This is particularly problematic for infants in remote areas because few providers take infants, there are limited infant spots at providers who do take infants, and almost no providers take CCCAP infants. Infants have more frequent absences and thus families with infants are impacted by the "hold option" more.				
PE.8	Counties have the ability to allow for "drop in days" per county policy but CHATS does not support authorization and tracking of drop in days.	System must have the ability to authorize and track drop in days.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	BO.2, SO.1, SO.3
PE.9	It is time-consuming to enter child care schedules related to variable parent work schedules, school calendars, holidays, vacations, etc. in the authorization screen CHATS. Some counties work around this by authorizing more care than is needed.	Additional features are needed to allow more efficient entry of work schedules and school calendars, such as linkages to pre-loaded school district calendars to automatically input and update children's schedules; ability to define blocks of time; ability to select "every other week" option.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.1, SO.3, BO.2, OO.4
PE.10	If any change is made to the child's standard schedule, the entire year must be re-done for each child impacted by change. This creates a large amount of duplicate work to re-enter information for an entire year for an entire family.	The system should allow county workers to make changes to an authorized schedule in CHATS without having to re-enter the entire year's schedule.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.3, BO.2, OO.4

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
PE.11	<p>A parent must make a written request for a change in their child care schedule (authorization) at least 10 days in advance in writing. It is sometimes impossible for parents with variable work schedules (different days, different hours, or different number of days per week) that change from week to week to meet this requirement. This requirement also impacts children in school-age care with unanticipated school closings and school vacations. A workaround is to authorize more days/hours of care than is needed to accommodate unknown and unpredictable schedules. These cases are monitored closely to prevent overuse. However, some counties are reluctant to or will not authorize more days/hours of care because they fear abuse by the parents and/or have tight budgets and need to allocate care based on more precise allocation. Policies and systems that are driven by parent work schedules do not support the use of early childhood education programs that have set schedules or consistency in care for children. Counties have the contract-for-slots option; CHATS must be able to support the implementation.</p>	<p>Counties have the contract-for-slots option; CHATS must be able to support the implementation. Allow a manual override to approve a change in authorized services with less than 10 days' notice.</p> <p>The Authorization component of the system must accommodate flexibility in the number of days children are authorized during a month, based on children's needs, rather than authorizing the amount of care strictly based on parents' schedules. The current CCCAP policies, supported by CHATS, make it difficult for seamless transitions and un-interrupted care for children.</p>	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.1, SO.3, BO.2
PE.12	Scheduling in CHATS creates too many	The system should offer the user	Parent Eligibility	CHATS Stab	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>correspondences, which often have to be individually deleted. It is time consuming to suppress each correspondence. This is particularly problematic for family situations that are complicated (when mom and dad share custody and alternate weeks for example) and there are multiple and/or different care settings for each child. In addition, notices are attached to the child, not the parent, so both parents will receive both notices for all children unless they are suppressed. This creates additional work for the case worker, who must monitor these cases carefully as sometimes joint custody situations involve confidential information that one parent may be prohibited from seeing.</p>	<p>the option to create a notice related to an action.</p> <p>The system should be able to consolidate notices by family instead of by child when appropriate.</p>	<p>and Case Management</p>	<p>(TBD)</p>	
PE.13	<p>As currently designed, the Authorization Notice does not meet parent and provider needs. County staff cannot make changes to the notice. The current format of the Authorization Notice leads to confusion, potential compromising of family privacy, and additional work for County staff. All data fields in an Authorization Notice are included in the copy sent to providers. Sometimes there is private information in the authorization that providers should not see.</p>	<p>Users would like more control over the creation of the Authorization Notice. For example, they would like to be able to: show how the Parent Fee was determined; list more than one child's information to accommodate cases with more than one child; include the name of the child and name of the provider in the fields, not just the name of the child; add parent name to the provider copy of the Authorization Notice;</p>	<p>Parent Eligibility and Case Management</p>	<p>CHATS Stab., PSSP</p>	<p>OO.2, OO.4, OO.5, TO.2</p>

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
		add provider rates to the Authorization Notice; remove history of Parent Fees from Authorization; move case notes section of Authorization Notice to first page; suppress fields that contain private information.			
PE.14	Parents do not have real-time access to information about their authorized schedule and hours used. The printed Authorization Notice is mailed in paper for a three-month period and is not updated or re-sent unless the reports a schedule change to the county office.	Parents should have the ability to view, real-time, their Authorized schedules, and service utilization.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	PEAK PSSP	OO.5, BO.1, SO.1, Rec.3, SO.3
PE.15	A case cannot be transferred in CHATS from one county to another. There is a feature to do this in CHATS but it does not work. The case must be closed and a new case opened in a new county. This would result in a new POS card being issued and a waiting period for a new card, which could mean a delay in services and/or the need for a provider to submit a manual claim.	Cases should be able to be transferred between counties without having to open a new case and request a new POS card.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	CHATS Stab. (TBD)	OO.4
PE.16	When child support is updated for one parent, the other parent linked to a case is sometimes changed as well (i.e., two different mothers but with the same father can result in the father's payment	CHATS should receive information from ACSES and update correctly.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	Rec.1, OO.1, OO.2, OO.4, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	to one mother creating an update to other mother's case).				
PE.17	On the "Care Level Summary" screen, the "School Age and Above" check box is starred as a Required Field, but the system does not prevent proceeding beyond this screen if this field is not correctly checked to align with the child's age. The county worker must remember to enter the child's birthday on this screen and manually change the provider rate to correctly represent the age of the child/level of care. If the county worker forgets, the higher provider rate will be paid, resulting in the need for a recoupment of funds from the provider; or in the case where the child's age is updated but the child is not authorized for School Age care, Fiscal will say "rate not matching age" and the provider may not be paid, resulting in a the need for the provider to submit a manual claim.	The system should automatically change the care-level / rate when a child ages into a new category such as "School Age" when a child turns five.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	CHATS Stab (TBD)	OO.4, BO.2
PE.18	The system does not provide an eligibility designation for families who are co-enrolled in CCCAP and Head Start and track these families.	The system must provide an eligibility designation for families who are co-enrolled in CCCAP and Head Start and track these families.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	Rec.1, OO.1, OO.2, OO.4, SO.1, SO.4, BO.2
PE.19	The system does not support flexible, family friendly, and streamlined requirements to verify employment	The system must support flexible, family friendly, and streamlined requirements to verify employment	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.1, OO.4, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	income.	income.			
PE.20	The system does not provide the flexibility to accommodate different time limits on activities such as job search and education/training.	The system must provide the flexibility to accommodate different time limits on activities such as job search and education/training.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.1, BO.2
PE.21	The list of case correspondence is difficult to manage. Workers must open each Notice individually to determine the case and the content. There is no way to tell which ones were created by a specific worker, and multiple are created per child.	Correspondences should be easy to create, delete, and a worker should quickly be able to identify what correspondence it is, who created it, what child is it for and the date without opening the correspondence.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	Chats Stab (TBD)	OO.4, BO.2
PE.22	Counties have no way of recording or seeing in CHATS if parents have unpaid parent fees within their county or with another county. According to policy and provider contract, providers are obligated to report unpaid Parent Fees to the county. According to policy, parents should be denied program enrollment if they have outstanding parent fees, but there is no way to validate this in CHATS. Discovering this information requires going into every closed case from that family and opening specific notes, and relying on other county workers entering this information clearly in a note field.	System-generated notification when attempting to enroll a parent with unpaid parent fees.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
PE.23	Parental fees are not flexible, user-friendly, or easy to understand for the	Parental fee functionality must be flexible, user friendly, and easy to	Parent Eligibility and Case	CHATS Stab. (TBD)	OO.4, BO.2, TO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	<p>county workers, providers or the public. CHATS currently cannot handle parent fees below 10% of income or in less than 5% increments. This is inconsistent with state rules. There is also a glitch in the system that in certain circumstances will cause the Authorization Notice to show '\$0' as the parent fee and the county worker has to manually cross out and write in the actual amount. This causes confusion to the parent and provider, and might not stand up in an appeal.</p>	<p>understand for county workers, providers and the public. The system must have the ability to handle parent payments from 0-100% of a parent's income and be calculated in increments as small as 1%. Parent fees must appear accurately in correspondences and rounded off in dollar amounts. The system should expand the ability of the Parental Fee Schedule to include the capacity for gradually increasing parental fees when a family exceeds a county's income eligibility levels but does not exceed 85% of the state median income level.</p>	<p>Management</p>		
PE.24	<p>The system does not allow the County worker to change a parent fee amount for current or future months, at time of redetermination, or when a change in income or provider is reported, which can result in an under- or overpayment to the provider, and therefore a recoupment or manual claim.</p>	<p>The system should allow the County worker to enter a new parent fee amount for the current and future months at the time of redetermination, or a change in provider or income is reported, regardless of the date. The system should allow County workers to change parent fees on a more flexible date range and to change/override the Parent Fee.</p>	<p>Parent Eligibility and Case Management</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>OO.4, BO.2</p>
PE.25	<p>County worker uses a side worksheet or calculator to calculate the parent fee, and</p>	<p>CHATS should have a tool to calculate Parent Fee based on</p>	<p>Parent Eligibility and Case</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>OO.4, BO.2</p>

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	manually enters the amount into CHATS.	income data entered and system rules. The system should manage data related to collection of Parent Fees, including Parent Fee amount and the actual amount collected from provider each month.	Management		
PE.26	The system must support a tiered parent fee structure to support the implementation of the current Six Month Transition Plan policy option, as well as provisions of HB14-1317.	The system must have the ability to handle parent payments from 0-100% of a parent's income and be calculated in increments as small as 1%. Parent fees must appear accurately in correspondences and rounded off in dollar amounts.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	HB14-1317 Changes	Rec.2, SO.1, BO.2
PE.27	CHATS automatically resets the redetermination date. County worker must manually change it to one year from the actual date of redetermination in order to stay in compliance with program rules.	CHATS should automatically populate redetermination date based on actual start date of new eligibility segment to align with the CCCAP regulation of conducting redeterminations just once every 12 months.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	OO.4, BO.2
PE.28	CHATS-generated, pre-populated Redetermination Form does not align with application and policy. It pulls the local address, not the mailing address. Counties use a stand-alone paper version.	Redesigned auto-generated and pre-populated Redetermination Form that aligns with CCCAP application and policy.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	CHATS Stab. (TBD)	OO.4, BO.2
PE.29	When users correct an error made during data entry, the system requires a change	The system would allow users to modify existing cases to correct any	Parent Eligibility and Case	N/A	OO.4, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	in effective date.	data without requiring a change in the effective data.	Management		
PE.30	The system must provide a method for child care providers and counties to conduct Pre-Eligibility Determinations for families likely to be eligible for CCCAP; a method for providers to submit pre-eligibility information and applications to counties; and a method to identify and track pre-eligibility determinations.	The system must provide a method for child care providers and counties to conduct Pre-Eligibility Determinations for families likely to be eligible for CCCAP; a method for providers to submit pre-eligibility information and applications to counties; and a method to identify and track pre-eligibility determinations.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.1, BO.2
PE.31	The system must support updated immunization eligibility regulations.	The system must support updated immunization eligibility regulations.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	CHATS Stab. (TBD)	BO.2
PE.32	Linkages between CHATS and quality initiatives are insufficient to support current and future business needs.	Links are required between CCCAP and Quality Initiatives to include: a) Information from Resource and Referral Agencies (contracted to Qualistar) to track data on Parental Education for CCCAP families; b) Information on Parent Education conducted by counties; c) The Next Generation QRIS tracking system; d) identification of unduplicated counts of children receiving services across all programs within the Office of Early Childhood. This capability is important for policy makers in	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	OO.4, SO.3, BO.2, TO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
		coordinating services for children, measuring outcomes, and making informed policy decisions.			
PE.33	The system does not currently support waitlist functionality required in the house bill.	The future environment must support waitlist functionality as outlined in the house bill.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	HB14-1317 Changes	SO.1, BO.2
PE.34	Currently CHATS does not track actual days of a job search and cannot provide accurate calculations related to authorizations for secondary education activities. Currently tracking is done manually.	In the future the system must be able to accurately track actual days of job searches and accurately perform necessary calculations related to authorizations for secondary education activities.	Parent Eligibility and Case Management	N/A	SO.1, BO.2
PM.1	No online provider application.	Provider application can be completed and submitted online or completed and submitted on paper.	Provider Management	N/A	Rec.3, OO.2, BO.2
PM.2	Updates to Provider Fiscal screen cannot be made easily; an update clears the information and all rates have to be retyped.	Enable updates to the provider fiscal screen without clearing existing data.	Provider Management	N/A	OO.4, Rec.2
PM.3	When a provider is updated with different rates or different rate type, CHATS sets the start date as the day after the update is made. According to rule, the new rates should start from the date they are received, not later.	User should have the ability to manually set the rate start date.	Provider Management	N/A	Rec.2, BO.2
PM.4	CHATS does not allow the addition of new rates or rate types to a provider agreement; it gives an error. The	Allow the user to easily add new rates or rate types.	Provider Management	N/A	SO.4, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	workaround is to start a new Fiscal Agreement date and add the new rate. Then, go back to the Fiscal Agreement Summary screen and find the pending change to initiate the update process. CHATS does not remember the original end date, so the user must have noted that before proceeding with the update; once the original rate is fixed, then can proceed with adding rates to a different rate type.				
PM.5	The system must provide flexibility in the rate structure component for county rates and payment policies (such as absences, holidays, registration fees, and activity fees) to accommodate upcoming changes in rules and policies.	The system must provide flexibility in the rate structure component for county rates and payment policies (such as absences, holidays, registration fees, and activity fees) to accommodate upcoming changes in rules and policies.	Provider Management	HB14-1317 Changes	SO.4, BO.2, Rec.2
PM.6	The system must support a tiered reimbursement payment type. Payments for tiered reimbursement must be linked and verified to programs that are participating in the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).	The system must support a tiered reimbursement payment type. Payments for tiered reimbursement must be linked and verified to programs that are participating in the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).	Provider Management	HB14-1317 Changes	Rec.2, SO.4, BO.2
PM.7	Linkages between CHATS, licensing and TRAILS are insufficient.	Expanded links are required between CCCAP, Licensing and TRAILS including: a) Identification of Qualified	Provider Management	N/A	OO.4, Rec.1, OO.1, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
		<p>providers who complete pre-service training requirements.</p> <p>b) On-site monitoring visits to Qualified providers.</p> <p>c) Information identifying providers with adverse licensing actions.</p>			
PM.8	There is no alert in CHATS to let the County worker know a background check is complete. County worker must repeatedly check CBC screen.	System-generated notification when background check is complete.	Provider Management	CHATS Stab. (TBD)	OO.4
PM.9	The system does not support collection, storage, and reporting of accurate information on criminal background checks for Qualified Providers.	The system must support collection, storage, and reporting of accurate information on criminal background checks for Qualified Providers.	Provider Management	N/A	BO.2
PM.10	Current system does not provide any alerts if providers are going over capacity.	In the future environment having the ability to be notified if providers are above capacity at their facility will improve safety and quality.	Provider Management	N/A	SO.3, BO.2
RP.1	CHATS does not have ad hoc reporting or query capability. Counties need to query CHATS data and run ad hoc reports on a combination of data elements related to any time period (point in time or cumulative based on date ranges) in order to conducting program planning and budgeting activities, respond to community requests for information, improve case management, and increase efficiency.	Provide real-time ad hoc querying and/or reporting capability with the ability to customize reports to include any combination of data elements related to any time period (point in time or cumulative based on date ranges).	Reports	CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights	OO.5, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
RP.2	County staff do not have direct, real-time access to standard CHATS data and reports. The user makes a request through CHATS and the report is provided the next day.	Provide direct, real-time access to CHATS data and standard reports.	Reports	CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
RP.3	Requested CHATS report cannot be saved. If a county would like the same report they need to run again and another ticket must be created. It would also be helpful to save reports for historical program data.	Provide the ability for requested reports to be saved.	Reports	CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
RP.4	Report data is static; the user cannot manipulate report data. For example, a report of providers is not presented in alphabetical order.	Provide the ability for the user to manipulate report data and to drill down to view details.	Reports	CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
RP.5	There is no current report to show basic CCCAP county-wide and state-wide data like number of children served, by age group. Counties currently do not have real-time access to their CCCAP demographics, expenditures, payments by types or “burn rate” in CHATS. The ability to generate county and state CCCAP reports is needed, as they are a critical tool for planning, monitoring, and projecting impact of policies and expenditures and meeting federal reporting needs.	Provide standard reports for counties and the state to conduct program planning and budgeting, and view point-in-time program and service data.	Reports	CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
RP.6	<p>Many reports, including the following, do not meet user needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case Load Management Report - Waitlist Report 	<p>Redesign standard CHATS reports with user input to meet user needs.</p>	<p>Reports</p>	<p>CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights</p>	<p>OO.4, OO.5, BO.2</p>
RP.7	<p>Standard reports are needed to support core business processes including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recovering overpayments - Monitoring parent fees - "What if" analysis report of policy changes 	<p>Create standard CHATS reports with user input to meet user needs.</p>	<p>Reports</p>	<p>CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights</p>	<p>OO.4, OO.5, BO.2</p>
RP.8	<p>CHATS does not support creation of federal reports such as the QPR, ACF-800, ACF-801, and ACF-696. Creating these reports involves manual look-up and compilation of data from numerous sources.</p>	<p>The system must provide the ability to generate the Quality Program Report (QPR), a federal report requiring states to provide data on their quality improvement initiatives linked to CCCAP children. Specifically, the data required is the percentage of Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) subsidized children served in programs participating in a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and the percentage of CCDF children served in high quality care. The system must provide the ability to generate the monthly federal ACF-801, which requires states to identify the number of CCCAP children in programs participating in</p>	<p>Reports</p>	<p>CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights</p>	<p>OO.4, OO.5, BO.2</p>

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
		<p>QRIS. In addition, the report requires the number of CCCAP children in accredited programs and the number of children in programs that meet Pre-K standards.</p>			
RP.9	<p>CCCAP data is needed from the former legacy CHATS system for purposes of strategic planning and trends analysis.</p>	<p>The ability to integrate legacy data with current system data for purposes of strategic planning and trends analysis.</p>	Reports	CHATS Stab., DaaS, Data Insights	OO.4, OO.5, BO.2
TR.1	<p>Formal CHATS training opportunities are limited and content is insufficient to enable users to perform core business functions effectively and efficiently.</p>	<p>Training in future must be comprehensive and ongoing and additional training should be provided if there are changes in releases, etc. State and some counties would like virtual, interactive, training opportunities but in-person training should be available on a regular basis. Training must be a priority regardless of chosen system due to failures associated with user-errors caused by insufficient training in any system. Training should be built into new budget.</p> <p>Training should be organized for county staff at different levels of experience and job responsibilities (finance, provider, intake, and eligibility staff; supervisors; auditors; security administrators; state</p>	Training	OEC Training	OO.3, Rec.3, SO.3

ID	Current Environment Issue	Future Environment Need	Business Area	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
		<p>CCCAP team; Help Desk). Ongoing CCCAP and CHATS support and training and place to share questions, tips, and documents with other counties. In the future the county plan should also clearly identify how the county decisions fit into the larger state policy/plan. Create a central CCCAP help number at the state that will route to the appropriate person.</p>			
TR.2	<p>CHATS system information/trouble-shooting is difficult to find in the portal. There are many separate User Manuals; they are not user-friendly and not always up-to-date with current policies. There used to be a hard copy User Manual for reference.</p>	<p>Easy to access and use "Quick Reference" materials.</p>	Training	OEC Training (TBD)	OO.3, Rec.3, SO.3
TR.3	<p>CHATS does not provide a "queue" for cases, so users in training struggle to remember all the necessary screens to use when working with different case types.</p>	<p>Users in training require a workflow and resource reference for all case types to draw from while working with cases.</p>	Training	OEC Training (TBD)	OO.3, Rec.3

ID	Current Environment Issues/GAPS Identified by OIT	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
Technical Issues / Gaps			
T1	Limited training environments and opportunities for county staff and providers.	OEC Training	Rec. 2, Rec. 3
T2	CHATS IT staff lack training on the technology tools and software applications that are required for their daily work and the long-term health of the CHATS system.	N/A	Rec. 2
T3	There is commonly CHATS system user confusion regarding which department or agency should be contacted for support needs both technical and programmatic.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T4	Limited funding allocated to on-going CHATS system maintenance and IT support.	N/A	OO.3, Rec. 2
T5	User support occurrences are not currently logged and tracked in one single location and not all calls (like those resolved in real-time or referred to another agency) are logged.	N/A	OO.2, OO.3
T6	Helpdesk support is unable to keep up with the current volume of support tickets.	N/A	OO.3, Rec. 2
T7	Current CHATS Sustainability funding and timeline to fix tickets does not account for the time required of the current OIT team to support the new staff over the 9 month project.	N/A	OO.1, OO.3, Rec. 2
T8	CHATS is currently running on the original hardware and software platform and regular maintenance and upgrades are needed. There are no funds budgeted for software or hardware upgrades.	N/A	OO.3, TO.2, Rec. 2
T9	Deloitte system documentation is out of date.	N/A	OO.3
T10	Informal disaster recovery plan that excludes testing.	N/A	OO.3
T11	POS does not support digital phone lines.	N/A	BO.1, TO.2
T12	BizTalk performance is not appropriate given CHATS busiest periods.	N/A	TO.2
T13	There are identified inconsistencies with Autosys.	N/A	TO.2
T14	Front-facing system screens are confusing to provider and county-staff users in the current layout and design.	N/A	OO.4

ID	Current Environment Issues/GAPS Identified by OIT	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
T15	Ongoing maintenance and enhancements to the CHATS system don't have solid plans at the moment. Additionally, it is unclear on the level of support for providers because OIT help desk does not support them. July 1, 2015 is the last date for the current vendor (Wyant) to be providing this support.	N/A	OO.1, OO.3, Rec. 1, Rec. 2
T16	The current interfaces with CBMS, EBT, SIDMOD, CDOR are insufficient and there is concern regarding accuracy. In addition, future needs related to vital statistics, social security, etc. cannot be met with existing interfaces.	N/A	OO.4
Reporting Related Issues / Gaps			
T17	There is an inability and/or difficulties to generate ad hoc reports as a result of original system design, the lack of a centralized data environment such as a data warehouse, and the potential negative impact to operations that could result in the production environment.	DaaS Data Insights	OO.5
T18	CHATS IT staff will only have back-end access to any reports generated in PSSP. Uncertainty about the structure of PSSP reports, formatting and data instructions, which raises questions about validation and the ability to provide user support.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T19	Provider Reports: Providers are currently unable to generate reconciliation reports.	PSSP	OO.5
T20	County Reports: Case management, family/parent, and aggregate reports are too limited to serve needs. Length of time to receive reports (next day) does not meet county needs.	DaaS Data Insights	OO.5
T21	State / Program Reports: Current reporting is insufficient to measure the business impacts (i.e., number of children served and monies received, for real-time monitoring and quarterly/yearly progress reporting). Existing reports are insufficient for managing expenditures between participating programs and counties. Current reports do not tie in historic and current data elements for comprehensive analysis.	DaaS Data Insights	OO.5
OEC / OIT Collaboration Related Issues / Gaps			
T22	PSSP development is underway; roll-out plan is four phases between September and December 2014 with no end-user training planned. OEC needs to come up with	OEC Training (TBD)	OO.1, Rec.1, Rec. 3

ID	Current Environment Issues/GAPS Identified by OIT	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
	the strategy as a party responsible for the end user training.		
T23	Constant shifting of OEC program priorities resulting in unfinished projects	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T24	CHATS OIT team has very limited time available for maintenance and polishing of the system.	N/A	OO.3, Rec. 2
T25	The current Qualistar search feature for parents does not distinguish whether the provider accepts CCCAP.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T26	Current CHATS-PSSP integration plans are only one directional.	N/A	TO.2
T27	Lack of understanding of the strategic goals and objectives for the Office of Early Childhood, the Office of Information Technology and the CHATS project.	N/A	OO.1, OO.2, Rec. 1
T28	OIT staff is informing counties of policy decisions and practices.	N/A	OO.2
T29	Limited communication across agencies who utilize similar technologies to understand lessons learned and best practices.	N/A	OO.2
T30	IT support team is currently in charge of contract management.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T31	In CHATS tiered reimbursement (the net difference when a provider is paid more because of its high tier), the difference between the high-tier cost and the providers private pay cost should be billed to the Quality Appropriation. The charges are coming through CHATS, perhaps not through the quality appropriation (perhaps 100% subsidy).	CHATS Stab (TBD)	BO.2
T32	While the new QRIS has business process flows and drafts of detailed requirements, data fields, and user groups, they currently do not address CHATS at all and will be subject to updates throughout development and user acceptance testing.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T33	With the reality of continual OIT project priority changes, there is potential for the change management task group to be out of sync with OEC management and the legislative needs. Need more involvement of management to support daily work activities.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1

ID	Current Environment Issues/GAPS Identified by OIT	Planned/In-Progress Initiative	Proposed State Objective or Recommendation
T34	POS System has been commonly reported to be a burden on families in large part because you must be present to swipe. Some counties, particularly the ones with greater training budgets have had fewer challenges in this regard.	N/A	BO.1
T35	Data inconsistencies exist between counties. Some counties for example are tracking who is on the wait list within CHATS, and others are not.	N/A	OO.2, OO.5
Universal Application Related Issues / Gaps			
T36	Limited functional plans for the CHATS/Universal Application linkage. Currently, plans only account for data being input into CHATS and accepted.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T37	Internal uncertainty surrounding the Universal application persists despite initial dates projected due to a breakdown in communications. This uncertainty is in regards to the ownership of the systems training, ongoing maintenance, and user support.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T38	Lack of identified short-term and long-term plans for the Universal Application.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
T39	Plans to integrate CHATS with the Universal Application and the Provider Self Service Portal (PSSP), lack clarity on system support protocols, ownership, and ongoing maintenance.	N/A	OO.1, Rec. 1
Future Needs			
T40	HB 1317 requires tiered reimbursement based on QRIS data. No operational solution yet.	N/A	OO.5