

Project Investment Justification

Educator/Licensure Certification

Replacement System

ED22002

Department of Education

Contents

1. General Information	3
2. Meeting Pre-Work	3
3. Pre-PIJ/Assessment	4
4. Project	4
5. Schedule	5
6. Impact	8
7. Budget	9
8. Technology	9
9. Security	12
10. Areas of Impact	13
11. Financials	15
12. Project Success	16
13. Conditions	17
14. Oversight Summary	17

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

PIJ ID: ED22002

PIJ Name: Educator/Licensure Certification Replacement System

Account: Department of Education

Business Unit Requesting: Educator Preparation and Certification

Sponsor: Sid Bailey

Sponsor Title: Associate Superintendent, SAEE

Sponsor Email: sid.bailey@azed.gov

Sponsor Phone: 6025422014

2. MEETING PRE-WORK

2.1 What is the operational issue or business need that the Agency is trying to solve? (i.e....current process is manual, which increases resource time/costs to the State/Agency, and leads to errors...):

The Arizona Department of Education (hereinafter referred to "ADE") is soliciting proposals to satisfy the needs of ADE to replace its educator licensure/certification system. The current system was released in FY 2000 and is in need of modernization.

Reference RFP BPM004538

The current system is no longer supported by the vendor. As result AED IT has had to patchwork bug fixes and enhancements to support the business requirements as they are changed due to changes in legislation. To date in FY'23, these changes have cost AED over \$65K to date. These costs will be virtually eliminated once the proposed solution is implemented.

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

The future certification system must be able to support a high volume of licensure/certification applications, processing, reporting, and have flexible and specific configurations to meet various agency and state needs.

2.3 Describe the proposed solution to this business need.

ADE is seeking a cloud-based/customer-hosted off-the-shelf software with the functionalities that can be configured and customized to meet the agency and state's licensure and operational requirements (<https://www.azed.gov/educator-certification>).

The system will assist the State in educator licensure/certification and satisfy the needs of the five (5) key users of the platform: the public, educators, local education agencies, educator preparation programs, and internal ADE staff including staff/evaluators, administrator, and IT development.

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

No

2.4a Please describe the existing technology environment into which the proposed solution will be implemented.
Vender shall provide a customer-hosted educator licensure/certification system with functionality which can be configured and customized to meet ADE's needs.

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

Yes

2.5a Please explain below why the requirements are not available.

3. PRE-PIJ/ASSESSMENT

3.1 Are you submitting this as a Pre-PIJ in order to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to evaluate options and select a solution that meets the project requirements?

No

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

Yes

3.2 Will you be completing an assessment/Pilot/RFP phase, i.e. an evaluation by a vendor, 3rd party or your agency, of the current state, needs, & desired future state, in order to determine the cost, effort, approach and/or feasibility of a project?

No

3.2a Describe the reason for completing the assessment/pilot/RFP and the expected deliverables.

3.2b Provide the estimated cost, if any, to conduct the assessment phase and/or Pilot and/or RFP/solicitation process.

3.2e Based on research to date, provide a high-level cost estimate to implement the final solution.

4. PROJECT

4.1 Does your agency have a formal project methodology in place?

Yes

4.2 Describe the high level makeup and roles/responsibilities of the Agency, Vendor(s) and other third parties (i.e. agency will do...vendor will do...third party will do).

ADE

Bruce DuPlanty, DAS - EDUCR PREPARATION & CERT, Buisness Owner - Portals SME

Michelle Brady, DIR OF CERTIFICATION, Operations SME

Luis Silva, EDUCATOR PREPARATION & CERT, Data, System(s), Safefuards, etc - Portals SME

Maura Yildirim, Rules and Procedures Coordinator, Rules, Statutes, and Cert requirements SME

Beth Neely, Chief Information Officer, CIO

Joe Carrillo, Chief Technology Officer,CTO

Qur'an Nero, IT PROGRAM MGMT DIRECTOR, Director of program management (PMO)

Phillip Ellis, IT Project Manager, IT PM for Certification Modernization project

Mainstream

Patsy Dather, Business Development – Software Solutions; Responsible business communications with AED

JD Robinson, Director Strategy and Consulting - Responsible for design, development and testing of final solution

Lori Stewart, Team/Project Manager - Responsible to track and report on vendor schedule and deliverables

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

Yes

4.3a If the PM is credentialed, e.g., PMP, CPM, State certification etc., please provide certification information.

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

Yes

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

Yes

5. SCHEDULE

5.1 Is a project plan available that reflects the estimated Start Date and End Date of the project, and the supporting Milestones of the project?

Yes

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

Est. Implementation Start Date

Est. Implementation End Date

1/19/2023 12:00:00 AM

9/30/2023 12:00:00 AM

5.3 How were the start and end dates determined?

Based on funding

5.3a List the expected high level project tasks/milestones of the project, e.g., acquire new web server, develop software interfaces, deploy new application, production go live, and estimate start/finish dates for each, if known.

Milestone / Task	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Finish Date
Discovery	01/09/23	02/03/23
SSP needs to be delivered to the Security team for review prior to going live in order to meet the condition.	01/19/23	07/03/23
Complete the full Arizona Risk and Authorization Management Program (AZRamp)	01/19/23	07/03/23
January 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$101,250.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	01/23/23	02/03/23
DB Design/Solution Scaffolding Target date to have proposed database schema as well as framework solution with Continuous Integration/ Continuous Deployment pipeline and development environment setup.	01/27/23	01/27/23
February 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$101,250.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	02/01/23	02/15/23
ADEConnect Integration Integrate disparate AzED applications with the ADEConnect platform.	02/10/23	02/10/23
March 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$175,500.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	03/01/23	03/15/23
April 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$175,500.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	04/01/23	04/17/23

Data Migration Complete redacted data migration from existing ADE schema to new ADE schema.	04/28/23	04/28/23
May 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$175,500.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	05/01/23	05/15/23
ADE Certification Deliver ADE Certification system to user testing environment environment.	05/26/23	05/26/23
UAT - ADE Certification	05/26/23	07/25/23
June 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$175,500.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	06/01/23	06/15/23
Public Educator look up portal delivered	06/09/23	06/09/23
July 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$162,000.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	07/01/23	07/15/23
Deliver Educator portal to user acceptance testing environment	07/28/23	07/28/23
UAT - Educator Portal	07/28/23	08/27/23
August 2023 Vendor Payment Estimate \$144,450.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	08/01/23	08/15/23
Deliver Local Education Agency (AKA Districts) application to user acceptance testing environment	08/15/23	08/15/23
UAT - Local Education Agency	08/15/23	09/04/23
Data Migration Complete non-redacted data migration from existing ADE schema to new ADE schema.	08/15/23	08/15/23
Deliver EPP is Education Preparation Program (AKA Universities and Colleges with Education Preparation Programs that recommend students for certification) application to to user acceptance environment	09/01/23	09/01/23

UAT - Education Preparation Program	09/01/23	09/21/23
September 2023 Final Vendor Payment Estimate \$133,920.00 The Vendor will generate a bill at the beginning of the month reflecting the hours spent in the previous month.	09/01/23	09/15/23
Feature/code freeze	09/09/23	09/09/23
Go-live	09/30/23	09/30/23

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

No

5.5 Will any physical infrastructure improvements be required prior to the implementation of the proposed solution. e.g., building reconstruction, cabling, etc.?

No

5.5a Does the PIJ include the facilities costs associated with construction?

5.5b Does the project plan reflect the timeline associated with completing the construction?

6. IMPACT

6.1 Are there any known resource availability conflicts that could impact the project?

No

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

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

No

6.2a Please identify the projects or procurements.

6.3 Will the implementation involve major end user view or functionality changes?

Yes

6.4 Will the proposed solution result in a change to a public-facing application or system?

No

7. BUDGET

7.1 Is a detailed project budget reflecting all of the up-front/startup costs to implement the project available, e.g, hardware, initial software licenses, training, taxes, P&OS, etc.?

Yes

7.2 Have the ongoing support costs for sustaining the proposed solution over a 5-year lifecycle, once the project is complete, been determined, e.g., ongoing vendor hosting costs, annual maintenance and support not acquired upfront, etc.?

Yes

7.3 Have all required funding sources for the project and ongoing support costs been identified?

Yes

7.4 Will the funding for this project expire on a specific date, regardless of project timelines?

Yes

7.5 Will the funding allocated for this project include any contingency, in the event of cost over-runs or potential changes in scope?

Yes

8. TECHNOLOGY

8.1 Please indicate whether a statewide enterprise solution will be used or select the primary reason for not choosing an enterprise solution.

The project is using a statewide enterprise solution

8.2 Will the technology and all required services be acquired off existing State contract(s)?

Yes

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

No

8.3a Describe how the software was selected below:

8.4 Does the project involve technology that is new and/or unfamiliar to your agency, e.g., software tool never used before, virtualized server environment?

No

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

No

8.6 Does the vendor (if known) have professional experience with similar projects?

Yes

8.7 Does the project involve any coordination across multiple vendors?

No

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

Yes

8.9 Have any compatibility issues been identified between the proposed solution and the existing environment, e.g., upgrade to server needed before new COTS solution can be installed?

No

8.9a Describe below the issues that were identified and how they have been/will be resolved, or whether an ADOA-ASET representative should contact you.

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

Yes

8.11 Is this replacing an existing solution?

Yes

8.11a Indicate below when the solution being replaced was originally acquired.

The current solution was developed in house in the year 2000.

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

The current application used will be retired

8.12 Describe how the agency determined the quantities reflected in the PIJ, e.g., number of hours of P&OS, disk capacity required, number of licenses, etc. for the proposed solution?

Vendor recommendation of hardware requirements

8.13 Does the proposed solution and associated costs reflect any assumptions regarding projected growth, e.g., more users over time, increases in the amount of data to be stored over 5 years?

Yes

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

Yes

8.14a Please select why failover and disaster recovery is not included in the proposed solution.

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

Yes

8.15a Are the costs associated with that configuration included in the PIJ financials?

Yes

8.16 Will any app dev or customization of the proposed solution be required for the agency to use the project in the current/planned tech environment, e.g. a COTS app that will req custom programming, an agency app that will be entirely custom developed?

Yes

8.16a Will the customizations inhibit the ability to implement regular product updates, or to move to future versions?

No

8.16b Describe who will be customizing the solution below:

The vendor and internal AzED IT resources will be used for customization.

8.16c Do the resources that will be customizing the application have experience with the technology platform being used, e.g., .NET, Java, Drupal?

Yes

8.16d Please select the application development methodology that will be used:

Agile/Scrum

8.16e Provide an estimate of the amount of customized development required, e.g., 25% for a COTS application, 100% for pure custom development, and describe how that estimate was determined below:

Almost 100% of the final solution will be customized by the vendor and ADE.

ADE will need to develop communication conduits the the vendor hosted solution. The vendor will be customizing screens and reports to be used by the endusers

8.16f Are any/all Professional & Outside Services costs associated with the customized development included in the PIJ financials?

Yes

8.17 Have you determined that this project is in compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, policies, standards & procedures, incl. those for network, security, platform, software/application &/or data/info found at aset.az.gov/resources/psp?

Yes

8.17a Describe below the compliance issues that were identified and how they have been/will be resolved, or whether an ADOA-ASET representative should contact you:

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

No

8.18a Please explain all unidentified high risk project issues below:

9. SECURITY

9.1 Will the proposed solution be vendor-hosted?

Yes

9.1a Please select from the following vendor-hosted options:

Commercial data center environment, e.g AWS, Azure

9.1b Describe the rationale for selecting the vendor-hosted option below:

Off loading overhead of server maintenance such as patching, security roles and hardware

9.1c Has the agency been able to confirm the long-term viability of the vendor hosted environment?

Yes

9.1d Has the agency addressed contract termination contingencies, e.g., solution ownership, data ownership, application portability, migration plans upon contract/support termination?

Yes

9.1e Has a Conceptual Design/Network Diagram been provided and reviewed by ASET-SPR?

No

9.1f Has the spreadsheet located at <https://aset.az.gov/arizona-baseline-security-controls-excel> already been completed by the vendor and approved by ASET-SPR?

No

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

No

9.2a Where will the on-premise solution be located:

9.2b Were vendor-hosted options available and reviewed?

9.2c Describe the rationale for selecting an on-premise option below:

9.2d Will any data be transmitted into or out of the agency's on-premise environment or the State Data Center?

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

Yes

9.3a Describe below what security infrastructure/controls are/will be put in place to safeguard this data:

The vendor is in the process of conforming to the Moderate controls set forth by the Az State Ramp.

10. AREAS OF IMPACT

Application Systems

Database Systems

Data Warehouse/Mart

Software

COTS Application Customization

Hardware

Hosted Solution (Cloud Implementation)

Security

Firewall

Telecommunications

Enterprise Solutions

Contract Services/Procurements

11. FINANCIALS

Description	PIJ Category	Cost Type	Fiscal Year Spend	Quantity	Unit Cost	Extended Cost	Tax Rate	Tax	Total Cost
Includes profession services, training, implementation and post-launch support from vendor	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1	\$1,260,900	\$1,260,900	0.00 %	\$0	\$1,260,900
Vendor Hosting and Security Tax is included 8.6%	License & Maintenance Fees	Development	1	1	\$84,000	\$84,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$84,000
Internal ADE IT costs	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1	\$181,000	\$181,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$181,000
Support, maintenance	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	2	1	\$105,000	\$105,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$105,000
Vendor Hosting/Security 8.6% tax rate included	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	2	1	\$88,200	\$88,200	0.00 %	\$0	\$88,200
Professional & Outside Services * (ADE Contractors)	Professional & Outside Services	Operational	2	1	\$10,000	\$10,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$10,000
Support, maintenance	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	3	1	\$112,260	\$112,260	0.00 %	\$0	\$112,260
Vendor Hosting/Security including 8.6% tax	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	3	1	\$92,610	\$92,610	0.00 %	\$0	\$92,610
Professional & Outside Services * (ADE Contractors)	Professional & Outside Services	Operational	3	1	\$10,000	\$10,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$10,000
Support, maintenance	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	4	1	\$120,246	\$120,246	0.00 %	\$0	\$120,246
Vendor Hosting/Security including 8.6% tax	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	4	1	\$97,241	\$97,241	0.00 %	\$0	\$97,241
Professional & Outside Services * (ADE Contractors)	Professional & Outside Services	Operational	4	1	\$10,000	\$10,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$10,000

Support, maintenance no tax	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	5	1	\$129,031	\$129,031	0.00 %	\$0	\$129,031
Professional & Outside Services * (ADE Contractors)	Professional & Outside Services	Operational	5	1	\$10,000	\$10,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$10,000
Vendor Hosting/Security	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	5	1	\$102,103	\$102,103	0.00 %	\$0	\$102,103

Base Budget (Available)	Base Budget (To Be Req)	Base Budget % of Project
\$1,067,691		44%
APF (Available)	APF (To Be Req)	APF % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Other Appropriated (Available)	Other Appropriated (To Be Req)	Other Appropriated % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Federal (Available)	Federal (To Be Req)	Federal % of Project
\$1,344,900	\$0	56%
Other Non-Appropriated (Available)	Other Non-Appropriated (To Be Req)	Other Non-Appropriated % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%

Total Budget Available	Total Development Cost
\$2,412,591	\$1,525,900
Total Budget To Be Req	Total Operational Cost
\$0	\$886,691
Total Budget	Total Cost
\$2,412,591	\$2,412,591

12. PROJECT SUCCESS

Please specify what performance indicator(s) will be referenced in determining the success of the proposed project (e.g. increased productivity, improved customer service, etc.)? (A minimum of one performance indicator must be specified)

Please provide the performance objective as a quantifiable metric for each performance indicator specified.

Note: The performance objective should provide the current performance level, the performance goal, and the time period within which that performance goal is intended to be achieved. You should have an auditable means to measure and take corrective action to address any deviations.

Example: Within 6 months of project completion, the agency would hope to increase "Neighborhood Beautification" program registration by 20% (3,986 registrants) from the current registration count of 19,930 active participants.

Performance Indicators

- 1) No down time between converting from current system and new system.
- 2) Within 6 months of project completion and in production, 100% of ADE certification processes will be hosted in the project and customer service portals will be active and reliable.
- 3) Annual support costs lower in the year by approximately 40%

13. CONDITIONS

Conditions for Approval

Should development costs exceed the approved estimates by 10% or more, or should there be significant changes to the proposed technology scope of work or implementation schedule, the Agency must amend the PIJ to reflect the changes and submit it to ADOA-ASET, and ITAC if required, for review and approval prior to further expenditure of funds.

Monthly reporting on the project status is due to ADOA-ASET no later than the 15th of the month following the start of the project. Failure to comply with timely project status reporting will affect the overall project health. The first status report for this project is due on March 15, 2023.

Prior to system production environment launch or go live, the Agency must work with the Department of Administration (ADOA) and Department of Homeland Security (AZDOHS) Cyber Command, to assure the System Security Plan document is completed and approved by Cyber Command in order to ensure that the selected solution will provide an appropriate level of protection for State data.

Prior to moving any State data into the vendor-hosted environment the Agency must work with the Department of Administration (ADOA) and Department of Homeland Security (AZDOHS) Cyber Command, to assure the vendor successfully completes the full Arizona Risk and Authorization Management Program (AZRamp) and is AZRamp Authorized in order to access, transmit, process or store state data.

14. OVERSIGHT SUMMARY

Project Background

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) the state agency tasked with overseeing Arizona's K-12 public education system. The department is led by a publicly elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, consisting of more than 600 staff across four state offices working to serve Arizona's students, families, educators, and school communities.

ADE is tasked with licensure and certification of educators throughout Arizona. The current system available to Internal ADE staff, the Public, Educators, Local Education Agencies and Educator Preparation Programs is no longer able to be maintained. The current solution is outdated, limited and insufficient for future needs of the agency.

ADOA-ASET has reviewed the agency proposal to develop and implement a cloud-based solution to replace the current outdated system. The project has started; the agency has begun working with the vendor and are currently in the discovery phase.

Business Justification

ADE will see an improvement in a cloud-based/vendor-hosted solution with the functionalities that will be configured and customized to meet the agency and state's licensure and operational requirements. The ADE staff will be able to better support the external users reducing the time assisting in information updates. The external users will be able to access the system with much more user friendly interface than the current solution improving the overall satisfaction of the external users.

Arizona's will benefit from the improvements by being able to provide more effective and user friendly services to the Arizonans that utilize the services.

SYSTEM PURPOSE:(as stated in SOW pg11)

EMPLOYEE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM District and school where educators are employed for the school year.

STUDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM Course scheduling and class rosters/sizes.

COURSE CODE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM License requirements for each course offering.

STATE ACCREDITATION SYSTEM Standards the schools/districts need meet to be accredited.
TEACHER ASSESSMENTS Evaluation data to advance an educator's license.
STATE PAYMENT SYSTEM Process license application fees.
FBI AND STATE CRIMINAL HISTORY SYSTEM Background checks for employment.
NASDTEC Educator misconduct reported by another state.
PEARSON TESTING Test scores for license qualification.
PRAXIS TESTING Test scores for license qualification.
TRANSCRIPTS Degree information for license qualification.

Implementation Plan

The solution will be hosted by the vendor to allow for better support of the solution. The vendor is undergoing AZ Ramp certification. The solution will not contain any state user data until the AZ Ramp certification is completed.

The vendor will provide a project management team:

Account Manager

Project Manager

Team Leader

Solution Architect / Technical Lead

Developers and Specialists

(Description of each in SOW pg.24-25)

The agency will provide a project team: (Detailed Information on "Agency Project Team" attachment)

Project Manager - Philip Ellis

Agency will do:

Review and approve requirements and design- Bruce DuPlanty/Joe Carrillo

Acceptance criteria - Bruce DuPlanty

User acceptance testing - Michelle Brady/Luis Silva

Sign-offs - Bruce DuPlanty

Vendor will do:

Requirements documentation

Design

Development

Functional testing

Training

Implementation

Hosting and security services

Shared

Database design - ADE:Harinath Gaddam/Luis Silva

Data communication pipes between new environment and existing ADE databases

ADE: Harinath Gaddam/Luis Silva/Kalyani Pula/Padma Nagilla

AZRamp approval prior to production data migration ADE: Phillip Ellis will facilitate meetings and updates between Mainstream, JD Robinson, Director of Strategy and Consulting and AZ Dept of Homeland Security, Michael

Petteway, Senior Statewide Security Manager

Support and maintenance

Training will be provided to the internal ADE staff, this will allow them the ability to assist any external users with issues. The vendor will also provide a step-by-step guide for each application type. This interactive interface will contain user friendly and professional instructions stepping the educator through the requirements. Some requirements will include but are not limited to uploading of documents, filling out online forms, accepting payments, or simply entering the requested data. (SOW pg.27)

Vendor Selection

The vendor was selected after the Request for Proposal (RFP) response for Solicitation No. BPM004538. Mainstream was able to provide the requirements the agency needed in the RFP. The contract Master Agreement Contract Code is CTR062735.

Budget or Funding Considerations

Federal funding available to the agency will cover the majority of the project development costs totaling 56% of the total cost. The base budget will cover the remaining development costs and the operational costs of the project for the 5 year cycle.

15. PIJ REVIEW CHECKLIST

Agency Project Sponsor

Sid Bailey

Agency CIO (or Designee)

Beth Neely

Agency ISO (or designee)

Beth Neely

OSPB Representative

ASET Engagement Manager

ASET SPR Representative

Emily Gross

Agency SPO Representative

Not Applicable - We are an unlimited delegated authority agency.

Agency CFO

Ross Begnoche