

Project Tracking No.: **10347****IOWAccess Advisory Council****Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application**

This template was built using the ITE ROI Submission Intranet application.

**FINAL AUDIT REQUIRED:** The Enterprise Quality Assurance Office of the Information Technology Enterprise is required to perform post implementation outcome audits for all Pooled Technology funded projects and may perform audits on other projects.

**This is an IOWAccess Revolving Fund Request.**

Amount of funding requested: Currently: \$75,000. (Design Cost)

Anticipated Total: \$ 443,000. (CoMIS Replacement)

[Scope (\$68K)+Design (\$75K)+Implement (\$300K)]

**Section I: Proposal**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Date:</b>  | 8/16/2007  |
| <b>Agency Name:</b>                                     | ISAC (Iowa State Association of Counties – Community Services Affiliate)   |
| <b>Project Name:</b>                                    | CoMIS (County Management Information System)   |
| <b>Agency Manager:</b>                                  | Robin Harlow   |
| <b>Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:</b>            | 515-244-7181 x 306,<br>rharlow@iowacounties.org  |
| <b>Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):</b> | Bill Peterson  |
| <b>IOWAccess Project Process Phase:</b>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Scope Analysis<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design<br><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation |

**A. Project Summary:** Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

This project is to design a standardized information system that allows the counties to share data among themselves and the State of Iowa for the management, tracking and reporting of Mental Health, General Assistance, Veterans Affairs, Substance Abuse and Case Management community services they provide. The system will connect county and state agencies with a common system to capture and report standardized information for lowans accessing the community services system.

During the Initiation Phase two systems vendors (Quilogy and Spindustry) that have already developed replacement CoMIS systems for a few Iowa counties were invited to submit an SOW that included deliverables, schedule and cost to provide a Statewide **County CSN (County Community Services Network)** from the Iowa CoMIS systems they had developed. The technical strength and lowest cost resulted in the selection of Spindustry. The cost estimate for

this design is \$75,000. This system design will consider all 99 counties each managing complex community services programs for:

1. Case Management
2. Data Exchange
3. Billing & Accounting
4. Operations
5. Budgeting
6. Reporting

The design will provide standardized solutions that meet the needs of all the counties, the State and the data exchange partners.

**B. Strategic Plan:** How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

Currently, because of the structure of the current CoMIS, counties are not connected. This separation resulted in the following:

- A lack of standardized data
- The difficulty of efficiently managing and evaluating services
- The inability to track clients as they move from county to county
- No collection of state-wide information on General Assistance, Substance Abuse, and Veterans Affairs

The ISAC Community Services affiliate exists to coordinate, identify and plan new approaches that improve community services access for Iowans. The design of a **County CSN (County Community Services Network)** that connects the counties with a common, standardized MIS is a key element of this strategic plan.

**C. Current Technology:** Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

The current CoMIS is a MS Access database developed in 1996. Due to the limitations of CoMIS, individual county needs, and limited support from DHS, counties have developed alternative data systems or re-worked CoMIS to address these problems. There are multiple data systems collecting data in different ways. These current systems are not consistent with either Service Oriented Architecture or existing enterprise standards and do not provide a public web site.

#### **D. Statutory or Other Requirements (*Not applicable*)**

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?  
**X YES** (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.) .

**Explanation:**

In order to submit reports required by the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Sections 331.438 and 331.438 of the *Code of Iowa* require counties to submit information about the services they provide and the individuals receiving those services. Section 441-25.41 of the *Iowa Administrative Code* specifies six files of information to be submitted, with the number of data elements ranging from 6 to 41 in each file. A total of 73 data elements are reported for each individual served, 19 data elements are reported for each claim processed, 16 data elements are reported for each service authorization made, 10 data elements are reported for each provider, and 6 data elements are reported for each service

provided by each provider. Failure to report the data may result in loss of significant state funds.

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?  
 X YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.) **See above.**

**Explanation:**

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement? **NO**

YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Explanation:**

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard? **NO**

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

**Explanation:**

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



## E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

**1. Project Participants** - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

This design will improve the delivery and evaluation of the way all Iowa 99 counties provide over \$300M in County Community Services to over 50,000 clients. Participants and interested parties are:

- The Iowa State Association of Counties (ISAC)
- The Iowa Department of Human Services (IADHS)
- The MH/DD Commission
- The Iowa Association of Community Providers
- Individuals receiving Community Services in the State of Iowa
- Iowa Courts/Judicial

**2. Service Improvements** - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Improvement in general assistance, mental health, substance abuse, case management, and substance abuse community services will be realized from a process and system designed to:

- Standardize data.
- Improve efficiency of service delivery and evaluation.

- Provide client tracking across all counties.
- Provide statewide information on community services provided by each county.
- Improve interaction with State information systems.
- Provide a public website

**3. Citizen Impact** – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa’s citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

Citizen’s will be have a public web site as part of the new County CSN. They will be able to obtain information about: (1) the County CSN services, (2) how to get service, news and forms (3) who to contact and even be able to complete the application all from the CSN public web site.

Records of community services provided to our citizens will continue to be maintained by each county where a service is provided but this design will make necessary data available across all 99 counties. This will speed the county intake process, provide a continuation of service, and prevent “starting over” in each different county where a service is provided. It will also coordinate records of a number of agencies that currently do not link.

**4. Public Health and/or Safety** – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Health and safety impacts:

- Improved access by Iowa’s citizens to county community services.
- Improved access to critical information about high risk individuals.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**  
**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).



## F. Process Reengineering

Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

**Response:**

This will be determined during this design project.

Provide a post-project or post-expenditure (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

**Response:**

Over time, traditional processes predominantly carried out on paper will be handled electronically. The security of the system will allow access to those who are authorized to see information about specific individuals and will block access for all others. Having

demographic, service, and payment information available statewide will greatly enhance the ability to report and analyze information about service delivery.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

**G. Timeline**

Provide a projected timeline for this project. Include such items as **start date**, planning, database design, coding, implementation, testing, conversion, parallel installation, and date of final release. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

The timeline for this design project is December 2007 to March 2008. The responsible party will be ISAC. The deliverables will be provided by Spindustry.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

**H. Funding Requirements (Design)**

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

|  | FY08            |              | FY09       |              | FY10       |              |
|--|-----------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
|  | Cost(\$)        | % Total Cost | Cost(\$)   | % Total Cost | Cost(\$)   | % Total Cost |
| State General Fund                       | \$0             | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           |
| <b>Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund</b> | <b>\$75,000</b> | <b>100%</b>  | <b>\$0</b> | <b>0%</b>    | <b>\$0</b> | <b>0%</b>    |
| Federal Funds                            | \$0             | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           |
| Local Gov. Funds                         | \$0             | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           |
| Grant or Private Funds                   | \$0             | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           |
| Other Funds (Specify)                    | \$0             | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           |
| <b>Total Project Cost</b>                | <b>\$75,000</b> | <b>100%</b>  | <b>\$0</b> | <b>0%</b>    | <b>\$0</b> | <b>0%</b>    |
| Non-Pooled Tech. Total                   | \$0             | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           | \$0        | 0%           |

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]****Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

**I. Scope**

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

**X** YES (If "YES", explain.)  NO, it is a stand-alone project.

**Explanation:**

This project is for the design phase of a project to replace CoMIS with a **County CSN (County Community Services Network)** to improve and standardize the delivery and visibility of community services across all 99 counties. The next project will be for the CoMIS implementation.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

**X** YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Explanation:**

The CoMIS Project Scope which was initially funded for \$20,000 and then supplemented by \$48,000. for a total of \$68,000.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]****Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)



The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

**J. Source of Funds**

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology and/or IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.


**Response:**

Although 100% of the funds will come from IOWAccess, staff from ISAC and various counties will be contributing over 1000 hours to this design project.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



## Section II: Financial Analysis

### A. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years. Additionally, the ROI calculation must include all new annual ongoing costs that are project related.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

| Budget Line Items     | Budget Amount (1st Year Cost) | Useful Life (Years) | % State Share | Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year) | % State Share | Annual Prorated Cost |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Agency Staff          |                               |                     |               |                                      |               |                      |
| Software              |                               |                     |               |                                      |               |                      |
| Hardware              |                               |                     |               |                                      |               |                      |
| Training              |                               |                     |               |                                      |               |                      |
| Facilities            |                               |                     |               |                                      |               |                      |
| Professional Services | \$60,000                      |                     |               |                                      |               | \$60,000             |
| ITE Services          | \$10,000                      | TBD                 |               | TBD                                  |               | \$10,000             |
| Supplies, Maint, etc. | \$5,000                       |                     |               |                                      |               | \$5,000              |
| Other                 |                               |                     |               |                                      |               |                      |
| <b>Totals</b>         | <b>\$75,000.</b>              |                     |               |                                      |               | <b>\$75,000.</b>     |

## B. Spending plan

### Explain how the funds will be allocated.

Funds will be allocated to the following activities:

- Initial Estimate and 12 Screen Mock Ups (by December 31)
- Compiled results from working with the group to gather detailed system requirements
- Statement of Work for the Development Project
- Document that details the requirements / specifications for the proposed system,
- High level design and data model of the proposed system
- Project plan to implement and support the design
- Budget and Timeline for the implementation, training, and support phases

## C. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the ROI Financial Worksheet as necessary:

*Tangible benefits (1. & 2. below) cannot be determined until after the design phase*

**1. Annual Pre-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation.

**Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

**Describe Annual Pre-Project Cost:**

There are currently 99 counties each with their own process and system. With so many differences among the counties in terms of number of clients and client services provided a total annual pre-project cost is probably not knowable.

**Quantify Annual Pre-Project Cost:**

There are currently 99 counties each with their own process and system. With so many differences among the counties in terms of number of clients and client services provided a total annual pre-project cost is probably not knowable.

|   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
|   | <b>State Total</b> |
| <b>FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):</b>  | unknown            |
| <b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>                                    | unknown            |
| <b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b> | unknown            |
| <b>Total Annual Pre-Project Cost:</b>   | unknown            |

**2. Annual Post-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation.

**Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.



**Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:**

A cost reduction is expected but the amount for each county cannot be determined or aggregated for all 99 counties.

**Quantify Annual Post-Project Cost:**

A cost reduction is expected but the amount for each county cannot be determined or aggregated for all 99 counties.

|   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
|   | <b>State Total</b> |
| <b>FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):</b>  | unknown            |
| <b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>                                    | unknown            |
| <b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b> | unknown            |
| <b>Total Annual Post-Project Cost:</b>  | unknown            |

**3. Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

This cannot be quantified but the benefits are summarized in *Section E. Impact on Iowa's citizens.*

| <b>Transaction Savings</b>            |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Number of annual online transactions: |  |
| Hours saved/transaction:              |  |
| Number of Citizens affected:          |  |
| Value of Citizen Hour                 |  |
| Total Transaction Savings:            |  |
| Other Savings (Describe)              |  |
| <b>Total Savings:</b>                 |  |

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance** - Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

**Response:**

These benefits are listed in Section A, B, C and in the project Concept Paper but cannot be quantified at the beginning of this design project.

| <b>ROI Financial Worksheet</b> <i>(This data is generated from Section II C data which is unknown because the amounts for each county cannot be determined or aggregated for all 99 counties.)</i> |         |
|--|---------|
| A. Total Annual Pre-Project cost (State Share from Section II C1):   | unknown |
| B. Total Annual Post-Project cost (State Share from Section II C2):  | unknown |
| State Government Benefit (= A-B):  | unknown |
| Annual Benefit Summary:  | unknown |
| State Government Benefit:  | unknown |
| Citizen Benefit:   | unknown |
| Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit:  | unknown |
| C. Total Annual Project Benefit:   | unknown |
| D. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table):   | unknown |
| <b>Benefit / Cost Ratio: (C/D) =</b>   | unknown |
| <b>Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 =</b>   | unknown |

**5. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable** - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

**Response:**

These benefits are listed in *Section A, B, C* and in the project *Concept Paper*.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**  
**Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



---

## **Appendix A. Auditable Outcome Measures (Soft/Intangible)**

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

- 1. Improved customer service**
- 2. Citizen impact**
- 3. Cost Savings**
- 4. Project reengineering**
- 5. Source of funds (Budget %)**
- 6. Tangible/Intangible benefits**