



IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request Design approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Implementation approval.

Part I - Project Information

Date:	April 10, 2008
Agency Name:	Iowa Department of Economic Development (IDED)
Project Name:	10236 – Business License Information Center (BLIC)
Agency Manager:	Sherry Timmins, Regulatory Assistance Coordinator
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	Sherry Timmins, 515.242.4901, Sherry.Timmins@iowalifechanging.com
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	Michael Tramontina, Director
Initial Total for Design:	\$ 25,000
Initial Total for Implementation:	\$354,360 – implementation phase \$ 13,520 – 1 st year hosting \$367,880
Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$392,880
Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)	Design Start Date: November, 2007 Design End Date: May, 2007 Implementation Start Date: May, 2008 Implementation End Date: Dec, 2008
Revised Total for Design and Implementation:	\$

<i>Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</i>	\$
---	----

Part II - Project Overview

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.

Response:

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

Response:

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?

Response:

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

YES (If "YES", explain.)


Response:

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

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

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Requirements/Compliance 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.

Response:

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.

Response:

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?

Response:

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

Response:


[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).



[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]



Customer Service 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. Scope

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

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

Response:

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Scope 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.

G. 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/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Funds 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)
-

Part III – Design Proposal

Amount of Design Funding Requested: \$

A. 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:

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:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Reengineering 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).



B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Design phase of the project. Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database design. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Design Timeline 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).



C. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Design Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:

1. One Year 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 One Year Pre-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	\$

2. One Year 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 One Year Post-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	\$

3. One Year Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated one year 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:

<u>Transaction Savings</u>	
Number of annual online transactions:	
Hours saved/transaction:	
Number of Citizens affected:	
Value of Citizen Hour	\$
Total Transaction Savings:	\$
Other Savings (Describe)	\$
Total One Year Citizen Benefit :	\$

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated one year 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:

5. Design Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	\$	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =		
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100		

6. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable 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:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Design Financial 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).



Part IV – Implementation Funding

Amount of Implementation Funding Requested: \$354,360

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$ 13,520

\$367,880

Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges

A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Implementation phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Response:

Start date:	5/26/8	Proj. Mgr; Development Resource;
Coding:	5/26/8	Development Resource
Data migration:	11/14/8	Development Resource; Technical Architect; Customer
Testing:	11/26/8	Tester; Development Resource; Proj. Mgr.
Deployment:	12/11/8	Development Resource; Technical Architect; Proj. Mgr
Projected Completion Date:	12/22/8	Development Resource; Proj. Mgr

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Implementation Timeline 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).



B. Funding Requirements

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.

	Current 2008		Current 2009		Current 2010	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$88,590	0%	\$273,830	0%	\$5,460	0%
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%
Total Project Cost	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Implementation Funding 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).



C. 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.

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 (1 st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$93756	1	100	\$82756	100%	\$
Software	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
ITE Services	\$367880	5	100%	\$	%	\$73576
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$3000	1	100%	\$3000	%	\$
Other	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Totals	\$464636		100 %	\$85756	%	\$73576

D. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:

1. 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: See below worksheet

2. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable – List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable 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:

- **Enhancing service to existing and prospective business**
- **Utilization of new IT technology;**
- **Reducing unnecessary regulatory delays**
- **Reducing costs of compliance**
- **Increasing business focus on core activities rather than compliance**
- **Increasing compliance rates**

3. Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$96756	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$85756	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$11000
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$58996
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	\$69996	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$25000	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	2.79	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	12.6978	

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Implementation Financial 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).



Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Design Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL DESIGN EVALUATION</u> (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Implementation Phase:

Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION</u> (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

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

Response: Information will be more readily accessible.

2. Citizen impact

Response: Citizens will have complete and accurate information available 24/7.

3. Cost Savings

Response: Decreasing the amount of 'down time' and 'frustration' for citizens or business users of BLIC and improving the clarity of information is very valuable.

4. Project reengineering

Response:

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response:

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Response: Current, update to date BLIC information will result in fewer calls to departments within the State thereby allowing State employees to focus on other business.