



## IOWAccess Advisory Council Compilation of Discussions September 11, 2008

acronyms.....	4	Outreach to Local Governments .....	9
Additional Funding .....	8	outside developers.....	13
Advertising .....	2, 3	outsource the work .....	6
amount of funding .....	6	periodic approval process.....	15
better option exists .....	10	planning phase .....	7, 10, 11
Changing or Enhancing Approved Project...	5	planning process.....	10
concept paper criteria .....	14	Post Implementation Support .....	8
Convenience Fees .....	4	Prioritization .....	2
criteria check list .....	14	project priorities .....	4
discretionary fund .....	8	projects have not progressed .....	6
fees in conjunction with Internet services ....	3	projects with previous funding .....	13
funding for the implementation phase .....	10	requests outnumbered the dollars .....	10
funding hardware.....	9	restricted to state agencies.....	5
Identity Security.....	4	revised ROI needed.....	6
In-house development .....	13	ROI .....	3
ITE Discretionary Fund .....	7	Scope/Limitations .....	5
justification.....	5	Setting Priorities.....	3
legal liability .....	3	Small Project Funds.....	7
length of time .....	12	standards for persons with disabilities .....	8
limit amount of money .....	13	timeline .....	6
local government.....	11	Travel Expenses .....	3
meet by phone .....	4	utilize outside vendor .....	14
MOU for Local Government.....	12	who owns code.....	13
nonprofits partner with state agencies .....	6	who owns the “intellectual property .....	12

- *September 29, 1998*

#### Policy Decisions on **Advertising**

At first blush, there are two main issues that need to be addressed:

Vendor Tag Lines: Vendor who develops an application and wants to identify their work via a tag line or log.

General Advertising: Endorsement of a product, similar to advertising in a newspaper.

Points to Consider:

Vendor Tag Lines: Does it look like an endorsement, does it add unnecessary clutter, or establish a precedent?

General Advertising: Does it commercialize the applications, what is public perception of advertising on a government website? Advertising dollars would be minimal, the amount of clutter would be significant.

Kent Hiller mentioned that it is possible to post a notice on the network indicating that you are "leaving" the IOWAccess network, therefore the public would know that they are no longer viewing government pages.

Comments made by various members: What about sales of government goods/services, such as through the State Historical Society, the Division of Tourism, or through Prison Industries? If a non-government entity helps sponsor an event, should you allow the sponsor to advertise on the website? Some state agencies already allow advertising on their brochures, etc. (such as DNR on the hunting/fishing brochures). Is paper copy different than electronic media? Maybe we will need the money from advertising as we move forward and consider the issue of funding the network. We need to define "advertising." One way to promote Iowa is by promoting Iowa businesses. Are there best practices that have already been established by other states?

Tamara Dukes could gather the information from the other states so that we can see how it has been handled elsewhere.

Diane Kolmer suggested that Iowa Interactive pull together a report detailing other states' policies. We will revisit the issue again at the October meeting. ITS resource staff was asked to put together a white paper defining "advertising."

- *November 24, 1998*

Discussion on **Prioritization** of Projects -- Some agencies have shown a strong interest in being part of the Network and some of these projects have already begun. There is already more demand than available resources. This is also closely tied to funding. The new Governor will certainly have some thoughts on how the funding would be generated. The more resources we have, the more we will be able to do. How does this group, in an advisory capacity to ITS, choose the criteria to get them done? How do we set priorities? Diane Kolmer sees the top two issues as:

a) impacts a large number of Iowans, or

b) has obvious potential for generating a certain amount of income.

Carol French-Johnson asked if we still plan to maintain a Citizen's Council. Yes, we do need a sounding board.

Although we need to determine what criteria we will use to judge each project, the Governor and Legislature may have strong views on what projects move forward first, especially if they bring in a lot of revenue. Libby Jacobs mentioned that it might be important to move some things higher on the list if they have a long-term benefit, such as freeing up other resources (staff, etc.).

Jim Youngblood sees development of the network as a three to five year effort. The Governor's original goal was that citizens would be able to transact business with the State of Iowa on a 24x7 basis by the Year 2000. There are projects where we can extract information and there are projects that involve doing business electronically. We are talking about funding for the long hall.

It must be self-sustaining.

Nancy Richardson mentioned that for an individual project, it is not only Iowa Interactive who is involved in making the project a reality, but also the agency who maintains the data, as they need to dedicate resources to get the data ready for public consumption. This is also one of the criteria that needs to be viewed when prioritizing projects.

Nancy identified six criteria for prioritizing projects, per our discussions today:

- 1) marketability
- 2) potential for generating income
- 3) amount of impact on Iowans
- 4) potential to free up other resources
- 5) complexity of application (effort needed to get on-line)
- 6) cost benefit of valued added enhancement

- *January 25, 1999*

A question was asked about **legal liability**. Kent Hiller advised that it is not Iowa Interactive's role to decide what information is accessible to the public. The agency and its legal staff need to make that determination.

**Travel Expenses** - Initially the Council chose not to reimburse members for mileage incurred, however has changed this policy and will reimburse travel expense (mileage only). Please submit your claims, beginning with this meeting, to Diane Van Zante.

- *April 16, 1999*

Attorney General's Opinion on **Advertising** - Dave Arringdale asked the Attorney General's Office for an informal opinion. Technically and legally it can be done, however from a policy standpoint, how do you restrict it? From the Attorney General's perspective, it would be better not to allow advertising. We will pursue some clarification via case law.

Discussion of Criteria Used in **Setting Priorities** for New Agency Projects - Current demand outweighs Iowa Interactive's resources, making decisions difficult with regard to which projects to take and in what order. What criteria should we focus on? Kent talked about developing a matrix showing the requests and their impact, which could then be used in prioritizing projects. A structured process is needed. Kent will compile a list of his requests and distribute it to members prior to the next meeting. With additional training, we could also empower agencies to complete some of the projects themselves. At the November 24, 1998 meeting of the Council, we identified a partial list of criteria. Dave, Rich and Kent will work together to develop a more comprehensive list (to be developed and sent out prior to the next meeting)

- *September 12, 2002*

Council Business – The IOWAccess Advisory Council is charged with recommending any **fees in conjunction with Internet services**.

November 14, 2002

**ROI** (Return on Investment) Scoring (Pooled Technology FY04 Projects and Rankings) – Randy Clemenson, ITD, outlined the criteria for submitting an application and the process for scoring. Quent explained the scoring system that each application is judged by and how the scores are derived. The same process was used last legislative session, however due to limited monies available, only four of the projects were funded at some level. Herb Strentz asked if there was ever any follow-up to see if the ROI projected was actually achieved, and what documentation existed that the ROI estimates were credible? Dan responded that we have several groups review the applications and give them the “smell” test, but we do not have a full-proof method.

Herb inquired if there was any leeway in altering the order of the projects, based on individual circumstances. The IT Council does discuss the outcome of the voting and has the flexibility to make any revisions it wants before making a final recommendation. This recommendation goes to the Governor and Legislature, however the council's recommendation is only an advisory document. There is no mandate to accept it.

**Identity Security** – Dan Combs. This is an extremely complex and difficult issue. Identification is an important function. How do you accurately identify someone? Identity theft and identity fraud are on the rise. Governments, businesses, and individuals all have a need to prove who they are. A couple of years ago, ITD began looking at this issue and contemplating how it should be addressed. Since 9/11/01, there has been an increased interest in this topic. Identity security is about creating, establishing, and identifying a person's identity. What issues should government address, how do we protect a person's privacy? Herb drew the distinction between data collection and individual privacy. Sheila mentioned that it is important that data be used only for the purpose it was collected. At some future point, the identity security initiative may come before the council in order to discuss funding or other issues.

Herb mentioned that we have already compiled some good information on privacy by way of a paper that Rich co-authored with Fred Cate. Dan mentioned a white paper that he wrote in conjunction with NECCC. ITD will supply copies of both of these items to council members. Senator Mary Lundby asked for bill language that addresses the number of members on boards, removal of members who don't participate, language that states once appointed to serve, members need to participate, and also suggested that we also look at the makeup of the council, i.e., do we still have the right mix of organizations? It was noted that we do have approval to **meet by phone** or via the ICN.

- *May 28, 2003*

Approve March 13, 2003 Minutes – Herb Strentz suggested that **acronyms** found in minutes also contain their translation. This should be detailed in all future minutes. Jane Ginapp made a motion, seconded by Craig Hiemstra, to approve the March minutes. A verbal vote was taken, there were no opposing votes. The minutes were approved as written.

Project Prioritization – Lorrie Tritch, ITD, distributed a document entitled "proposal for establishing **project priorities**." Lorrie asked the council to review the document and offer comments in addition to considering what criteria should be used. This item will be proposed again at the next meeting. A discussion ensued regarding convenience fees. Questions were raised: "What is really a convenience?" "What constitutes a value-added service?" For the next meeting, Lorrie advised that the council would see a list of current digital government projects. Quent asked if Lorrie had reviewed the criteria used by the Information Technology Council for the Return on Investment (ROI) process. Quent would also like Lorrie to take a stab at weighting the criteria listed on the handout she provided.

**Convenience Fees** for Online License Renewal – Due to an anticipated vote on this matter, it was noted that there was a quorum of the members (10 of the 15 voting members). Sharon Sperry, ITD, distributed a handout and explained that the first page was proposed wording for a recommendation. A spreadsheet was included that provided more detail on the cost figures that were presented. It is important that ITD recovers its cost and the Boards (Board of Nursing and Board of Medical Examiners) would also like to recover their credit card costs. If a person renews online, he/she pays by credit card. Right now the Boards are eating the credit card costs. At present, doctors and nurses can renew online or by paper. The Boards do not have the money to pay ITD for ongoing support of these applications. One way to facilitate ongoing online renewal is to add a convenience fee. Online renewal should achieve efficiencies in

resources and money. Herb Strentz asked if any studies had been conducted in terms of accuracy rates for paper filing versus online filing. Miriam Ubben asked if there were any other professional licenses that already have a convenience fee. There was some discussion about the option of recovering ITD's cost through IOWAccess appropriations. Jane Ginapp asked if a recommendation of this sort would set a precedent (recovering ITD's cost from IOWAccess appropriations, rather than from the customer agency and recovering the customer's ongoing costs by adding a convenience fee). Walk-in license renewal is \$325.00. Online license renewal currently runs \$300. David Redlawsk asked why the Boards aren't paying the ITD costs themselves. The Boards have indicated that they do not have the money in their budget to pay us ongoing costs, in fact they have refused to pay. Craig Hiemstra felt that we were headed in the wrong direction. There was some support for the concept that the Boards should be held responsible for paying ITD's ongoing costs. If the IOWAccess Advisory Council refuses to approve a fee, there are only two choices -- continue in the same manner as before or shut the system down due to lack of payment. Herb suggested that the convenience fee cover both the Board recovery cost and the ITD recovery cost, as he does not favor taking the money from the IOWAccess appropriation.

- *August 26, 2003*

Because it was believed that there would be adequate funding to cover the projects that were submitted, the council chose not to rank order the projects. Council members noted that in many cases, there was no **justification** detailing how the money would be spent, several of the proposals were incomplete (how many citizens would be affected, etc.?), many applications were vague, lacked detail, and didn't make their own case. Some projects indicated no long-term costs, so a question arose about how these projects would be supported in the future. Another issue raised was whether the benefits were worth the money being spent (example: \$45,000 request that would benefit 300 people). Quent proposed that the council talk about each one of the eight projects briefly and come to some degree of consensus on each one. Council members discussed the need for additional information, including the possibility of having someone come to the next meeting to make a presentation and/or answer questions.

- *November 3, 2003*

Discuss **Scope/Limitations** of IOWAccess Funds – Mark Uhrin (handout). ITE has developed a few guidelines for the council's consideration. ITE recommends that project hosting fees be included for the first year. This would require the customer department to pay the hosting fees itself after the first year. These costs would be spelled out and agreed to from the outset. ITE also recommends defining an intake process for projects coming into ITE as well as a formal process for marketing IOWAccess. A question arose whether agencies were required to commit to the project past the first year. Due to the budgeting process, that would be difficult.

- *April 19, 2004*

Should IOWAccess **funds be restricted to state agencies**? One potential project, the Iowa Diversity Education Network, is from an entity that is not part of state government. Further exploration is needed to determine if the project qualifies for funding. John Gillispie suggested contacting the Attorney General's Office and advised that he would do so. The law initially indicates that the money is for state, federal, and local agencies.

**Process for Changing or Enhancing an Approved Project** – ITE proposed a set of guidelines for changing or enhancing an already approved IOWAccess project, as follows:

Amount of funding requested	Recommendation required
-----------------------------	-------------------------

Within the original budget	ITE's COO
Within 20% of the original budget or \$25,000, whichever is less.	ITE's COO and IOWAccess' Chairperson
Over 20% of the original budget or \$25,000, whichever is less.	Request brought to the full IOWAccess Advisory Council for review

If a project comes back to the Council, is a **revised ROI needed**? Mark Uhrin replied that ITE would generate a change request form. The Council suggested some sort of written documentation that contrasts what "was" and what "is" being proposed. After some discussion, council members recommended the following revised guidelines:

<b>Amount of funding requested</b>	<b>Recommendation required</b>
Within the original budget	ITE's COO. Change reported to council members at their next meeting.
Within 20% of the original budget or \$25,000, whichever is less.	ITE's COO and IOWAccess' Chairperson, only after e-mail notice to council members to allow opportunity to provide Council Chair with feedback.
Over 20% of the original budget or \$25,000, whichever is less.	Request brought to the full IOWAccess Advisory Council for review. Must include change order summary.

Kelly Hayworth moved approval of the revised proposal. Herb Strentz seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken with all members voting to approve.

- *June 17, 2004*

Project Updates – Mark Uhrin. The teacher licensing and food inspection projects are moving along well. For future project updates, Quent would like to see ITE's **timeline** (expected start date, expected completion date). For pending/concept projects, the Council would like a general idea of the **amount of funding** that would be requested. Quent encouraged Mark to be assertive with agencies whose projects have been approved, but who for whatever reason do not seem to be making progress. When the council approves funds, it expects the project to begin. Mark reported that the project for Campaign Finance had been completed (WRS public access improvements), but had gone over budget by \$122.00. Herb Strentz suggested that a letter be sent to those agencies whose **projects have not progressed**. Quent indicated that he would compose the letter. Future projects/presentations should include the anticipated timeline for completion, etc.

If IOWAccess does not fund the request, the Network will seek other funding. The Council was generally supportive, but still has to explore the legality issue. Could a state agency request this money on behalf of the Network, even though it chooses to **outsource the work**? There are a couple of other potential projects that appear to be similar. Marla will contact the Department of Management to see if the projects have overlapping goals. The Code of Iowa states that the Council's mission is to provide access to government information. It would be better to have **nonprofits partner with state agencies** when requesting funds. The Council may also wish to consider whether the nonprofit is an advocate for certain public policy which the State does not adhere to. The Council believes that nonprofits should bring requests through a state agency or that there should be a 28E agreement in place.

- *September 10, 2004*

Process for Requesting Funding for Projects – Mark Uhrin.

Project costs are often figured via a first cut estimate based on incomplete information. This has not been as accurate as it should be; oftentimes, estimates are based on false assumptions. ITE is proposing a more in-depth process whereby ITE works with the sponsoring agency to scope out the project and create an initial cost estimate solely for the planning phase. This would replace the concept process that the Council is using now. In effect, it would be an “approval-to-plan” process. There would be no cost to the Council or the customer in the first step. The **planning phase** is an important step in the process and would allow ITE to more fully understand the project as well as the deliverables. Oftentimes, the project turns out to be different than originally thought. In the second step, the Council would elect to approve payment for the development of the detailed work. This is a two-phased process, the first phase nonbillable, the second phase billable. Tina Schmidt commented that this model is being used with increasing frequency in the IT industry and is becoming a standard. Sheila Castaneda pointed out that the council is paying for the planning now, it is simply paying after the project has been approved, rather than before. Payment for the second step of the planning phase would be made to ITE. The council would like the planning document to include a range of cost for the execution phase. Should this new process apply to all projects regardless of how much is being requested (for example \$5000 versus \$150,000)? The assessment for a \$5000 project might be one page whereas a larger dollar amount might require several pages. David Redlawsk moved approval of the process. Tom Gronstal seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the new process.

- *November 10, 2004*

Pre-Approval for ITE to Manage **Small Project Funds** – Quent Boyken.

Perhaps the Council should consider approving a pool of IOWAccess funds that ITE staff could use on a discretionary basis for small projects. This would be an efficiency tactic. A number of questions/comments were voiced: Would this pool be for a one year period? What amount of funding should the Council approve? What kinds of things would this cover? Would this type of thing happen very often? The Council would still like ITE staff to provide periodic project/activity reports. Council members were in agreement that quick projects like web hosting were appropriate, but they did not want to see discretionary funds used for the planning phase without first hearing about the project. Such things need to come before the Council as part of a bigger, long-range project. Later in the discussion, the Council concurred that these guidelines pertained to major projects. Since the Council is advisory, doesn't the director have the power/latitude to spend small amounts as he/she sees fit? John does not have that level of authority; at present, John takes all of the Council's recommendations to Mollie Anderson and Mollie approves them. Having the council act upon the matter would result in John being given the authorization to use IOWAccess funds. The Chair inquired what level of individual funding John would suggest. John responded that \$25,000 would cover an entire project. Council members ultimately decided they would be more comfortable seeing a definite proposal rather than voting on the concept at this meeting.

- *January 12, 2005*

Proposal for the **ITE Discretionary Fund** – John Gillispie.

This proposal mirrors the discussion from our last meeting. If a project is less than \$25,000 total, including planning, ITE could proceed. If it is more than \$25,000, the Chief Operating Officer would confer with the council chair. Projected web hosting fees, if applicable, would not be included in the \$25,000 project cost limit. The discretionary fund would initially be populated with \$150,000. ITE would provide a monthly update as well as status reports at council meetings.

Utilization of discretionary funds is not intended to circumvent the process or the IOWAccess Advisory Council, but rather to provide a mechanism to facilitate smaller projects and maximize efficiency

#### Proposal for Handling **Post Implementation Support** Costs – Mark Uhrin.

This proposal addresses post implementation bugs or fixes for approved projects and recommends that the Council reserves 20% of the overall value of the project during the first year of operation. Council members asked whether the fixes would be of a critical or noncritical nature. Mark explained that sometimes a project doesn't work as it was intended to or is not fully functional. One view is that a customer should get a working system built according to customer requirements; if it isn't delivered correctly, why should the customer incur additional charges? In some cases, ITE contracts with third parties. In other instances, ITE staff performs the work. ITE works on a time and materials basis, not a fixed cost basis.

This charge would cover the cost of ITE staff time. It was suggested that the project proposal include adequate time for testing, possibly a week or two of post implementation support. Would it be appropriate to use the discretionary fund for such things? If the additional work costs more than \$25,000, maybe the council needs to revisit the project. The Council reached general consensus on the following: *The project proposal should include two weeks of postimplementation support. After that time, any costs incurred would come from the discretionary fund, not to exceed the \$25,000 limit. Expenditures over and above that amount need to be reviewed by the council.* There were no motions to approve the specific proposal that Mark initially brought forward.

#### Request for **Additional Funding** (related to a specific project)

Discussion points brought forth prior to the vote: Would council members have approved the proposal if it was originally submitted with the new total? From his experience, Tim Erickson believes this figure is not out of line with similar projects. It takes a considerable amount of resources. The overall project has been more expensive than we allowed for; ITE has already spent more than what was approved, but it has not been charged to the IOWAccess fund. The Council is concerned that there are continuing costs simply because the customer can't deliver and that is frustrating. Is there some sort of middle ground where the Council could approve part of the money now and then reassess in a couple of months?

Taking note of trends in the aging population, the National Governor's Association has identified several items that should be available through all state websites. In the 2004 Brown University study, Iowa was listed as one of the poorest in web accessibility for disabled persons. At present, we are reviewing all of our **standards for persons with disabilities** and will begin adopting/implementing and enforcing the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) standards that are required. In the future when the Council approves projects, it might consider whether the project meets disability standards. Council members inquired if the state receives complaints. There have been no complaints from visually impaired persons, however we do receive complaints about the Babelfish language translator service on our site. It is not flawless. Tim Erickson advised that the 2004 Brown University study may have reviewed the old state website rather than the new one as his staff routinely goes through the pages to check for broken links. They also run the pages through several tools in order to comply with standards as much as possible.

- *March 9, 2005*

When last we met, the Council approved a **discretionary fund** of \$150,000 to allow ITE to move forward with small projects and/or clean-up issues between meetings. A more detailed rationale on the discretionary fund is as follows:

The discretionary fund is intended to provide a source of funds, accessible to COO of ITE in consultation with the DAS Director, to be used to fund low cost, short duration projects and support activities. These efforts are intended to have a total implementation cost of \$25,000 or less. The intent is to allow efforts of this size to be started without incurring the delays inherent in waiting for the board meetings necessary to complete the usual approval cycle. This will also allow the board to concentrate on larger projects, where the scope, impact and risk are more substantial and require a more in depth analysis by the board.”

A motion was made and seconded to formally approve the discretionary fund language. An oral vote was taken and unanimously approved.

- *May 11, 2005*

#### Public Safety Records Project

Approval would set a precedent for **funding hardware**. Does this project have an impact on our citizens? From an efficiency standpoint, the computers make a big difference. Our mission statement says that “the mission of the IOWAccess Advisory Council is to create a one-stop electronic gateway to government information and transactions – whether federal, state, or local” and this project seems to fit that definition. Larry Murphy expressed his support for the project as it also impacts the court system and promotes efficiency in meeting their mission. John Gillispie stated he would not normally support a request to replace department computers, however this is a special case which puts information in the hands of the patrol and the court system more quickly.

#### Special Meeting - Minutes

- *Wednesday, July 13, 2005*

#### Introduction to Discussion - **Outreach to Local Governments** - Sheila Castaneda, Chair

The discussion initially centered on being creative in outreach to local government. Instead of surveying local governments and getting limited responses of questionable value, it was suggested that IOWAccess partner with local governmental entities that have successful implementations and core competencies in e-Government. Butler County, for example, has been identified as one of the top 10 counties in the nation in e-Government. There was general agreement that the IOWAccess Advisory Council didn't want to spend a lot of resources on another survey. Instead, they wanted to give some thought to identifying local governments that excel. It was suggested that the online Property Tax Collection application is a great example. It was an exemplary collaborative effort and the IOWAccess Advisory Council should use it as a model. There is no reason to reinvent the wheel on collection of payments.

By way of example, Justice Marcia Ternus stated that 20 to 30 years ago, courts were able to be consistent in using the same software because of central financing. This facilitates great cost savings and enables the development of a consistent interface for citizens. The IOWAccess funding could be used in much the same way.

A question was raised by Sheila Castaneda concerning whether the IOWAccess Advisory Council had already committed to conducting a survey for local governments. Quentin Boyken commented that the monthly reports state that the council had committed to an e-Government citizen survey with Iowa State.

Mary Maloney stated that the County Recorders have a statewide project underway currently. The local governments look at the State as issuing a number of unfunded mandates. Local government also feels that to collaborate with the state requires them to give up local autonomy. The discussion also addressed the issue that it is difficult for the IOWAccess Advisory Council to come up with things on which to collaborate with local government. It was agreed that the council needs to solicit input from local government and must be ready to support ideas from local government. The key here is to collaborate with, and support, local government on

initiatives that are important to them. It is important to get local governmental entities interested and talking among themselves.

It was also stated that an important hallmark of local government projects funded by IOWAccess must be able to be used by other cities or counties in the state. In addition to direct contact with local government, it is important to work with the various associations. Once the IOWAccess Advisory Council identifies and provides to support a limited number of projects, there will be interest generated from the results.

There was some discussion if the approach should be top down or grass roots. A top down approach would enlist the aid of state agencies that conduct business with or have regular contact with local government. The council felt that they should earmark funds currently in the IOWAccess revolving fund for local government projects.

Pat Deluhery from the Department of Administrative Services explained his function and the genesis of DAS and its customer focus.

The council noted "Transition is scary. The unknowns can slow down or stop many efforts."

Sheila Castaneda asked the members for a proposal. It was suggested that an approval process and guidelines for collaborative processes would need to be established. It was also suggested that some "marketing materials" be developed and possible some articles be submitted for appropriate association newsletters.

- *September 14, 2005*

There was one discussion point; if the Council approves everything presented today, that would be about \$750,000, which is about half of the projected total spend for the year. That could also have a bearing on future project requests. The Chair asked for suggestions, as council members have no idea what projects will be presented in the future. One thought was that if the Council finds itself at a meeting where the **requests outnumbered the dollars**, they could start prioritizing them. What would the Information Technology Enterprise (ITE) do if the IOWAccess fund runs out of money? ITE does not limit what agencies bring to the Council, ITE only acts as a go-between.

What does the **planning process** consist of? Mark Uhrin explained that an agency first approaches ITE with a project. ITE then identifies a project manager and a technical architect. Those individuals sit down with the customer and generate a statement of work, based upon the project scope and business processes, detailing what needs to be done and what that will require.

One of the Council members noted that it was incumbent upon the Council to assess individual projects/processes to determine if the agency's project plan is truly the best or if a **better option exists**.

Mark Uhrin explained that ITE's **planning phase** takes a project right up to the stage where it can be handed off to a coder. ITE staff has wrestled with this approach, trying to determine if the process should be scaled back.

What happens after this? It's becoming clear that planning is more than what we originally thought.

The initial concept was to incorporate a **planning phase** to help tell us what the overall cost was to implement. We seem to be getting planning and design. Is that what the board wants, especially in light of the fact that we may not be funding everything that comes along?

Post meeting discussion: The concept paper should include a question about where the agency expects to obtain **funding for the implementation phase** of their project.

- *January 11, 2006*

Tom distributed a draft brochure entitled, “e-Government Funding Opportunities for Local Government in Iowa.” IOWAccess funding can be used to help **local government** in Iowa adopt and use Internet technology to establish their presence on the World Wide Web and improve services to Iowa’s citizens. The brochure outlines conditions for IOWAccess funding. Questions for the Council to consider:

- What is the definition of local government?
- How much do you want to allocate for local government programs?
- Do you want to utilize the same process for both state and local government funding requests?
- Should priority be given to projects which are more collaborative in nature or that contain templates that other counties might be able to use?

Q: Where are the standards and reporting requirements noted?

A. The Council still needs to develop the reporting requirements.

Q. Is an official agreement warranted?

A. A signed agreement between the recipient of funds and DAS is recommended.

Conditions for payment should also be outlined.

Other comments:

- A project with a local government entity would likely need a grant-type structure.
- The brochure does not indicate what you actually need to do to get started.
- If the project is going to encompass more than one county or can be used as a model or can be used in a broader perspective, it would be more appealing for the Council to fund it (or if there was cooperation between several different groups). The brochure should include that information.
- Are we going to market this?

What is Included in the IOWAccess “**Planning Phase**” – Mark Uhrin.

Mark created a chart showing the components of ITE’s planning phase. The first phase is initiation – a “get to know you” type of phase with the customer, understanding the customer’s basic requirements and what the project will accomplish for them. After that, ITE moves to the analysis portion of the planning phase which yields three results: uses cases, a detailed requirements document (specific statement of what the customer wants out of the system), and a high level data model (this identifies the type of fields and tables used and looks at how the data will be organized). Considerations during this phase include testing, security, accessibility, database/data modeling, training, and infrastructure. Once the analysis has been completed, the process moves into the design stage (mockups, a detailed design document /technical roadmap, a first-level test plan, statement of work, and a draft service level agreement). ITE also provides the project plan. That concludes the planning phase.

Mark’s explanation helped to clarify things for the Council. Members were working on the assumption that planning was primarily analysis and no more. The Chair asked members to consider the following: What do we want? Do we really want to fund more than the analysis in the first phase? Is analysis sufficient to get an idea of the cost? At the end of the analysis phase, you should be able to come up with a ballpark figure for the rest of the project.

Mark mentioned that there does appear to be a fair amount of change that occurs during the design phase. In terms of the cost, a pre-design estimate would necessitate a broader range than one given at the end of the design phase. Tim Erickson’s experience with agencies is that they forget a lot of things; there is a tremendous amount of difference between the analysis and design phases.

Council comments:

- Previously, some estimates were very inaccurate.

- The more money you spend on the planning phase, the less likely you are to stay “stop, let’s not spend any more money.”
- It is more difficult to turn something down after you spend a lot of money and energy.
- It sounds like we want to draw a line between the analysis and design phases.
- You could add an additional step to the process, including a requirement to come before the Council.
- Maybe we need to see more detail coming to the Council after the analysis.
- Is the current process a one size fits all approach? The process is basically the same for all projects.
- How do we quantify what we want to see?

David Redlawsk moved that the decision point for additional funding be moved from the end of the design phase to the end of the analysis phase, resulting in the design and implementation phases being funded together, and acknowledging that this creates greater uncertainty about the cost. Kelly Hayworth seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken and unanimously approved.

Concern was expressed about the **length of time** involved between project approval and completion. The average time is 16 months. When requestors come before the Council, there seems to be a sense of urgency. What is a reasonable timeframe? The targeted small business project has been dragging on since November 2003. The Council’s assumption is that an agency is ready to work on a project that they submit for funding. To some extent, ITE works at the pace of the customer. Maybe the Council needs to ask if resources will be available once a project is approved. Is the agency ready and committed to allocating the resources?

- *March 8, 2006*

**MOU for Local Government** Projects – Background: At the January IOWAccess Advisory Council meeting, the Council discussed using IOWAccess funds to help local governments. The Council recommended a signed agreement between DAS and the recipient of the funds. ITE was asked to draft an MOU template for this purpose. Status report: Development of the template is not yet complete.

- *May 10, 2006*

The City of Dubuque is proposing to create a web-based front end so that citizens can submit questions and/or request information or feedback. This would make government accessible 24 x 7. Herb Strentz asked about sharing the finished product with others as the system could serve as a model to other cities. Members were urged to be cautious of proprietary software, i.e., who owns the software at the end of the day? The current City of Dubuque system is owned by Mission Creative in Dubuque. Has the City of Dubuque spoken with Mission Creative to see if they would front the \$15,000, as the system enhancements would be in their best interest and add to their product marketability? No.

How much have you paid the vendor for the system thus far? It was bundled with website development at a total cost of \$50,000. When do you anticipate the web-based front end being completed? In approximately three months. Is it customary to pay a business to develop a product for your use, but they actually own it and you pay them to use it? Many times this is a licensing issue and the recipient is getting a customized product.

Herb Strentz moved approval of the funding; Barbara Corson seconded the motion. For future projects, the Council may want to consider **who owns the “intellectual property.”**

Another model is a joint IP (the intellectual property concept and the actual code itself).

Chris Coleman does not believe that the City of Dubuque will own the code; the only way that would occur is if Mission Creative ceases to do business. If the City of Dubuque ceases to do business with Mission Creative, all the City gets is the data.

John Gillispie commented that there are no absolutes in software development. As a general rule, the State owns the intellectual property with the perpetual right to use the Iowa Interactive development projects. It is best to have the intellectual property rights to any software system developed. Then if anyone else wants to implement a similar model, it has already been paid for. For cities, the hosted model is more common. Cities generally have a small staff and limited budget, so do not have the resources to develop and support such a system themselves.

- *January 10, 2007*

Can an agency use funds to support **in-house development**, or must ITE or an outside vendor be the developer?

The Council can make a recommendation.

ITE has a very detailed cost analysis for staff time; other agencies may use an artificially low number.

Being able to view the design documents may be more important than whether it's done in-house or not. We need to ensure that the project is approved by Technology Governance Board standards and fits within the IT enterprise architecture.

A review should be conducted by ITE in all cases. Where should the money for that come from?

We want to encourage more local governments to do development. We can't expect ITE to do all the development.

If it's within state government, I think we can say that it has to be reviewed by ITE.

Where in the process do we ensure that **outside developers** adhere to certain standards?

Possibly the process chart could address that issue.

We get the biggest bang for our buck when we use what we already have.

- *November 7, 2007*

In light of the number of projects that have been approved for funding, the Council may need to **limit the amount of money** that it is spending and start prioritizing projects. In the future, Malcolm Huston will try to analyze the long term cost. We must start taking advantage of things that have already been developed. To grow the IOWAccess fund, you have to consider how that fund gets replenished; do the projects create resources to spend elsewhere? Thus far, that has not been happening. One option might be to ask those projects that sell licenses to give us a few cents per license. We also need to be cognizant of **who owns the code**. We want to own the code so that we have resale rights and can generate revenue for IOWAccess.

- *January 9, 2008*

Historically, the Council has fully funded a project once they approve initial funding. This is only a forecast, based on best guesstimates. The Council may have to become more selective in approving funding. Council members asked several questions to get a clear understanding of the data presented. Is it more important to fund **projects that have received previous funding** or to accept a new project? Opinions vary. The projects would probably be funded eventually, but possibly not in the timeframe originally hoped for.

Is the IOWAccess Advisory Council charged with showing cost savings? Governor Vilsack developed an ROI program so that IT projects would be evaluated against ROI processes. There is no requirement by law.

Could ITE be put out of business if all the work went to an outside vendor? The Department of Administrative Services receives no appropriation, all revenue is the result of a fee for service model. Is there a certain percentage of money that needs to go to ITE to keep it viable? There

has to be a balance. ITE has had trouble getting projects done on time. If ITE cannot complete the work within 6-8 months, the submitter should be able to **utilize an outside vendor**. ITE should know whether or not it has the time and resources when a project is submitted. When is that decision made? It is hard for ITE to assess its workload until the Council decides what is/isn't going to be approved. The answer varies, based upon the project and available resources. How do we ensure that software developed by one agency can be used by another? There is no standard at present.

- *July 9, 2008*

One idea is to use existing return on investment (ROI) criteria as a foundation. Until now, there has been no **criterion at the concept paper (first) stage** with which to assign a ranking. There is already an ROI component built into the second and third stages (just recently approved), but it really hasn't been used. One frame of reference for the individual steps might be:

Step 1: Is it a good project? What's the benefit to the citizens?

Step 2: Now that we've decided it's a good project, how much do we want to spend?

Step 3: Do we still want to continue?

Other Ideas:

- Consideration should be given to what other sources the sponsor has pursued.
- Develop a priority board just to get in the door. It gives sponsors an idea where their concept is weak, so they can rework it.
- Utilize the concept of matching dollars. At the state level, there may not be financial matching, but there could be resource matching.

Proposed **criteria check list**:

- Is there a statutory requirement – also need to determine whether it is new or an enhancement to an existing statutory requirement.
- Does it improve customer service – maybe the wording for this criterion needs to be more aligned with improving citizen access to government information.
- Impact to citizens/business
- Is it a gateway for one stop electronic access to government information and transactions?
- Project participants – is there collaboration involving more than one entity, state/local government?
- Risk – there are all kinds of risks: technical, political, business. Should risk be a factor?
- Experience and past performance – what is the agency's maturity level? Was previous money awarded to the agency well spent or not well spent? At the concept phase, this consideration may be inappropriate; the initial phase should be selling you on the idea. NOTE: Decided to drop this criterion.
- Funding requirements – NOTE: Decided to drop.
- Additional funding source – requestor must have some form of match. This should not be limited to a monetary match, but could be a commitment of resources. Agencies that commit money/resources to a project are more likely to complete it. Did the requestor try to get additional funding? Are transaction-based fees possible?
- Should the concept paper only look at benefits and not cost? Should the requestor be able to substantiate cost savings upfront? There may be a huge benefit to the citizens, but little to no cost savings. Maybe there should be two sets of scores, one on a benefit basis, the other on a cost basis. Both facets are important.

- Capability Maturity – NOTE: Do not include in criteria for first phase.
- IOWAccess Share Criteria – ratio of agency project to all projects. This would rank the proposed project relative to other proposals on several dimensions.

Is it feasible to create a pool of projects that are reviewed periodically? When the Council reviews and approves one project, it has no notion of others that are forthcoming. Having a **periodic approval process** would level the playing field a bit more.