



IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Part I - Project Information

Date:	10/28/2009
Agency Name:	Legislative Services Agency (LSA)
Project Name:	Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search
Agency Manager:	Jeff VanEngelenhoven
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	jeff.van.engelenhoven@legis.state.ia.us (515) 281-7842
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	Richard Johnson, Division Director Legal Services
Initial Total for Planning:	\$40,000 – Note: this request is for authorization for \$26,500 additional funding to complete the planning phase. The Council approved \$20,000 for the design phase, we utilized \$6,500. We will use the remaining \$13,500 and the additional \$26,500, if authorized, to complete the planning phase.
Initial Total for Execution:	\$325,000 lowAccess funding.
Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	
Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)	Planning Start Date: 9/10/2009 Planning End Date: 11/2009 Execution Start Date: 11/2009 Execution End Date: 2/2011
Revised Total for Planning and Execution:	\$365,000

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: The expected result of this project would be to improve citizen access to and understanding of the relationship between Iowa Administrative Rules and the Iowa Code. At present, many citizens are aware of the difference or relationship between Iowa Administrative Rules and Iowa Code. The objectives of this project would be accomplished by refining and exposing the relationship between the Iowa Administrative Rules and the Iowa Code by improving the ease and use of the navigation system in order to search the aforementioned Code and Rules.

At present, there is only a paper-based table that lists which rules are implementing the Iowa Code. Unfortunately the current system is not very accurate, since the Iowa Code is changed every year with sections added and deleted and provisions renumbered. The Iowa Administrative Rules contains 18,000 pages that is kept up to date under the auspices of the Executive Branch agencies. The development effort would create a link between Iowa Administrative Rules references and Iowa Code. The new system would recognize changes in the Iowa Code and the resulting reference changes required. This would allow a citizen who was interested in a certain topic to see the relevant Iowa Code sections and the rules implementing the Code section in relation to each other.

The creation of a uniform index for the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Rules and the development of enhanced electronic index capabilities would allow the following:

- Allow a user to build collections across legal documents. An example could be a user interested in day care. In a single location the user could find all statutes and rules related to day care allowing him or her to build a single document that contains the related content.
- The creation of a uniform index would allow customized, subscription-based delivery of legal documents to be based upon uniform index entries. An individual could subscribe to "Day care" and be notified of changes or proposed changes to the Iowa Code or the Iowa Administrative Rules.

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

Response: The Iowa Legislative Services Agency (LSA) is a non-partisan agency that organizes, updates, and publishes the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Rules. The Iowa Code is the official collection of Iowa's permanent laws. The Iowa Administrative Rules is a composite of all rules written by the executive branch which have the full force and effect of law. The Iowa Administrative Rules contain rules that have been adopted by the state agencies to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the agencies.

The LSA is continually working to improve the delivery and understanding of the legal documents it produces. One element of the LSA strategic plan is to provide the legal documents we produce in an accessible manner that helps the user understand their meaning.

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: The LSA is currently engaged in a multiyear digitization project to consolidate multiple publication platforms into a single database publishing and management platform using standardized software. This project includes replacing the current legacy systems used for the production of bills, amendments, the Iowa Code, and the Iowa Administrative Rules. The project is in the third year with the production release of all phases to be complete by the end of the fiscal year 2010.

The major change has been the implementation of a standardized content markup language (XML) across all critical databases. This has been key to enhancing both the integration and extensibility of the new platform and software system.

The new design provides functionality as interoperable services (SOA) and allows these services to be available and used from systems created by other organizations. Underlying and enabling all of this requires metadata in sufficient detail to describe the characteristics of these services and the data that drives them. With the extensive use of XML in SOA to structure data there is a broad description-container.

The new system is using Web services to implement SOA. The Web services make data accessible over standard Internet protocols independent of platforms and programming languages. As a service provider the intent is to make the information more transparent.

All existing enterprise standards will be followed where applicable.

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: No

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: Chapter 2B of the Iowa Code requires the Legislative Services Agency to publish certain legal documents. These include the Iowa Administrative Rules, the Iowa Court Rules, the Iowa Code, the Iowa Code Supplement, and the Iowa Acts.

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

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: No

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

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

Response: No

[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: All executive branch agencies that write rules will be involved in verifying and updating the rules implementing statutes table. Legislative Services Agency staff will be involved in creating the unified index for statutes and rules.

Anyone who uses the statutes and rules will be direct users of the system. These would include:

- Legislators
- State Agencies
- County and City Employees
- Lobbyists
- Iowa Courts/Judicial
- Citizens

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: By enhancing both statutes and rules with metadata (tagging of content with additional information) we will be able to help the average citizen find the laws in which they are interested. The creation of a unified index will allow individuals to look for topics and find the related statute and rule. By linking both statutes and rules with the information necessary to understand which rules are implementing which statutes, the individual user will benefit because it will deliver relevant statutes and rules in context with each other.

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: A modern, sophisticated system of law provides wide access to both current law and the process to change current law. Providing enhanced access to both statutes and related rules improves citizen access to current law and allows citizens to petition either their legislators for a

change in the law or the executive branch for a change in the application of the administrative rules.

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

Response: No direct applicability but enhanced citizen access to both statutes and rules relating to public health and safety enables better citizen participation in execution of public health and safety statutes and rules.

[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: The LSA will be putting an emphasis on creating many tools that will generate greater access to bills, amendments, the Iowa Code, and the Iowa Administrative Rules. The additional tools include:

- **Development of a customized subscription-based delivery of legal documents. This would allow the user to sign up for updates by RSS, email, etc. The user could subscribe by index subject, keyword, chapter, or committee. The subscription could include various products.**
- **Allowing developers access to the current legal documents through the creation of web services.**
- **Providing a tool for local delivery of collections with automatic updates. This may be a good delivery mechanism for people who do not have constant web connectivity (field workers).**
- **Allowing storage by individuals of annotations that are tied to pieces of content. This could be a repository for comments or notes on a specific statute, rule, or bill.**

The development effort on the delivery of all of these tools for the public will require a large effort. We anticipate a significant cost in developer services. In addition, the use of LSA resources for the development effort will be significant.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: The LSA is currently engaged in a multiyear digitization project to consolidate multiple publication platforms into a single database publishing and management platform using standardized software. The major change has been the implementation of a standardized content markup language (XML) across all critical databases. The development focus has been on document creation, the internal business process, and workflow. The LSA is now starting the development of the publicly accessible tools that will improve citizen access and understanding of Iowa law.

[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 Execution 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 is part of a multiyear effort to redesign the LSA legal publications. The Legislative Council has allocated \$1.6 million annually to this effort. Once the planning phase has determined the cost of this project the LSA will commit at least 50% towards its development and then ask lowAccess to consider funding the remaining amount. The system will be on the Legislative computer system and the agency will absorb 100% of the ongoing operational and maintenance costs.

[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 – Planning Proposal

Amount of Planning Funding Requested: \$

A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before Execution) 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: The Iowa Code is the official collection of Iowa’s permanent laws. The Iowa Administrative Rules are written by the Executive Branch which has the full force and effect of law. The Iowa Administrative Rules have been adopted by the state agencies to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the agencies.

The Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Rules are available both in electronic format and printed copy. Each publication has an index available to help users find information. These indexes are different between the publications. The Administrative Rules do contain information about which statutes they are implementing. Unfortunately many of the references are not up to date with the current code, incomplete or simply incorrect.

An average citizen would find it difficult, in some cases, to look for a topic and understand the current law – both statutes and rules. The LSA does provide advanced searching tools that will look for words and phrases. These tools are valuable to individuals who know what they are looking for and understand how statutes and rules are related. They may not help the average citizen who does not have an understanding of the relationship between statutes and rules.

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after Execution) 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: By enhancing both statutes and rules with metadata (tagging of content with additional information) this project will help the average citizen find the laws in which they are interested. The creation of a unified index will allow users to look at topics and find the related statutes and

rules. By linking both statutes and rules with the information necessary to understand which rules are implementing which statutes, the project will allow the delivery of relevant statutes and rules in context with each other.

The provided use cases give examples of a few scenarios of an average citizen taking advantage of this system. It is easy to think of hundreds of other scenarios which would leverage this new ability to deliver relevant rules and statutes together to interested citizens.

A modern, sophisticated system of law provides wide access to both current law and the process to change current law. Providing enhanced access to both statutes and related rules improves citizen access to current law and allows citizens to petition either their legislators for a change in the law or the executive branch for a change in the application of the administrative rules.

[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 Planning phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, **projected end date**, planning, and database Planning. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Begin planning date – September 2009

End planning date – November 2009

Execution dates would be determined after the planning phase.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Planning 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.

Planning Activities	Hours	Cost
Customer Meetings	20	2,000
Team Meetings	70	7,000
ROI Planning Document	15	1,500
Detail Design	70	7,000
Project Management	50	5,000
Business Analysis	75	7,500
Mock Up Screens	70	7,000
Test Document	30	3,000
Total		\$ 40,000

D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Execution 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 Execution. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project Execution.

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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: This is not possible to quantify. Thousands of citizens use the statutes and the rules. The saving of their time in quickly finding applicable rules and statutes could be very large, yet we are unable to quantify the exact number.

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: Not Applicable

5. Planning Phase Cost Calculation

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, etc., during the Planning Phase.

Response: The spending plans estimates that \$40,000 will be spent on the planning phase (Part 3C). The LSA estimates that it will contribute at least as many hours as the consultant during the planning phase. It is anticipated LSA will contribute \$15,000 to \$20,000 of personal services towards the planning stage.

Once the planning phase has determined the cost of this project, the LSA will commit at least 50% towards its development and then ask lowAccess to consider funding the remaining amount. The system will be on the Legislative computer system and the agency will absorb 100% of the ongoing operational and maintenance costs.

6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet

These costs will be able to be determined after the planning phase. The ability to quantify the impact is subject to many underlying assumptions that are unknown.

7. 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 project will greatly enhance the citizen’s interaction with the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Rules. This project also provides access to legal information in a way which, at this time, is not available to the public. The citizen will then be able to analyze and use legal information in new and different ways to discern both opportunities the law may afford the citizen, as well as restraints placed on the citizen.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Planning 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 – Execution Funding

Amount of Execution Funding Requested: \$325,000

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$0

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

A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Execution 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:

Date	Task	Description
Sep 2009	Project Scope Analysis	Complete the Project Scope Analysis
Nov 2009	Project Planning	Complete the Project Planning. Complete the Test Plan, Requirements, Use Cases, and Implementation Plan for the project.
PHASE I – Topic/Indexing Content Management Tools		
Jan 2010	Implementation Kick-Off	Conduct Project kick-off meeting with all resources involved in the first phase of the project. Finalize Resources
March 2010	Convert Existing Indexes	Convert the existing Index Content for the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Rules
June 2010	Deploy Phase I to production	All Topic/Indexing Management Tools are deployed to a production environment
PHASE II – Web Application Development		
April 2010	Finalize Search Engine	Finalize Search Engine Selection
May 2010	Complete Search Integration and Content Indexing	Finalize Search Engine Selection.
June 2010	Public Beta Site	Deploy Public Beta site
Sept 2010	Deploy to Production	Finalize Search Engine Selection.
PHASE 3 – Web Usability Enhancements		
Oct 2010	Custom Document Collection APIs	Complete the APIs and back-end infrastructure needed to support the Custom Collections
Dec 2010	Public Beta Site	Move new functionality to publicly available production servers for beta feedback
Feb 2011	Deploy Production Site	Deploy all Web Usability Enhancements to production.

Resources required:

Role	Description
Project Sponsor	LSA Staff member responsible for coordinating and approving budget, assigning priorities, and approving schedules.
Project Manager	LSA Staff member responsible for coordinating sponsor, technical team lead meetings, communicating sponsor priorities, managing resources (including personnel, hardware needs, software licensing).
Technical Team Lead	Technical resource that will manage the day-to-day activities of the Developers, coordinate activities with the Project Manager and the Project Sponsor(s).
Technical Architect	Technical resource that makes architectural decisions. Determines and approves technologies to be used within the solution. Guides the developers to a common

	approach to writing code, test cases, and APIs. Assists with critical issue resolution. Coordinates interaction of different components of the solution (APIs, Web Services, Databases, Security, etc...)
.NET Web Application Developer	Developer specializing in the creation of .NET web applications.
Database Developer	Developer specializing in Database Schema development, stored procedure development, database optimization, and content normalization
Tester – Topic Content Management Tools	Resource to test the document topic assignment and topic management tools.
Tester – Web Applications	Resource to test the web delivery applications.
Public Beta Tester – Web Applications	Users invited to participate in reviewing the Public Beta website.
Content Specialist	Technical Developer expert in processing and converting content
Technical Writer	Author documentation for applications created

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Execution 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. Execution 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, etc., during the **Execution Phase**.

	Current FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$250,000	27%	\$350,000	35%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$325,000	38%	\$0	0%	\$0	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	\$575,000	0%	\$350,000	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$250,000	0%	\$350,000	0%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Execution 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)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 st)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	125,000	4	100%	60,000	100%	91,250
Software	0	4	100%	0		-
Hardware	0		%	0	%	0
Training	0		%	0	%	0
Facilities	0		%	0	%	0
Professional Services	450,000	4	100%	0	%	112,500
ITE Services	0		%	0	%	0
Supplies, Maint., etc.	0		%	0	%	0
Other	0		%	0	%	0
Totals	575,000		%	60,000	%	203,750

D. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

Funds will be allocated to the following activities:

- Conversion of Existing Indexes
- Web Application Development
 - Graphic Interface Integration
 - GUI personalization/user profiles development
 - Public Portal Implementation
 - Web Services for Data Exchanges
- Search Integration and Content Indexing
- Custom Document Collection APIs

- Web Based Testing Tracking
- Project Management
- Documentation

In addition, see the response to IV, A.

E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Execution 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: Unable to quantify.

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: Improved citizen understanding of the Iowa Code and Administrative Rules.

3. Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet – Copy items A through F from Part III (Planning Phase), Section III D6; item G is from Section IV C, above.

Response: Unable to calculate precisely, thousands of citizens use the statutes and the rules. The saving of their time in quickly finding applicable rules and statutes could be very large, yet we are unable to quantify the exact number. To estimate we used \$1,000,000 as the time savings for citizens (2500 users, usage 10 times a year, average savings per usage is 30 minutes, average Iowa wage \$17 per hour). Post project cost savings are reduction of staff time helping citizens find applicable statute and rules.

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$0	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$50,000	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$50,000
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$212,500
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)	\$262,500	
G. Annual prorated Cost:	\$203,750	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	1.29	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	129%	

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Execution 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 V – Auditable Outcome Measures

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

1. Improved customer service

Response: The LSA will solicit feedback from citizens on the delivery of Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search. The LSA will collect comments from the public via web survey.

2. Citizen impact

Response: The LSA will record the number of hits on the Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search page. This will estimate improved services to the public and the utility of the system.

3. Cost Savings

Response: The LSA will conduct an internal survey to determine the amount of time currently spent responding to citizen questions about rules and statutes and contrast that to the amount of time spent once the new system is available.

4. Project reengineering

Response: The LSA is continually working to improve the delivery and understanding of the legal documents it produces. One element of the LSA strategic plan is to provide the legal documents we produce in an accessible manner that helps the user understand their meaning. This project will reengineer the delivery of legal materials that will provide greater access and understanding to the citizens of Iowa.

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response: Program funds will be maintained at the same level or above. This project will require continuous effort to assign and correct index values and rules implementing statutes. The LSA will track the level of staff effort required to maintain these values and relationships.

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Response:

- Help the average citizen find the laws in which they are interested.
- The creation of a unified index will allow individuals to look for topics and find the related statute and rule.
- By linking both statutes and rules with the information necessary to understand which rules are implementing which statutes.
- Providing enhanced access to both statutes and related rules improves citizen access to current law and allows citizens to petition either their legislators for a change in the law or the executive branch for a change in the application of the administrative rules.