NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
Pursuant to Iowa Code §21.4
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
IOWACCESS ADVISORY COUNCIL
Wednesday, November 4, 2009 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM

NOTE: To conserve time and expense, many of the Council members will be participating via online conferencing. If you wish to participate online, contact Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, at 515-281-0393. If you wish to participate in person, this meeting will be coordinated from Hoover Bldg., B Level Conference Room 2.

1. Introductions, Approve Minutes, 2010 Meeting Schedule
   Richard Neri, Chair

2. Iowa Interactive Project Update
   Wayne Middleton, Iowa Interactive

3. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheets/Monthly Report
   Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager

4. SHSI – State Historical Society Museum Content Management System – Full Project **$20,235**
   Tabled from September 2009 Meeting
   Jodi Evans, State Historical Society of Iowa

5. ITE-ARRA Project Execution Change Request **175,000**
   Teresa McMahon, Dept. of Management/Jon Murphy, Governor's Office

6. DVA-Dynamic forms-Execution **$96,276**
   Kent Hartwig, Department of Veterans Affairs

7. DVA-Dynamic forms-Hosting **$3,600**
   Kent Hartwig, Department of Veterans Affairs

8. ICAB-ICAB Online Execution Change Request **$295,900**
   Darrell Fremont, Information Technology Enterprise

9. LSA - Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search-Execution **$325,000**
   Rich Johnson, Legislative Service Agency

10. DRAFT IOWAccess Advisory Council By-Laws Update
    Beth Baldwin, Committee Chair

11. ITE Project Updates
    Mark Uhrin, Information Technology Enterprise

12. Wrap Up And Adjourn
    Richard Neri, Chair

Members,
Here are my proposed meeting dates for 2010, to be voted on at the November 4, 2009, meeting:

Time:

1:00 – 4:30

Place:

Hoover Building, A Level Conference Room 7

Dates:

- ***January 13, 2010***
- ***March 10, 2010***
- ***May 12, 2010***
- ***July 7, 2010***
- ***September 8, 2010***
- ***November 10, 2010***

I should note that, in the past, we adjusted some dates from the second Wednesday of every two months so we could coincide with the Technology Governance Board (TGB) meeting that usually took place the second Thursday of the month. In most cases, this was to allow the submission of a transaction fee proposal to be reviewed by IAC before the required TGB approval. Since it has been a couple of years since this circumstance has arisen, I am proposing we make no consideration of TGB dates in setting our calendar and revert instead to consistently meeting the second Wednesday of every two months, as above.

IOWAccess Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes of September 9, 2009, 1:00 PM
Hoover Building, Third Floor, Conference Rooms 329/330

Draft

Present: Richard Neri, Barb Corson, Kathleen Richardson, Terrence Neuzil, Tom Gronstal, Randy Nyberg, Herb Copley, Terri Selberg, Kelly Hayworth (at 1:12 p.m.)

Absent: Sheila Castaneda, Dawn Ainger, Beth Baldwin, Dan McGinn

Guests: Malcolm Huston, Tracy Smith, Mary Hadd, Jeff Franklin, Rich Johnson, Mark Uhrin, Matt Eaton, Diane Van Zante

Council Chair, Richard Neri, opened the meeting at 1:02 p.m. and noted that a quorum of members was present.

1. Introduction, Approve Minutes – Richard Neri, Chair.
   All members and guests introduced themselves. Barb Corson moved approval of the July 8, 2009 meeting minutes. Terrence Neuzil seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

2. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Recovery Project Update – Scott Vander Hart, Department of Management (DOM).
   This agenda item was cancelled at the last minute.

3. Iowa Interactive Project Update – Tracy Smith Iowa Interactive.
   July transaction volumes indicate a 25% growth in online cabin/campground reservations, compared to last year. A year has passed since new legislation went into effect, mandating single use of a driver's license record (a record can be used only one time for one purpose). July and August volumes for sales of driver's license records continued to show growth. Online license renewal for plumbers and mechanical engineers seems to be catching on.

   Q. How does online renewal compare to the manual process?
   A. In the month of July, the Bureau of Professional Licensure saw a nearly 80% adoption rate for online license renewal.

   In July, several new projects went live: two projects for the Office of Drug Control Policy, the Iowa Board of Regents' website redesign, and websites for the Broadband Deployment Governance Board and Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development.

   Iowa Interactive has begun conducting a post project survey. Whenever a project goes live, the partner agency is asked to rate its satisfaction. For July and August, the average score was 4.9 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest rating. Tracy personally follows up on any poor ratings that are received.

Note: Kelly Hayworth joined the meeting at this point in time.

4. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheets/Monthly Report – Malcolm Huston.
   Malcolm summarized the current financial spreadsheet, highlighting significant numbers. Actual costs are reflected through the end of July. The total of projects being considered today is $206,643. The amount of money available at this point in time, assuming continued funding for all previously approved projects, is sufficient to fund the projects before the Council. The Council's overall financial picture is healthy; obligations are low at the present time and revenue has been steady.

   A couple of projects seem to be lagging. Veterans Affairs is reassessing the business requirements for their dynamic forms project after coming to the conclusion that there is a better way to do things than originally thought. The Transparency project has not yet secured a business sponsor, so the project has been put on hold.

5. LIB – State Library – Live Helper Annual Subscription – Request for Recurring Funding ($408) – Malcolm Huston.
   This is an annual fee for the online chat that connects to the State Library website. Blanket approval is sought so that the fee may be paid annually, without bringing it back to the Council each year. Tom Gronstal moved approval; Kelly Hayworth seconded the motion.

   Q. Is this purely for software maintenance?
   A. Yes. This is an element of the home page and is our responsibility.

   An oral vote was taken; the motion was approved unanimously.

6. IGOV – Boards and Commissions – Change Request ($110,000) – Mary Hadd, DAS-Information Technology Enterprise.
   ITE is working with the Boards/Commissions Coordinator to build more functionality into the application. Some portions of the site are for board members, others are for board administrators. ITE wanted to improve workflow, which necessitated rework of some of the screens and coding. The number of hours required to complete that work resulted in a shortfall in the amount of funds approved. The project originally started under the agile method, but is migrating to the waterfall method because it is better suited to the nature of this project. Mary is comfortable that the additional funding will be sufficient to finish the project.

   Q. How much has been approved thus far?
   A. $167,000.
   Q. What happens if the funding is not approved?
   A. Unknown. We would have to consider other options.

   Kelly Hayworth moved approval of the additional funding; Randy Nyberg seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion was approved unanimously.

7. ITE – Cyber Security Education and Awareness Training – Request for Scope Analysis Funding ($20,000) – Jeff Franklin, ITE-Information Security Office.
Cyber security is an ever present threat. It is vital that we establish a base level of knowledge and give cities, counties, and school districts a single point of reference for up-to-date information. Cities and counties often do not have an information security office and are not able to provide training. We want to help bridge that gap by building a web application that serves as a resource and offers training, testing, and tracking. We have pursued other funding sources, but not been able to secure funding.

Q. What type of content would you use?
A. It would be a mixture of multi-media, case studies, and awareness education.
Q. Will there be any requirement that cities, schools, and counties participate or are we simply hoping that they will?
A. At present, it would not be a requirement.
Q. Why should the State of Iowa build this and be the resource for cities and counties?
A. At present, there are many different sources of information. ITE looks at 133 sites on a recurring basis. Being able to check one authoritative source would be extremely helpful. This would be a resource for anyone that wants to use it.
Q. Why should the State of Iowa be the resource for cities, counties, etc.?
A. The Information Security Office is already doing it and stays current on products and solutions. Many organizations do not have the resources to do so.
Q. Will there be a monitoring function?
A. No.
Q. Are there any other states that provide this type of service?
A. Unsure.

Additional discussion:
- It would be great to have a piece that is available to citizens, as well as cities, counties, and school districts.
- I struggle with whether this is part of the Council's role.
- Maybe the League of Cities and ISAC could contribute some money down the road.
- Could you do a survey to get some sense of buy-in?
- Scope analysis would help answer many of these questions; that's why it needs to be done.

Terrence Neuzil moved approval of funding; Terri Selberg seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, subsequently substantiated by a vote of hands, as follows:

Ayes – Dick Neri, Kathleen Richardson, Herb Copley, Terri Selberg, Terrence Neuzil, Kelly Hayworth, Tom Gronstal
Nays – Barb Corson, Randy Nyberg
Abstentions – None

The motion carried.

8. Legislative Services Agency (LSA) – Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search – Request for Planning Funds ($26,000) – Rich Johnson and Matt Eaton, LSA.
At the July meeting, the Council approved $20,000 for this project for scope analysis. Of that amount, only about $7,000 has been spent. LSA is requesting approval to use the remaining $13,000 plus an additional $26,000 for the planning phase of the project.

Legislative Services is currently engaged in a multi-year computerization project to consolidate multiple publication platforms. One of their goals is to create a uniform index for easy to use navigation and search of both the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code, in effect creating a bridge so that the two bodies of content are cross referenced. This cross referencing would permit greater understanding of the relationship between the Iowa Code and Iowa Administrative Code. We anticipate the planning phase will take about two months and then we would proceed to the execution phase.

Q. Is there any existing software that could do this?
A. None that we know of.
Q. Is there a search engine that you could teach?
A. There are good search engines available, but none that have been integrated with indexed entries. We will use the existing search engine and customize it.
Q. Has there been any discussion of tying into proposed legislation or rule making?
A. No, but there is an interest in doing so.

Tom Gronstal moved approval; Terrence Neuzil seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion was approved unanimously.

Malcolm Huston offered a clarification; the final amount of funding is subject to the amount returned from the first phase of the project.

Council members took a brief break from 2:45 to 2:56 p.m.

9. General Services Enterprise (GSE) – Vertical Infrastructure Program – Request for Scope Analysis Funds ($30,000) – Tony Schmitz, DAS/GSE.
The Vertical Infrastructure Program oversees the design, construction, and maintenance of state buildings in 70 different locations in Iowa. We have been working with ITE to identify internal workflow processes. We have a lot of information, but it is not accessible to anyone outside of GSE. We would like to put some of the process information online so that citizens can see how the State's money is being used and can check on the status of a project. There would be more accountability and transparency if the information was available to contractors and the public. This would be similar to what the University of Iowa and Iowa State University have already done. We don't want to reinvent the wheel, but simply don't have the money to move forward on our own.

Discussion:
- This sounds more operationally oriented than for public use. How are you going to approach the concept? A lot of it doesn't seem to be under the Council's purview, but some of it might.

- It allows the employees to be more efficient, but also provides information to the public.

Q. I assumed this was partly for putting out bids.
A. That information is already available on the purchasing website. We would post specifications and link that information to the purchasing website. We would also post an inventory of all buildings for the twelve agencies that DAS manages.
Q. You only represent twelve agencies, not all agencies?
A. Yes, by statute the twelve agencies are required to work through GSE.

Barb Corson moved approval of funding; Kelly Hayworth seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken as follows:

Nays – Randy Nyberg
Abstentions – None
Ayes – All others

The motion carried. The Chair recommended that GSE split the project into a number of pieces as the Council may not wish to support the entire project.

10. SHSI – State Historical Society Museum Content Management System – Request for Full Project Funding ($20,235) – Jodi Evans, State Historical Society of Iowa.
In Jodi's absence, Malcolm Huston presented the funding request. The State Historical Society has a number of archived items that are not on display to the public. They would like to put this information online. The Society can purchase an off the shelf product for $20,000 that satisfies the archival standards of a museum, allows the item to be displayed on a website, and pulls in existing information about the item.

Terrence Neuzil moved that further discussion of the project be tabled to the next Council meeting; Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously upholding the motion. Council members would like to see the State Historical Society make an in-person presentation.

11. Draft IOWAccess Advisory Council By-Laws Update – Beth Baldwin, Committee Chair.
Two members of the committee, Beth Baldwin and Sheila Castaneda, are not able to be at today's meeting, so Randy Nyberg gave a progress report. The first area of focus is under Article 2, section 1.a(1) which states that 50% of funding shall be reserved for Enterprise project proposals. As a group, the Council needs to decide whether to remove that language or change it. Some of the other by-laws are contradictory to that statement. Beth, Sheila, and Randy also talked about the current process which analyzes projects as they are received/presented. Assuming the availability of funds, the Council tends to approve projects as they come in; maybe they should review all of the projects at the same time, determine which ones rate the highest, and fund only a certain number. The committee also looked at the project management process, and the agile and waterfall methodologies. For the by-laws, we were most interested in determining how often to meet and whether to review projects on a collective basis and whether to give more weight to enterprise projects.

Tracy Smith commented that the State of Kansas uses something similar to a grant process. They meet on a quarterly basis and review everything first, before awarding any money. They also require an agency to come back and give a status update. When the project is completed, the sponsor is asked to showcase the project. The process also lends itself more to enterprise projects.

Discussion:

- We are obligated to try to develop software that benefits multiple agencies. We should give more value to people who want to collaborate.
- It would be good if project awards could coincide with the budget approval process. If projects were reviewed on an annual basis, it would do away with the three step process that the Council uses now.
- Another idea would be to grant initial scope analysis at one meeting and then subsequent phases at meetings throughout the year.
- How does the Council feel about holding quarterly meetings and trying to come up with a process that looks at a pool of projects and makes decisions based on some criteria?
- If an agency chooses to make use of a value added fee, the IOWAccess Advisory Council is the first step in that process. What if the request is time sensitive?
- The Council could conduct a meeting via conference call.
- We could hold quarterly project approval meetings and schedule other business to occur at another meeting. We are an advisory council, the bottom line is that we just make a recommendation, but the DAS administrator can override that decision.
- We almost never have too many projects. A grant process could take us more time than we are using now. I don't know if we need to move to a grant process type approval.
- Another option is working with Malcolm or a subcommittee and adjusting the by-laws to fit the process. If we agree on what we want the process to be, we can create by-laws to reflect that process.
- Could we encourage more enterprise wide projects?
- The Council should also be prepared to show its process or paper trail for making decisions/awards.
- A grant typically does not provide 100% funding. There is more buy-in when you have some investment yourself.
- Can we fund a portion of a project rather than the whole thing?
- Fifty percent for enterprise projects is probably too high. It would require another set of accounting. We could say we favor that, but not make it a requirement.

Agreement was reached to pull the language earmarking 50% of the funding for enterprise projects. A suggestion was also made to remove Article 2, section 4 ("develop a plan and process to make recommendations to Department of Administrative Services for improvements to information technology projects, and to maximize the value of information technology investments by the state").

We will distribute the comments from today's meeting and ask council members to provide feedback.

12. ITE Project Updates – Mark Uhrin, ITE.

DPS	Criminal History Check Online	Responding to vendor updates to data. Target to Production by end of September.
DAS	ITE School Alerts	227 districts enrolled, 19284 registered users. For August 2008-July 2009 we sent 389,671 separate emails. Usage statistics were reset at the beginning of August to reflect the new school year. We have had 25 notifications so far. Mapping function working in Test with a targeted late Sept launch.
CREEGAC	Real Estate Online	Application went live 8/13 with associated press releases. Assessor's data is currently not being supplied to the site. This code has been reused as part of the state's ARRA site for collaboration between groups seeking joint application for available grants.
DPS	ISOR Update	Working with vendor on updated data being provided. Target end of September launch to Production
DNR	Boat Dock Registrations	Application is in Production.
DNR	Safety Education	Application is in Production. Customer has some additional changes that they are funding.
IDED	BLIC	Application is in Production.
DNR	Turn In Poachers	Application is in Production.
DVA	Website Redesign	Completed business requirements.
DIA	Child Advocacy	Continuing toward an expected code completion by 10/1.
DHR	Weatherization Assistance	Waiting for customer resource to return so can set Production rollout.
DOM	ARRA Recovery Tracking	Completed first Pilot Reporting test cycle, second test cycle started 9/9. First official reporting cycle starts 10/10/2009. Prod Pilot site for Collaboration is available. State has very good site at a fraction of the cost (~$100,000 to date) of most proposed products.
DAS	ITE Transparency	No work is planned until a business owner is identified.
CSAC	Scholarships & Grants Integration	Continue to work with customer and their vendor to meet very aggressive timelines.
DOM	Local Gov Financial Reports	Progress has been slow so far as end of the state's fiscal year and vacations have impacted availability. Will start making better progress now that customer and ITE staff availability is increasing.

13. Wrap Up and Adjourn – Dick Neri, Chair.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Iowa Interactive Bi-Monthly Update

to the

IOWAccess Advisory Council

for the months of

September and October 2009

SEPTEMBER
TRANSACTION VOLUME

Partner	Application	2009 Volume	2008 Volume	Difference
Dept. Natural Resources	Campground Reservations	1,919	1,957	-1.94%
Dept. Natural Resources	Call Center Reservations	245	225	8.89%
Dept. Natural Resources	Changes and Cancellations	318	226	40.71%
Dept. of Transportation	DLR Lookup	106,477	93,432	13.96%
Iowa Bureau of Professional Licensure	License Renewal	487	516	-5.62%
Professional Licensing Division	Online Renewal	0	0	0.00%
Professional Licensing Division	Admin Tool- Letters of Good Standing	30	37	-18.92%
Plumbers & Mechanical Engineers	License Renewals	1,155	0	
Electricians	Permits $50.00 or Less	882	0	
Electricians	Permits Greater Than $50.00	1,341	0	
Electricians Licensing	Apprentice and Unclassified Licenses	472	0	

SEPTEMBER ADOPTION STATISTICS				
Partner	Application	Online	Paper	Adoption
Iowa Bureau of Professional Licensure	License Renewal	585	37	94.05%

SEPTEMBER EXISTING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

Partner	Application/Website	Code Rolls	Issues/Bugs	Enhancements
Department of Public Health - PMSB	https://eservices.iowa.gov/pmsb/	1	0	1
Department of Commerse - PLD	https://eservices.iowa.gov/licensediniowa/	1	2	1
Department of Public Safety	https://iowaelectrical.gov/index.php	1	4	7
Department of Public Safety Electrical Permits/Inspections	https://iowaelectrical.gov/index.php/login	2	3	1
Department of Public Safety Electrical License Renewal	https://iowaelectrical.gov/licensing/	2	2	1
Department of Transportation DLR Look up	https://www.egov.state.ia.us/dlrlookup/index.html	1	0	0
Bureau of Professional Licensensure - Online License Renewal	https://eservices.iowa.gov/ibpl/	1	12	1
TOTAL		**9**	**23**	**12**

iowa interactive

SEPTEMBER CONTENT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY

Partner	Application/Website	Code Rolls/Maintenance Requests
Iowa Broadband Deployment Governance Board	http://broadband.iowa.gov/	2
Iowa Civil Rights Commission	http://www.state.ia.us/government/crc/index.html	6
IOWAccess	http://www.iowa.gov	2
Iowa Commission on the Status of African Americans	http://www.state.ia.us/government/dhr/saa/index.html	1
Information Security Office	http://secureonline.iowa.gov/newsletters/index.html	3
Early Childhood Iowa	http://www.state.ia.us/earlychildhood/	1
Iowa Department of Economic Development	http://regassist.iowa.gov	1
Public Employee Relations Board	http://iowaperb.iowa.gov/	1
Iowa Department of Management	www.dom.state.ia.us	3
TOTAL		**20**

September

NEW PROJECTS THAT HAVE GONE LIVE

Partner	Project	Project Type	URL	Date	Description
Department of Motor Vehicles	Diverse License Look-up Change Request 1-1	Dynamic Transaction Enhancement	https://www.egov.state.ia.us/dlrlookup/index.html	9/10/2009	This was a change request to increase security of the system and allow the DOT to audit users suspected of sharing log in information. The user now has to acknowledge they will not share their log in information with anyone .
Iowa Clean Cities Coalition	Iowa Clean Cities Coalition Static Website	Static Website	http://www.iowacleancities.org/	9/16/2009	New website for Iowa Clean Cities Coalition - Office of Energy Independence
Iowa Insurance Division	Office of Consumer Advocacy Static Website	Static Website	http://www.insuranceca.iowa.gov	9/20/2009	New website for the Iowa Insurance Division's Office of Consumer Advocacy.

OCTOBER

TRANSACTION VOLUME

Partner	Application	2009 Volume	2008 Volume	Difference
Dept. Natural Resources	Campground Reservations	404	711	-43.18%
Dept. Natural Resources	Call Center Reservations	45	95	-52.63%
Dept. Natural Resources	Changes and Cancellations	233	99	135.35%
Dept. of Transportation	DLR Lookup	99,374	94,520	5.14%
Iowa Bureau of Professional Licensure	License Renewal	418	219	90.87%
Professional Licensing Division	Online Renewal	0	0	0.00%
Professional Licensing Division	Admin Tool- Letters of Good Standing	49	74	-33.78%
Plumbers & Mechanical Engineers	License Applications	641	0	#DIV/0!
Electricians	Permits $50.00 or Less	548	0	#DIV/0!
Electricians	Permits Greater Than $50.00	1,405	0	#DIV/0!
Electricians Licensing	Apprentice and Unclassified Licenses	76	0	

OCTOBER ADOPTION STATISTICS

Partner	Application	Online	Paper	Adoption
Iowa Bureau of Professional Licensure	License Renewal	418	19	95.65%

OCTOBER EXISTING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

Partner	Application/Website	Code Rolls	Issues/Bugs	Enhancements
Department of Public Safety Electrical Permits/Inspections	https://iowaelectrical.gov/index.php/login	3	2	2
Department of Public Safety Electrical License Renewal	https://iowaelectrical.gov/licensing/	3	3	2
Department of Transportation DLR Look up	https://www.egov.state.ia.us/dlrlookup/index.html	1	0	0
Bureau of Professional Licensensure - Online License Renewal	https://eservices.iowa.gov/ibpl/	2	10	1
IOWAccess	http://iowaccess.iowa.gov/	1	0	0
Governor's Office	http://www.governor.iowa.gov/	1	0	0
TOTAL		**11**	**15**	**5**

iowa interactive

OCTOBER CONTENT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY

Partner	Application/Website	Code Rolls/Maintenance Requests
Community Empowerment	http://www.empowerment.state.ia.us/	6
Iowa Clean Cities Coalition	http://www.iowacleancities.org/	7
Iowa Civil Rights Commission	http://www.state.ia.us/government/crc/index.html	3
IOWAccess	iowaccess.iowa.gov/	1
Iowa Commission on the Status of African Americans	http://www.state.ia.us/government/dhr/saa/index.html	2
Information Security Office	http://secureonline.iowa.gov/newsletters/index.html	2
Iowa Department of Economic Development	http://regassist.iowa.gov	1
Iowa Department of Management	www.dom.state.ia.us	12
Governor's Office	http://www.governor.iowa.gov/	1
Iowa Office of Energy Independence	http://www.iowacleancities.org/	4
TOTAL		**39**

October

NEW PROJECTS THAT HAVE GONE LIVE

Partner	Project	Project Type	URL	Date	Description
Iowa Board of Regents	Iowa Board of Regents Static Website Redesign	static website	http://regents.iowa.gov/	10/7/09	The redesigned website provides an updated look and feel and reorganized content display.
Governor's Office	Governor's Web site Static Redesign 2009	static website	http://www.governor.iowa.gov/	10/20/09	Create a website design that is fresh and more reflective of the Governor's direction. The objectives was to add new functionality, incorporating Web 2.0 tools and more interactive features.
IOWAccess	IOWAccess Static Redesign 2009	static website	http://iowaccess.iowa.gov/	10/21/09	Update the banner graphics and build the html template to simplify updating content. The existing content was harvested and added to the redesigned look and feel.

IOWA INTERACTIVE POST-PROJECT SURVEY RESULTS FOR PROJECTS LAUNCHED SINCE JANUARY 1, 2009

Agencies Responding
Department of Human Rights
Department of Management
Department of Public Safety
Governor's Office of Drug Control Policy
Human Rights
Iowa Agricultural Development Authority
Iowa Communications Network
Iowa Department of Human Rights
Iowa Department of Public Health - Environmental Health
Iowa Department of Revenue
Office of Auditor of State

Projects
Auditor Of the State Web Site Redesign
Broadband Governance Board 2009 Site Creation
Department of Management 4 web sites redesigns
Detention Center Application
Electrical Permits and Inspections Program
ICYD Website
Iowa Agriculture Development Authority Website redesign
Iowa Property Assessment Appeals Board Static Website Update
Iowa Statewide Interoperability Communications System Board Website
Life or Meth Website Redesign
Made in Iowa
ODCP Website Redesign
Plumbing & Mechanical Licensing & Administrative Tool Project

Project Role	
Project Manager	15
Business Manager	0
Technical Contact	0
Director/Executive Sponsor	4
Other	1

Areas of Satisfaction	Satisfaction Rating (1=poor; 5=excellent)					Average Score
	1	2	3	4	5	
Treated respectfully by Iowa Interactive staff				1	19	4.95
Understood the process your project was to go through		1	1	4	14	4.6
As involved in the process as you wanted to be				3	17	4.9
Kept informed of project's progress	1			2	17	4.7
Iowa Interactive met their commitments to the project timelines	1		1	3	15	4.6
Quality of product (application or web site)			2	2	16	4.7
Timely responses of Iowa Interactive staff to requests/ messages				2	18	4.9
Iowa Interactive demonstrated expert knowledge in web design & development				4	16	4.8
TOTAL	**2**	**1**	**4**	**21**	**132**	**4.8**

iowa interactive

How did you learn about Iowa Interactive?	
Another government employee	3
Supervisor	4
Past experience	12
Public information officer	0
Iowa Interactive presentation	0
State IT committee	1
Web site	0
Other	0

Would you choose to work with Iowa Interactive again?	
Yes	18
Maybe	1
No	1

Please explain your choice to or not to work with Iowa Interactive again.
from original start date with much to be done on the program before it is complete. The working relationship with II is much better with Chris and there is graet value in the progress we have made since his start date.
Rick was a great person to work with. He was in constant contact and provided the updated information. If there was ever a concern, the agency was contact and helped.
Very easy to work with, and it's great to create a useful product free of charge!
Considering plans to expand to other licensing programs within the EH Division.
Iowa Interactive was able to create a functional licensure program for our board under a very tight and very limited time schedule. Communication remained open at all times and the overall experience has been great.
If I had the choice...No. However, since the cost of work is included in our IT utility fees, it's the choice we make given limited funds. Unfortunately we sacrificed timeliness for no cost.
Absolutely, they were so helpful during our website re-design and the final outcome was exactly what we had envisioned.
Very professional and expedited our requests with excellent results.
Very easy to work with, very organized, and great communication.
There could be opportunities to further develop webtools for the website. II could be a good partner.

Additional Comments
We are very happy with our website and have already received favorable comments about the design and content. Rick was alwyas helpful when we had questions!
Despite my technical ignorance, I was always treated respectfully by Iowa Interactive, and I learned a lot. I worked with Scott, Chris and Polly on this project. They are excellent.
Thank you for providing such a valuable resource to our agency!
The benifit with II is the ability to create a program that fits our needs. The disadvantage is we are a long way from seeing the final product. This survey was completed before the code changes in question went to production.
I will be contacting Iowa Interactive soon for another project.
Rick and his colleagues have been very responsive to our needs, concerns, and feedback and should be commended on their ability to adjust to changing demands with the development of a brand new program. Same can be said for Tracy and Wayne, this has been a solid working relationship and we look forward to the continued success of the project.
There is no doubt the licensure process would not have advanced as quickly and smoothly as it has without our Iowa Interactive Project Manager Rick Rosno and the excellent development team behind the scenes.
Iowa Interactive has to figure out a way to deliver its products in a timely manner. To take 13 months to redesign the DOM site and its subsidiary sites was way out of line. All of the content was either the same or already created. It's a static site so it didn't require extraordinary programming. Feedback on the DOM end was always timely so it had nothing to do with the customer dragging their feet. The people at IA Interactive are friendly and professional but in the end that doesn't matter when delivery time is way too long.
We actually started this redesign project with Iowa Interactive over 2 years ago. It seemed people would change, etc. & nothing ever happened. When Janet showed up & took over, it was a short period of time to completion. I commend her interest in the project Jeff Ward Executive Director Iowa Ag Development Authority
Janet & Polly were so helpful through the whole process. They made all requested changes down to the formatting, and kept us informed on the progress. We are so pleased with the final website and very excited for our customers to be able to more easily navigate through our programs and applications. Thank you so much for your help!
Great Job!!! I am very pleased. I sincerely appreciate the extra effort to get this done so quickly.
Great teamwork and methodology.
The original project manager from Iowa Interactive was very ineffective. The change to a new project manager made this project successful.
Well done. I appreciated project staff's patience since we moved more slowly than anticipated.
While Kathleen was working on the project, I would not have responded in the same way. It was terrible working with her. However, once Rick took over, it was fantastic. He and Polly both are wonderful to work with, helpful, knowledgable, creative and willing to do whatever we ask of them. It was a pleasure working with them!
Thanks for the effort. We really appreciate Molly and Janet's efforts.

IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

1. *Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: malcolm.huston@iowa.gov .*
2. *Send signed hard copy to Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, DAS-ITE, Hoover B Level, Des Moines, IA, 50319-0150.*
3. *Contact ITE or vendor to prepare for project.*

Date
26 August 2009

Project Name
Museum Collection Content Management System

Requesting Agency
Department of Cultural Affairs/State Historical Society of Iowa (DCA/SHSI)

Is this project in support of a program designated as an Iowa Great Place, pursuant to section 303.3c?
NO

Project Point(s)-of-Contact *(include name and phone number)*
Jodi Evans 281-3295

Project Sponsor *(include name and phone number)*
Mary Jane Olney 281-6320

Business Case Justification
Project is listed as a goal in SHSI Mission Statement

Expected Results in this Project
Increased citizen access to museum collection records and images

Recipients of this Service
Citizens of Iowa; anyone with internet connection

Request *(include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased - i.e. services, hardware, software)*

Project Timeline

Phase	***Start Month/Year***	***End Month/Year***	***Estimated Amount***
Scope Analysis	July 2007	July 2009	$0 phase complete
Design	July 2009	August 2009	$0 phase complete
Implementation	Jan 2010	April 2010	**$20,235**

Resources Being Contributed *(people or funds being contributed to the project by the sponsoring agency- include role/% of time or amount in dollars)*

Jodi Evans, Museum Registrar/Project Leader	**60% time Jan to April 2010**
	30% time thereafter
Walter Ladd, ITE	**10% time Jan and Feb 2010**
Rick Dressler, DCA/SHSI webmaster	**10% time Jan and Feb 2010**

IOWAccess Advisory Council Scoring Factors

Each IOWAccess Advisory Council member assigns a 1 to 10 point value on the following factors to your project proposal. These scores, plus your presentation before the Council and various discussion points, form the basis for the Council's decision on your proposal. Address each factor below:

1. Statutory requirement or other mandate

Is the project required by law or regulation, or is it needed to comply with state IT standards? Does the project fulfill a new mandate or is it required by existing law? Is it required by IT standards or necessary to interface with existing application?

From the State Historical Society of Iowa Mission/Vision Statement:

Goal 1. Connect Iowans with their heritage – where they want it, when they want it and how they want it.

Strategy 1.b. Provide on-line access to State Historical Society of Iowa resources, programs and service.

2. Other funding source(s)

What other funding sources have been investigated and what were the results? Have they been applied for? What is available? Have transaction or other customer fees been considered? Is there a return to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund through transaction fees? Highest ranking for seeking/receiving outside funding.

ROI-Pooled Tech: committee unanimously recommended IOWAccess as a better fit for this project.

3. Improved citizen access to government information

How is citizen access to government enhanced? Greater convenience? Better reliability? Proportion of manual/in person effort being replaced/eliminated? Faster response time? Easier to use? More secure? The greater the degree of citizen access to information, the more points.

- **Greater convenience – anyone with a connection to the WWW can access museum object information.**
- **Faster response time to casual information requests.**
- **Since the museum moved to the New Historical Building in 1988, people have been asking "where's all the stuff" – on-line content will allow viewing of those objects not on exhibition.**

4. Impact on citizens or the business they conduct with the governmental entity

What segment of the citizen population is affected? Is this just a select group or the public as a whole? How does the proposed solution meet an identified need vs. a "nice to have"? Is the primary beneficiary the citizen vs. does this enhance the entity's ability to serve the citizen? Highest ranking for most citizens served.

- **Public as a whole – anyone with WWW connection.**
- **The project falls somewhere between 'need' and 'nice to have': current electronic resources are adequate to manage the museum collection but will not support an on-line function.**
- **Our constituents have indicated they want more access to museum object information.**
- **Other museums (many smaller than SHSI) have put content online.**
- **On-line content is no longer the cutting edge in the museum profession – it is now a standard goal.**
- **Cannot disconnect the difference between citizen as beneficiary and enhancing the agency's ability to serve – the citizens want access to museum collections; on-line is the most efficient mechanism.**
- **State government agencies should provide a high operating standard; the State Museum needs to be a leader in museum management, setting an example for how all Iowa museums should operate.**

5. Enhanced access to government information/ greater interactivity

How does the project enhance citizen one-stop electronic access to government information and transactions or allow for greater interactivity? The most points for "beneficial" use of IT to revamp business processes. Highest for total replacement. Average if adds new dimension to existing service.

- **The citizen has the control in accessing museum object information; most questions can be answered as the citizen browses.**
- **Current museum collection management is the result of two *kaizan* events and a near-constant evaluation of methods and procedures weighed against available resources and the standards of the museum profession. Museum-specific content management system (CMS) will replace the 'look' of collection management but not the content.**
- **Replacing current electronic systems with museum-specific CMS will streamline some processes; the CMS has been developed specifically for accepted museum practices; content can be manipulated easily within the CMS.**

6. Collaboration

Does your project provide an opportunity for another governmental entity to share the resources or benefits? Can your project be used by another entity? The most points for projects benefiting multiple governmental entities or encouraging collaboration between entities. (May be demonstrated by letters of commitment from other entities.)

The operations of the state museum are fairly unique among government agencies. PastPerfect is widely used among individual museums so collaboration potential does exist. While PastPerfect has fundraising, archives, library, and exhibition development components, linking those functions within the State Historical Society of Iowa is not a current goal.

7. Chance for success

Describe why the project is well placed for success. Realistic timeline? Previous success rate? Sufficient support staff? Upper level management commitment? More points for projects with low technical and business risk and high chance of success.

- **SHSI does not have a programmer. A CMS takes programming out of the process, freeing up time to create content.**
- **Switching from an ad hoc set of forms and templates created in a two different operating systems (MS-WORD and MS-ACCESS) to a fully-contained CMS just makes good sense; the most useful forms and templates already exist and the system provides enough flexibility to create specialized applications.**
- **Staff have researched other museum CMS – PastPerfect is well-known in the field, developed specifically for museums with small staff.**
- **Some images are available for immediate upload.**
- **The Director of DCA is fully committed to on-line access.**
- **With museum-specific CMS the technicalities have been worked out – this is almost a load-and-use system.**
- **The biggest time-factor will be new photography – staff have created a priority list based on citizen requests, risk, and ease of photography. Creation of images of objects not on the priority list will become part of staff workplans.**

8. Estimated financial cost/benefit

Provide a rough calculation of costs vs. benefits. The higher the ratio of estimated benefit to the estimated cost, the more points.

1st year Execution costs: $20,235.
2nd year and continuing Execution cost: $11,350 (registrar salary and hosting costs)
Benefit to citizens: about $58,000 in time spent accessing museum collection information.
Ongoing Cost vs benefit: 5.11

9. Transparency

How does the project enhance open and transparent government for citizens? More points for project with high usability in allowing citizens to quickly reach information or services.

Since the museum moved to the New Historical Building in 1988, citizens have asked 'where's all the stuff?' On-line content managed through CMS will provide an answer to that question in a format that is becoming more and more familiar to most people.
Citizens will have immediate access to object information rather than waiting for staff to respond to emails, phone calls, or letters.

10. Efficiency

Why is this project the "best" solution for the need? Are there alternatives and if so, why are they inadequate? More points for project that replaces outdated/legacy system or localized information access.

- **This project will replace a legacy system using MS-ACCESS and MS-WORD developed by a non-programmer in response to immediate job responsibilities.**
- **While the current database systems are adequate in managing the museum collection, they will not support the inclusion of images which is essential to on-line museum catalogs.**

- **Other museum-specific CMS have been considered but those systems are more expensive and more complicated. PastPerfect has been developed with smaller museums in mind (smaller staff, not necessarily smaller collections.)**
- **PastPerfect has also been developed specifically for history museums while other systems are designed for art or archeology collections.**

Acknowledgement of Conditions for Approval of IOWAccess Project

Project Approval Conditions

IOWAccess Revolving Fund project approvals are based upon the application materials submitted to the IOWAccess Advisory Council and approved by the Director of DAS. Recipients of IOWAccess projects are subject to the following conditions.

- The Iowa Accountable Government Act, Iowa Code Chapter 8E
- Information technology standards and practices that that are applicable to "participating agencies", the Office of the Governor, and elective constitutional or statutory officers pursuant to Iowa Code Section 8A.206.
- Iowa Administrative Code Section 11-25(8A) - Information Technology Operational Standards.
- Policies and procedures of the IOWAccess Advisory Council and DAS as outlined in this acknowledgement or published on their websites.

IOWAccess Project Policy Guides

The acceptance of an IOWAccess Project is based on the following:

- Sponsoring agency is responsible for the efficient and effective administration of IOWAccess Projects through the application of sound management practices.
- The IOWAccess Project Process is guidance only and describes a customary sequence used in software development. As such, sponsoring agencies are not required to conform to the IOWAccess Project Process.
- Sponsoring agency assumes responsibility for using IOWAccess funds in a manner consistent with program objectives and the terms and conditions of the IOWAccess Project.
- Sponsoring agency will commit appropriate resources in a timely manner to the project to prevent undue delay in project completion.
- Sponsoring agency will be responsible for compliance with audit requirements.
- Approval of one phase of an IOWAccess project does not mean that other phases will be approved. Each phase is subject to separate approval.

Guidelines for Costs

Allowable costs

To be allowable under IOWAccess Projects, costs must meet the following general criteria:

- Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient performance of IOWAccess Projects.
- Be authorized or not prohibited under State or local laws or regulations.

- ✓ Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other State or Federal Project in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by State law or regulation.

Reasonable costs

A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. In determining the reasonableness of a cost, consideration shall be given to:

- Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the sponsoring agency or performance under the IOWAccess Project.
- Market prices for comparable goods or services.

Composition of Cost

Typical costs chargeable to IOWAccess Projects are:

- Cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of those Projects.
- Equipment and other capital expenditures detailed in the application and previously approved as part of the Project.

Amounts not recoverable as costs under one State or Federal Project may not be shifted to another State or Federal Project, unless specifically authorized by State or Federal legislation or regulation.

Availability of Funds

DAS Finance processes the disbursement of all funds for IOWAccess Projects. Qualifying expenditures for goods and services obtained from other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC, must be paid by the sponsor and submitted to DAS for reimbursement. In order to facilitate the timely processing of IOWAccess Project reimbursements, entities must use the following process:

- The request must be submitted by the sponsor in writing or through e-mail to the IOWAccess Manager.
- The request must include the following information:
  - ✓ Identification of the IOWAccess Project for which reimbursement is being sought,
  - ✓ The amount of reimbursement requested,
  - ✓ Period of time covered by request,
  - ✓ A comprehensive description of the items covered by the request, and
  - ✓ Copies of any supportive documentation (e.g. vendor invoices, documentation for completed work).
- The IOWAccess Manager will review the supporting financial information and evaluate it against the originally approved project.

- When satisfied that the request meets the stated requirements, the IOWAccess Manager will recommend the request for approval for payment and submit it to DAS Finance for processing.
- In no case will the total reimbursement for each phase exceed the approved amount of the Project phase.

The sponsor seeking reimbursement of expenses is responsible for retaining all necessary documentation pertaining to the relevance and results of the work performed and will provide such documentation upon request. DAS Finance will refer the Auditor of State to the sponsor should there be any questions about the expenditures associated with the Project.

Sponsor Monthly Status Reports

No later than the 21st day of each month the sponsoring agency shall submit a status report to the IOWAccess Manager if work is being performed by a developer *other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC*. This status report should include:

- A short narrative of the accomplishments for the month.
- Descriptions of any changes in tasks, resources, or issues materially affecting the project plan and, if necessary, a schedule with new target dates provided.

Changes to a Project

All changes to the Project, or the proposal that resulted in the Project, must be reviewed by the IOWAccess Advisory Council. The Sponsor must be prepared to appear before the IOWAccess Advisory Council to answer questions and provide any clarifications necessary prior to any action by the Council regarding a change to the Project. Reasons for requesting a change to the amount of the Project include, but are not limited to:

- Changes in the scope or objectives of the Project.
- Changes in the amount of project funding.
- Carryover of approved funding for a period of more than one year from the date of approval of the original funding.

All changes to an Project recommended by the IOWAccess Advisory Council must be subsequently approved by the Director of DAS.

Project Disputes

Iowa Code 679A.19 DISPUTES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

"Any litigation between administrative departments, commissions or boards of the state government is prohibited. All disputes between said governmental agencies shall be submitted to a board of arbitration of three members to be composed of two members to be appointed by the departments involved in the dispute and a third member to be appointed by the governor. The decision of the board shall be final."

Sponsor Acceptance

Signing below will signify that sponsor acknowledges and agrees to the IOWAccess project approval conditions as defined in this document.

Sponsor Signature	IOWAccess Manager Signature
Date	Date

IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

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

Part I - Project Information

Date:	**31 August 2009**
Agency Name:	**State Historical Society of Iowa**
Project Name:	**Museum Content Management System**
Agency Manager:	**Jodi Evans**
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	**515-281-3295 jodi.evans@iowa.gov**
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	**Mary Jane Olney**
***Initial* Total for Planning:**	**$ 0**
***Initial* Total for Execution:**	**$ 20,235**
***Initial* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:**	**$ 20,235**
Project Timeline: *(estimate start and end dates for project spending)*	**Planning Start Date: completed** **Planning End Date: completed** **Execution Start Date: January 2010** **Execution End Date: April 1, 2010**
***Revised* Total for Planning and Execution:**	**$ 20,235**
***Revised* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:**	**$ 20,235**

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 proposed project is to a purchase a museum-specific content management system (CMS) designed to allow access to the museum catalog via the Internet. The CMS conforms to the latest industry standards for cataloguing museum collections, allowing capacity for descriptions and images of objects in the museum collections. Funding through an IOWAccess Grant will purchase the equipment and software necessary to: (1) efficiently create and manage digital images of collection items; (2) manage these newly created digital assets, and (3) combine collection information into an efficient, consistent, usable collection management system.

The State Museum holds nearly 110,000 objects in its collections, adding over 400 objects to the collections each year. Most objects are stored in Des Moines. Three of the 8 State Historical Society of Iowa (SHSI) historic sites maintain significant on-site collections: Montauk 11,000+; Edel Blacksmith 1500+; Plum Grove 700+. The SHSI Centennial Building in Iowa City holds over 2500 objects that have not been catalogued fully. None of these objects are available for public access by electronic means.

Nine museum staff will be networked into the CMS. These staffers – representing curatorial, registration, conservation and exhibition – will all be able to see the most current object content and images. Reports, lists, and plans generated through the CMS will be consistent. CMS web-based applications allow one person to do the work currently requiring the expertise of three or four individuals. Using an integrated CMS will decrease the time needed to catalogue, photograph, and upload content to the Web.

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

Response: From the State Historical Society of Iowa Mission/Vision Statement:
Goal 1. Connect Iowans with their heritage – where they want it, when they want it and how they want it.

> Strategy 1.b. Provide on-line access to State Historical Society of Iowa resources, programs and service.

The SHSI Vision and Mission Statements mandate that SHSI help Iowans connect to Iowa's past while serving as a trustee and advocate of historical information and education. Specific Goals of the Mission Statement include providing on-line access to SHSI resources. Use of on-line content in the museum community increases every day, as does the expectation by the general public that museums will provide an on-line service. The inability of the State Museum to put collection information on-line means more and more information is unavailable to the public it serves.

The project supports state government by helping SHSI maintain its collections in professionally appropriate conditions; increases SHSI's ability and capacity to store historical collections held in trust

for the public; expands provision of technical assistance to colleagues throughout the state; and continues to develop SHSI collections to assure thorough documentation of Iowa's historical resources.

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: Collection content is currently managed using paper files and several MS-ACCESS databases. While ACCESS is a powerful tool, it is just a database. No one on the Museum staff has the expertise to move beyond simple database utilities. Purchase of museum-specific CMS will provide efficient, structured management of information content and digital assets.

Access to collection information on-line will require images of objects as well as ordered, coherent descriptions of those objects. While the museum has descriptions of most objects, without images these descriptions aren't very useful on-line. Creation of the images without the means to manage content results in a time-consuming piece-meal approach to getting images on-line. Combining images with content in one integrated system allows researchers to find and download what they want.

Past considerations of on-line access have been constrained by the lack of an integrated system and the lack of adequate server space. Collection objects have been prioritized for photography according to those objects that are fragile, valuable, popular, and possess a certain 'wow' factor.

The project funding request also includes money to purchase a camera needed to create digital images, a server and supporting software capable of storing images and information, a computer upgrade for the Project Manager (museum registrar) and possible upgrades for museum staff most directly involved with creating collection information. The need for server space and software is negotiable, pending an assessment of the current capabilities and future needs with regards to this project.

The components of the chosen CMS – PastPerfect – include:
the Basic Program;
Version 4.0 Upgrade;
Network upgrade for multiple users;
Scatter/Gather;
conversion of existing records to PastPerfect;
training CD;
Multi-Media add-on;
PastPerfect Online hosting of collection records.
Additional expenses will be annual support for up to ten (10) users.

The chosen CMS – Past Perfect - is a proven technology, used by hundreds of museums around the country. The greatest benefit of Past Perfect is that it combines all the functions of museum collection management into one integrated system.

These technological improvements will subsequently help SHSI serve Iowans in a more timely and efficient manner. Iowans use the SHSI collection of artifacts in numerous capacities: research for primary, secondary, undergraduate and post-graduate academic pursuits; genealogical research; museum exhibits; and more.

Artifact stories and information provide historical context that connects Iowans to their past and paves the way to their future. The purchase of a digital SLR camera/software, a dedicated server/software, a museum-specific Content Management System (CMS), and upgrades to existing computers will significantly improve the creation of usable, deliverable content available to anyone interested in the collections of the State Historical Society of Iowa. The project enhances the quality of life for all Iowans by making Iowa's historical artifacts more readily available to Iowans via digital archival technologies.

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: N/A

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: N/A

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

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: N/A

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

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

Response: N/A

[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: The overarching result of this project is to get the museum collection information out into the world. The citizens of Iowa, as the collection 'owners', are the first beneficiaries of this project; not only will they have access to 'their' collections, the reputation of their museum will be greatly enhanced. While this is a single-agency project, the richness of the museum collections will be appreciated by anyone with a connection to the World Wide Web.

Response time to researchers will be cut dramatically as more content is posted on-line. An integrated system with images will deliver content faster than the current process requiring contact with a staff member, piece-meal creation of images, and response to researchers via email attachments.

The Museum loans objects to other museums under controlled circumstances. Creating a public catalog will allow other museums to browse our collections, make their selections and start the loan process. Loans to other museums enhance the visibility of Iowa's rich history.

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: This project will replace a legacy system using MS-ACCESS and MS-WORD developed by a non-programmer in response to immediate job responsibilities. While the current database systems are adequate in managing the museum collection, they will not support the inclusion of images which is essential to on-line access of museum collections. Other museum-specific CMS have been considered but those systems are more expensive and more complicated. PastPerfect has been developed with smaller museums in mind (smaller staff, not necessarily smaller collections.) PastPerfect has also been developed specifically for history museums while other systems are designed for art or archeology collections.

Current museum collection management practices have been developed as the result of two *kaizan* events and a near-constant evaluation of methods and procedures weighed against available resources and the standards of the museum profession. Museum-specific content management system (CMS) will replace the 'look' of collection management and the procedures, but not the adherence to standards.

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: Since the museum moved to the New Historical Building in 1988, people have been asking "where's all the stuff" – on-line content will allow viewing of those objects not on exhibition. On-line content means anyone with a connection to the WWW can access museum object information. On-line content means faster response time to casual information requests. The citizen has the control in accessing museum object information; most questions can be answered as the citizen browses.

The project falls somewhere between 'need' and 'nice to have': our public has indicated they want more access to museum objects and the State Historical Society of Iowa has committed to greater on-line content. Funding this project is a means to an end articulated by our public. On-line content is no longer the cutting edge in the museum profession – it is now a standard goal. Discussion of this project cannot disconnect the difference between citizen as beneficiary and enhancing the agency's ability to serve – the citizens want access to museum collections; on-line is the most efficient mechanism. State government agencies should provide a high operating standard; therefore the State Museum needs to be a leader in museum management, setting an example for operation of all Iowa museums.

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

Response: Public Health/Safety. This project has no real impact on the health or safety of the public.

[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.) X NO, it is a stand-alone project

Response: 1. This is a stand-alone project. Once the CMS is up and running, museum staff will refine existing policies and procedures to incorporate image creation and uploading, and maintenance of the on-line component.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: the State Museum continues to manage collection object content to the highest professional standard using available technologies. This project is a refinement of those standards

[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:. Annual support for the PastPerfect network will be at least $600 per year. If necessary, the Department of Cultural Affairs/State Historical Society of Iowa will absorb the cost of having a third-party host the on-line content

[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: $ 0 planning phase has been completed

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 concept behind museum collections management is quite simple:

- Know what you have;
- Know who gave it to you;
- Know where you put it.

Everything else is technique.

Public interaction with collection is through the museum staff. The museum creates exhibitions which are the public face of the collections, but this access is limited to what is on exhibition. Staff are happy to search the collection records for any member of the public but this takes some time ranging from a few minutes to a few days, depending on the scope of the search and the need to produce documents and images.

Currently all content relating to individual museum objects is stored in paper files, printed Accession Books (accession is the museum term for accepting and recording an object into the permanent museum collection. An accession number is assigned to each object connecting the object to its donation and to associated documentation), and a MS-ACCESS database All objects are processed into the collection using a consistent series of steps.

A paper file of each donation or loan transaction is made, containing correspondence, documents with original signatures, written descriptions of objects, notes relating to exhibition or conservation, and any other information relating to the objects or the transaction. These files are stored in vertical files in the Curatorial Offices.

Accession Records are printed each year in July for the previous calendar year. These lists include the Accession Number assigned to each object, description, source information, and date of acquisition. Below is a brief history of the format for these books:

- 1911 to 1939 Typewritten pages in post-bound covers. Some collections handwritten in commercial ledgers.
- 1939-1994 typewritten entries in commercial post-bound ledgers.
- 1995-2006 Discontinue ledgers. Object information re-keyed into WORD document and printed.
- 2007-present Object information cut from database and pasted into WORD document, then printed.

While the museum has been using computer technologies since 1989, limitations in the operating systems made extensive use of these technologies difficult. Character limits in the database allowed very little input of information. The database was merely a finding aid for the manual card catalog. Upgrades in the operating systems allowing for more use of memo-type fields has made the card catalog redundant. In 2002 the Registrar changed the description field in the DB from 56 characters to memo and began transcribing all available object information into the DB. Use of catalog cards was discontinued in 2003 in favor of using the database as the main source of object information.

Museum staff have access to the database but rarely add or change information themselves. Changes are submitted to the museum Registrar who cuts-and-pastes this information into the database and completes the DB record. It is simply the fragility of the current DB that makes this procedure necessary. MS-ACCESS is not very forgiving in correcting simple keystroke mistakes. The Registrar has built and maintained the DB through various operating system changes and is the staffer most familiar with its capabilities and problems. The DB is backed-up consistently as part of the State network.

Object images exist in many formats – b/w prints, color prints and slides, color transparencies, contact sheets, etc. The museum has never committed to a consistent photography procedure mainly due to lack of resources in creating and managing the images. These available images are stored in vertical files arranged by accession number.

Conservation information is created and managed by the Museum Conservator using an electronic system developed specifically for conservation. The conservator is the only staffer using this system and it is not networked within the Museum. Conservation information for specific objects can be linked to the documentation for those objects but only by request and in paper format.

Transaction documents such as the Deed of Gift and Loan Agreements are generated by the Registrar as-needed. These documents are in WORD and are over-written with each new transaction. Original documents with signatures are kept in the paper files. The maintenance of paper files is a museum profession standard and will not be completely discontinued with the advent of new technology.

The current system of managing museum collections in-house is adequate but not efficient. It is completely inadequate for on-line applications. The accession number of each object links that object with any associated information but the information is generated in many formats. Individual staffers may spend an inordinate amount of time searching those formats and still miss important information simply because the formats are not centralized. .

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: For the public, the main difference post-project will be: (1) an opportunity to actually interact with the museum collection information and, (2) the ability manage that interaction personally. Anyone with a connection to the Internet can search the museum collection at their convenience. The PP-Online tutorial creates the online catalog, indexes a sitemap, and delivers monthly visitor stats. Data from this stat feature will help in redefining a digitization strategy. Site visitor feedback will drive refinements to the online presence.

The SHSI website receives an average of 13,500 hits each month. Roughly half of these hits are for simple visitor information. Based in time spent by citizens on our website, we beliece the remaining 80,000 people could be researching the museum collections.

With the purchase of a museum-specific Content Management System and associated equipment upgrades, as well as the purchase of a digital camera, the staff of the State Museum will be better equipped to manage the museum collection resulting in better response to public inquiries.

Museum collection information will be centralized using a relational program capable of managing information and images. Once the existing DB has been converted to PastPerfect (PP) individual museum staff will have access to the various information screens related to their areas of expertise, i.e. conservation, exhibition, object information, etc. Using fields and records from this main catalog, the Museum will use PastPerfect-Online to create a fully searchable online catalog linked through the SHSI website. This online presence will be derived from the main catalog and will not affect day-to-day management of the museum collections.

PastPerfect staff will convert the existing collection database, freeing museum staff from re-keying that information. Once the system is up and running, all staff networked into PP will use the same templates for reports, documents, or lists, eliminating the need to cut-and-paste between WORD and ACCESS. All networked staff will have read-rights to the catalog allowing all staff to see additions or corrections in real-time. Protocols will be placed detailing the rights and responsibilities among staff; very little change is expected in this area.

Once the conversion and editing phases are complete, the first phase of both the main catalog and the on-line catalog will contain narrative descriptions for the nearly 75,000 objects currently in the MS-ACCESS database. Museum staff will create a procedure and priority list to photograph and upload images to PP. Current images will be digitized to conform to PastPerfect's standards, ready for uploading.

Switching to a CMS will not drastically affect the content of museum collection management. Objects destined for the collection will still be processed with a consistent procedure. Staff will still be able to create lists, reports, and research. The main difference will be in the 'look' of collection management. Staff will be working within the parameters of an established system. As no one on the museum staff is attached to the 'old' method, the learning curve should be quite shallow.

[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.

The planning for this project has been completed. Museum staff began researching CMS in 2007 and committed to PastPerfect as the best CMS for the State Museum in 2008.

[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. The planning for this project has been completed. No costs are associated with the planning phase

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.

Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:

N/A – no change in government costs expected

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits): Jodi Evans, 15% time one year	$16,700
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.): N/A	$ 0
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.): N/A	$ 0
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	$16,700

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.

Describe One Year Post-Project Cost: same as pre-project. The Museum Registrar will continue to manage the museum collections.

Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost: increase in citizen access to museum collection information

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits): Jodi Evans, 10% time one year	**$8350**
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	**$ 0**
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	**$ 0**
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	**$8350**

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: Iowa citizens will have more control over information access. Information searches can be performed electronically which saves time and money in travel costs. Staff research time expenditures are reduced, as are expenditures in mailing collection research results.

Transaction Savings	
Number of annual online transactions:	**78,000**
Hours saved/transaction:	**.75 per hour**
Number of Citizens affected:	**78,000+**
Value of Citizen Hour	**$10**
Total Transaction Savings:	**$58,500**
Other Savings (Describe)	**$0**
Total One Year Citizen Benefit :	**$58,500**

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: No quantifiable monetary value to non-operational benefit. The real benefit comes from enhancement of museum operations, catching up to current museum collection management standards, and allowing the State Museum to be a role-model for Iowa museums.

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**.

	Current FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost($)	% Total Cost	Cost($)	% Total Cost	Cost($)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	$33,400	100%	$0	0%	$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	$0	0%	$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	$33,400	0%	$0	0%	$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	$0	0%	$0	0%	$0	0%

6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1): Jodi Evans @ 15%	$16,700	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2): Jodi Evans @10%	$8350	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		$ 8350
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		$ 58,500
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		$ 0
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)	$ 66,850	
G. Planning Phase Cost Calculation (Section III D5):	$ 33,400	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	2	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	165.30	

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: Meets stated strategic goal; Utilization of new tech; replacement of legacy systems; reduces hassle factor for people searching for collection information; creates consistency in 'look' of collection of management; reduces information formats.

[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: $17,235

Amount of Hosting Requested: $ 3000 ($250 x 12)

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: The CMS is already developed. The timeline lists actions needed to (1) commit to PastPerfect as the CMS for museum collection information and, (2) create the on-line catalog accessible to the citizens of Iowa.

Jan 2010
Purchase PastPerfect. Install PP, and convert existing database to PP. (Registrar, DCA-IT)
Scan existing collection images, begin uploading these images to PP. (Registrar and museum staff)
Test and edit PP application. (Registrar)
Develop photography priority list. (Registrar and museum staff)
Introduce network users to PP. (Registrar, DCA-IT)
Read training manual and follow tutorials. (All network users)
Feb 2010
Continue uploading and editing. (Registrar, staff, volunteers)
Begin new photography from priority list and upload. (registrar, volunteers)
Design online catalog. (Registrar, DCA-IT, webmaster, IOWAccess)
Have 2-3 user meetings to discuss PP functions. (all network users)
March 2010
Create links between SHSI website and online catalog. (Registrar and DCA webmaster)
Create user feedback opportunity to refine functionality of online catalog. (Registrar, DCA-IT, webmaster)
Launch online catalog. (Webmaster, IOWAccess, DCA-PR)
Develop new cataloging procedure incorporating PastPerfect functions. (Registrar)
April 1, 2010
Stop using MS-ACCESS completely and commit to PastPerfect. (all network users)
Ongoing
Continue to redefine on-line catalog based on user feedback. (Registrar, staff)
Continue to coach network users in PastPerfect functions. (Registrar)

[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	$53,310	72%	$41,750	100%	$8350	100%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	$20,235	28%	$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	$73,545	100%	$41,750	100%	$8350	100%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	$53,310	100%	$41,750	100%	$8350	100%

[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:

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

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	$53,310	5	100%	$8350	100%	$19,012
Software	$4235	4	100%	$600	100%	$16,518
Hardware	$13,000	3	100%	$0	100%	$4,333
Training	$0	0	0%	$0	0%	$0
Facilities	$0	0	0%	$0	%	$0
Professional Services	$425	1	100%	$600	100%	$1,025
ITE Services	$3000	1	100%	$2500	100%	$5,500
Supplies, Maint., etc.	$0	0	0%	$0	0%	$0
Other	$0	0	0%	$0	0%	$0
Totals	$73,970	14	100 %	$12,050	100 %	$17,333

D. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

Purchase	**Description**	**Estimated Cost**
Canon EOS Rebel 55 mm	Create digital images	1,000
HP scanner	Create digital assets	500
Server	store object images and information	6,000
Server Software	Server	2,000
Computers	Registrar	1,500
Computer upgrades	Other staff	2,000
TOTAL		**13,000**
Past Perfect		
Past Perfect basic	Integrated content management.	900
PP Version 4.0 upgrade	Necessary for current version	200
Network Upgrade 6-11 users	Necessary for multiple users	900
Multimedia/Imaging	Power to attach and display one or more images of each record. Works with scanners and digital cameras.	400
Scatter/Gather	Allows information to be scattered to portable mechanisms (disk, zip, CD) then gathered from the mechanism to the main CMS	350
Past Perfect On-line	Selects and creates a fully searchable online catalog. Creates and submits site map to Google for indexing. Delivers visitation reports.	500
Data Conversion	No need to re-key data. $50/hour	500
First Year Support	Network users	425
Annual Tech support	Network users	[600] Annual cost, not counted in total
Users Guide		20

Training CD		40
TOTAL		**4,235**

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: No quantifiable monetary value to non-operational benefit. Without a CMS the museum will continue to operate adequately. The real benefit comes from enhancement of museum operations, catching up to current museum collection management standards, and allowing the State Museum to be a role-model for Iowa museums.

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: In the region of mid-western states, most state museum have a CMS in place. Use of CMS will place the State Museum in-line with expected practices. The use of a recognized CMS will be a benefit in grant applications, demonstrating to grantors that the State Museum is ready to use new technologies in the care and interpretation of the state's historical resources.

The main goal of this project is to get museum collection information into the hands of the people of Iowa using electronic capabilities. Allowing individuals access to museum collection information at their leisure is a stated goal of the SHSI Mission Statement. Using a recognized CMS to manage the museum collection and build an on-line catalog is the most efficient means to that end.

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.

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	**$16,700**	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	**$8350**	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		**$ 8350**
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		**$58,500**
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		**$0**
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)	**$66,850**	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	**$17,333**	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	**3.85**	

Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	244.71	

[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).

Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Planning Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)	

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	
Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)	

Execution Phase:

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: Citizens able to access museum collection information measured by how many hits on website and how long a visitor browses.

2. Citizen impact

Response: Fewer complaints regarding disposition of older museum collections measured by decline in these types of inquires at museum information desk, and by letter, email and phone.

3. Cost Savings

Response: Increase in citizen access without increase in overall museum costs measured over 5 years.

4. Project reengineering

Response: Greater efficiency in managing museum collections resulting in a reduction of time needed to post content online.

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response: IOWAccess funds for 1st year execution phase (100%)

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Response:
Tangible:
Increased online visits and browsing;
Increased citizen access to state government;
Greater citizen understanding of museum collections;

Intangible:
Greater transparency in state museum operations;
Increased perceived value of museum and collections;
Increased value of State Museum to citizens;
Increased status for State Museum among Iowa museums and on national scale.

Project Name:	**DOM – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)**	**Change request**	**ARRA-001-2009**
Urgency:	**HIGH**		
Project Sponsor:	**Teresa McMahon, Performance Results Division Administrator**		
Originator:	**Deb McDaniel – DAS-ITE**	**Requested by:**	**Deb McDaniel**
Date requested:	**11/04/2009**		

Justification

Description of Change Requested:	Additional Planning/Scope Phase funds
Reason for Change:	Original estimate for Planning/Scope funding did not include enough funding to cover updates and changes required by the Federal government.
Proposed Approach to Resolve:	Request additional planning/scope funding of $175,000.00

Impact

Impact on Scope:

The original planning/scope was not known at the onset of the project. Complexity of the project has grown to include an additional on line application – e.g. the collaboration application, in addition to the reporting application, the reporting website and the application to report the awards and reports to the Federal government. While it was known at the onset that we would need an application to report the awards and reports to the Federal government, the complexity and functionality were not known. Additionally, as the complexity and functionality grew, so did the number of DAS-ITE resources that were committed to the project. Whereas it was known there would be at least 2 (two) coding resources needed, 1 (one) additional DAS-ITE resource was needed to work on the project almost full time and 2 (two) additional testers were needed to assist in the completion of the initial submission process.

Impact on Scope Risk:

The complexity and functionality of the reporting application grew as information was received from the Federal government. The added functionality was needed to increase the usability of the application for the reporting agencies. Also, the functionality was needed to allow for increased transparency of the awards by the public.

As it is critical that the data being reported to the Federal government was correct and was reported within the timeframe set forth by Federal guidelines, additional time was spent working with the submitting agencies reviewing and validating the data.

Impact on Schedule:

We anticipate we will need DAS-ITE resources to spend an additional 1,200 – 1,500 hours to prepare for the second reporting period. We will need to have all awards and reports submitted to the Federal government by January 10, 2010.

Impact on Staffing Effort:

We anticipate we will continue to keep 3 coding resources committed to this project almost exclusively for the next 2 ½ months. As before, we will also need to be prepared to bring in additional testing resources, database administrators, and system administrators as needed.

Impact on Spending:

Additional $175,000.00 is needed to prepare for the next reporting of awards and reports to the Federal government.

Approval

Originator/Date	Project Leader/Date	Sponsor/Date	Customer/Date

Reason for change:

When we originally requested funding, it was not known nor could it have been known the complexity required to complete the reporting application. We could only estimate that we needed to have a reporting application and a website, knowing we would need to include additional functionality to the reporting application as the information became known to us. This functionality was necessary to be included as required by the Federal government.

IOWAccess Advisory Council By-laws

ARTICLE 1. NAME

The name of this body shall be the IOWAccess Advisory Council, hereafter referred to as the IAC.

ARTICLE 2. PURPOSE

The IAC was established by the Code of Iowa, §8A.221.

The IAC acts as an advisory council to promote and consider citizen-focused information technology projects, and services.

In its capacity as an advisory council, the IAC will work to create and provide a service to citizens of the state that will serve as a gateway for one-stop electronic access to governmental information, transactions, and services at state, county, or local levels. In this role, the Council accepts and reviews proposals for funding of electronic projects that benefit the citizens they serve.

More specifically, the IAC shall:

1. Using Concept Paper or Return on Investment submissions by applicable proposing sponsors, and ranking tools incorporated in the IAC Return on Investment analysis tools, provide periodic recommendations to the Director, Department of Administrative Services, as to the appropriateness of proposals for information technology projects that primarily benefit the citizens of Iowa by providing information and services normally achieved through more burdensome means.
2. Review all IAC information technology outsourcing project proposals prior to issuance, and refer to the Technology Governance Board for its action, any projects that exceed the greater of a total cost of fifty thousand dollars or a total involvement of seven hundred fifty agency staff hours.
3. Review and recommend to the Technology Governance Board rates to be charged for access to and for value-added service performed through IOWAccess.
4. Make recommendations to Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for improvements to information technology projects, and to maximize the value of information technology investments by the state.
5. Make recommendations to DAS regarding technology utility services to be implemented by DAS or other agencies.
6. Work with the DAS Finance office to maintain the relevancy of the central budget, proprietary control accounts, and reimbursement funds to information technology.
7. Annually prepare a report to the Governor, the Department of Management, and the General Assembly regarding the total spending on technology for the previous fiscal year, the total amount obligated for the current fiscal year, and an estimate of the amount to be requested for the succeeding fiscal year for all agencies,
8. Review and recommend to the director of the Department of Administrative Services all rules to be adopted by the department that are related to IOWAccess.
9. IAC shall maintain a publically accessible website for sharing minutes, agendas, membership, proposals, budgetary information, and other documentation relevant to its purpose for access by citizens as well as the senate, house of representatives, legislative services agency and the office of the citizen's aide.
10. Advise DAS leadership on related issues as requested.

ARTICLE 3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The IAC members will:

1) Ensure as a council that priority is given to serving the needs of the citizens of Iowa;
2) Advocate for access to government information and services through IOWAccess and for data privacy protection, information ethics, accuracy and security in IOWAccess programs and services.
3) Work for the common good of the State of Iowa;
4) Strive for quality decisions within timeframes provided;
5) Evaluate the Council's effectiveness;
6) Conduct themselves as professionals, including:
    a. Treat each other respectfully;
    b. Work to develop mutual trust; and
    c. Practice active listening;
7) Openly share opinions and expertise.

ARTICLE 4. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The IAC is composed of 14 members appointed by the governor unless otherwise noted:

1) Five representatives of the primary customers of IOWAccess;
2) One representative of the Judicial Branch appointed by the chief justice;
3) One representative of the Executive Branch;
4) One person representing Iowa cities who is actively engaged in city administration;
5) One representative of Iowa counties who is actively engaged in county administration;
6) One representative of the Federal government; and
7) Four representatives of the citizens of Iowa.

Section 2. Except for the representative from the Judicial Branch, members appointed pursuant to Section 1 are subject to confirmation by the senate and shall serve four-year staggered terms as designated by the governor.

Section 3. Members shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in performance of the members' duties in accordance with Iowa Code Section 7E.6 and other currently applicable state law or rule.

Section 4. Substitutes for absent members will not be allowed. Members may attend by telephone or other electronic means.

Section 5. Members can participate in voting if they are present at the meeting or attending the meeting by phone or by other electronic means.

Section 6. Each member is expected to attend and actively participate in meetings:

1) Iowa Code §69.15 Board members - nonattendance - vacancy. Any person who has been appointed by the governor to any board under the laws of this state shall be deemed to have submitted a resignation from such office if either of the following events occurs:
    a. The person does not attend three or more consecutive regular meetings of such board. This paragraph does not apply unless the first and last of the consecutive meetings counted for this purpose are at least thirty days apart.
    b. The person attends less than one-half of the regular meetings of such board within any period of twelve calendar months beginning on July 1 or January 1. This paragraph does not apply unless such board holds at least four regular meetings during such period. This paragraph applies only to such a period beginning on or after the date when the person takes office as a member of such board.

2) If such person received no notice and had no knowledge of a regular meeting and gives the governor a sworn statement to that effect within ten days after the person learns of the meeting, such meeting shall not be counted for the purposes of this section.

3) The governor may accept or reject such resignation. If the governor accepts it, the governor shall notify such person, in writing, that the resignation is accepted pursuant to this section. The governor shall then make another appointment to such office. Such appointment shall be made in the same manner and for the same term as in the case of other vacancies caused by resignation from such office.

4) As used in this section, "board" includes any commission, committee, agency, or governmental body which has three or more members.

Section 7. The DAS Information Technology Enterprise shall provide a staff person to take notes at the meetings and produce minutes that will be distributed to all members.

ARTICLE 5. OFFICERS AND STAFF

Section 1. The IAC annually shall elect a chair and vice chair from among the members of the council, by majority vote, to serve one-year terms.

ARTICLE 6. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the IAC.

Section 2. The vice chairperson will assist the chairperson in the discharge of the chairperson's duties as requested and, in the absence or inability of the chairperson to act, shall perform the chairperson's duties.

ARTICLE 7. COMMITTEES

Section 1. Chair may authorize or dissolve committees as needed to complete the charter of the IAC.

Section 2. Individuals who are members of the IAC and individuals who are not members of IAC may be appointed by the chairperson to serve on committees.

Section 3. Committees shall organize themselves to be effective.

Section 4. Committees shall provide feedback to the chairperson and the IAC at the Council's request.

Section 5. Committees shall meet, discuss, study and/or resolve assigned issues as needed.

ARTICLE 8. MEETINGS

Section 1. Meetings of the council shall be held no less than bi-monthly for the one-year period following the appointment of all members.

Section 2. Agenda items shall be solicited from the members in advance of an upcoming meeting.

Section 3. An agenda, including those items requiring action, shall be provided five (5) days prior to the meeting to council members and customers. The agenda should also include any information necessary for discussion at the upcoming meeting.

Section 4. A simple majority of the members of the council, including vacant positions, shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5. Meeting shall comply with Iowa Code Chapters 21 and 22, the Iowa open meetings and open records laws.

ARTICLE 9. VOTING

Section 1. Each member has one vote. A quorum, as defined in Article 8, is required to vote on a matter and a majority vote of the quorum shall determine the outcome of the issue being voted upon.

Section 2. IAC bylaws may only be amended by a majority vote of all members.

ARTICLE 10. ADMINISTRATION

Section 1. The IOWAccess Manager, with the assistance of Information Technology Enterprise staff and others as deemed necessary, shall keep the official, current and complete books and records of the decisions, members, actions, meeting minutes, and obligations of the IAC.

Section 2. The IOWAccess Manager shall coordinate meeting notices and locations, and shall keep a record of names and addresses, including E-mail addresses, of the members of the IAC.

Section 3. Any member of the IAC may inspect all books and records for good purposes at a reasonable time and location.

Section 4. The IOWAccess Manager shall update the council on the current operational status of all pending and dormant projects and account balances according to Article 11 below.

ARTICLE 11. ACCOUNTS

Section 1. The IOWAccess Manager shall maintain and regularly update a tracking of charges to project accounts and remaining balances of each account, and an analysis of obligations and unobligated funds available. This analysis may include projections of revenue, spending, costs, and obligations for future periods.

Section 2. Dormant IOWAccess Projects may be adjusted in one of two ways:

1) IOWAccess projects that have not made requests for reimbursement of funds for at least 120 days may be closed by:
    1. Notifying the sponsoring agency of intent to close the account,
    2. Receiving concurrence from an agency representative empowered to provide the agency position on the intent to close the account,
    3. Authorizing DAS Finance to close the account and remit any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund.
2) IOWAccess projects that have not made requests for reimbursement of funds and have not provided status reports for at least 180 days may be closed by:
    1. Notifying the sponsoring agency of intent to close the account,
    2. Closing the account by
        a. Receiving concurrence from an agency representative empowered to provide the agency position on the intent to close the account, or
        b. A vote to close the account by the Council if the sponsoring agency fails to reply.
    3. Authorizing DAS Finance to close the account and remit any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund.

ARTICLE 12. PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Section 1. Meetings should be conducted using Robert's Rules of Order (Revised).

Section 2. The chairperson may elect to use the vice chairperson as parliamentarian.

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:	**October 20, 2009**
Agency Name:	**Department of Veterans Affairs**
Project Name:	**Dynamic Forms Project**
Agency Manager:	**Kent Hartwig**
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	**515-242-0031** **Kent.Hartwig@iowa.gov**
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	**Patrick Palmersheim**
***Initial* Total for Design:**	**$89,700**
***Initial* Total for Implementation:**	**$96,276 – Implementation phase** **$ 3,600 – 1st year hosting** **$99,876 – Implementation phase and hosting**
***Initial* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:**	**$**
Project Timeline: ***(estimate start and end dates for project spending)***	**Design Start Date: 1/09** **Design End Date: 3/09** **Implementation Start Date: 11/9** **Implementation End Date: 01/10**

Revised **Total for Design and Implementation:**	**$ 52,700 –Design($37,000 back to IOWAccess)** **$ 96,276– Implementation** **$ 3,600- 1st year hosting** **$152,576 – Total for Design and Implem.**
Revised **Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:**	**$**

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 main purpose of this project is for DAS-ITE to add the capability for our veterans to be able to apply online at the IDVA website for:

1. The Veterans Trust Fund
2. Veterans Commemorative Property transactions
3. County Grant Program
4. Vietnam Bonus Program
5. War Orphan Tuition Assistance
6. Injured Veteran Grant Program
7. All other application for benefits and service currently made to the IDVA

This will be accomplished by adding the forms to the existing IDVA website as interactive forms so that counties and veterans may fill them out online and submit them without printing and mailing. This will greatly improve the way veterans are able to apply to the IDVA for benefits and services by allowing the veteran to apply for a benefit at any time.

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

Response: IDVA's mission statement is "To enable management, staff, and our customers to accomplish their objectives by working cooperatively with them. To seek to constantly improve resources to serve Iowa veterans, their dependents and survivors, in securing benefits provided by federal and state laws."

This project dovetails with the department's mission by providing veterans with another option in accessing benefits through the state. Also, it allows the department to improve services to veterans by streamlining applications into a database upon arrival and decreasing processing time for application received online.

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: Currently, a veteran can go to the existing website and print off a hard copy of several of the applications, complete the application by hand and mail it in. There is currently no system that allows for a Veteran to enter any information on line. DAS-ITE will use existing enterprise standards to complete the project.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

1. **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, this expenditure is not required by Federal law, rule, or order.

2. **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: No, this expenditure is not required by state law or rule.

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

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: No, this expenditure does not meet a health, safety or security requirement.

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

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

Response: **No, this expenditure is not necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard.**

[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: The participants of this project will be the IDVA and the veterans who apply for benefits. It is estimated there may be as many as 750 veterans who will use the online capability on an annual basis.

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: Veterans are an increasingly technologically savvy citizenry. Printing out a form and completing it by hand is error-prone, cumbersome and frustrating. Especially to those who are dealing with a combat related illness. Online forms present an opportunity for the veteran and their spouse to complete the form and present it to the department in a manner that they are most comfortable with.

Furthermore, online submittal will speed the processing time by getting the application to the department immediately instead of through the mail. It will help to reduce human error in processing through handwriting interpretation and will provide more clarity to the program administer at the department. Applications will be immediately placed into a database which will eliminate a portion of the department processing, speeding up the delivery of the benefit for the applicant.

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: This project provides an immediate connection to the Iowa Department of Veterans Affairs. By providing the option to complete applications online, a veteran has immediate satisfaction that they have submitted the form and it has been received. This provides an added layer of accountability to the department to ensure the applicant is notified of the receipt of the form and that processing timeframes will be followed. Staff members who administer programs have been involved in the development of this project and are fully prepared to adopt the use of online forms.

As an extension of the previous IDVA website design, there is anecdotal information indicating that the information provided on the site is 100% improved and is a valuable resource to veterans in this state. In fact, other states have informed the department that they are utilizing the site as a portal to federal information and they are planning to pattern their site after ours. This project is an extension of Phase I to help veterans who feel more comfortable utilizing technology for their benefits.

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

Response: In extending the usability of our Phase I effort, this project will provide veterans with timely and reliable access to the services and resources that can assist them in their transition to civilian life as well as providing assistance for health and family issues.

[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

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

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.) X NO,

Response: No

2. **Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?**

X YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: Yes – The IDVA website was completely renovated in the first phase and DAS-ITE is adding the capability of submitting an application on-line rather than printing the application off, completing and sending it in via the mail in the second phase.

[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: Once completed, updates and changes will be made by the department and all associated costs will be absorbed by IDVA. However, the department does not have the funds to pay for the design and implementation of the project and cannot absorb the cost at this time.

[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: $89,700.00

A. Process Reengineering

1. 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: Currently, a veteran can go to the IDVA website, click on the application in which the veteran is interested, print off the application, complete the application and mail it into the IDVA. The application is received at the IDVA offices where numerous fields of information from the application are entered into the appropriate spreadsheet by an IDVA resource.

2. 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: With the implementation of the capability to complete an application on-line, the veteran will fill in the required fields on the application and submit the application to the IDVA. The following applications will be available for submission online:

1. Iowa Injured Veteran Grant Application
2. War Orphan Educational aid application
3. Iowa Veterans Trust Fund Assistance Application
4. Iowa Veterans Trust Fund Family Support Group or Children's Programs application
5. Iowa Veterans Trust Fund Honor Guard reimbursement application
6. Operation Recognition – Honorary High School Diploma application

Upon receipt, the submitted data for all applications will be saved to a new database. The Vietnam Conflict Veterans Bonus program is being used as a pilot for full electronic handling. The program administrator will use the database to maintain and process the application through the use of administrative screens.

For all other program applications a data file containing the application information will be emailed to one or more IDVA resources. The appropriate IDVA resource will be able to transfer the data from the data file into the appropriate spreadsheet used for processing applications for that program.

A timeline for moving to fully on-line applications for the other programs have not yet been established, but the software is being designed with that goal in mind.

[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.

Scope -	Completed -	IDVA and DAS-ITE
Planning/design funding request		
	January, 2009	IDVA
Planning/design	January, 2009 -	IDVA and DAS-ITE
Implementation funding request		
	May, 2009	IDVA
Implementation	May, 2009	IDVA and DAS-ITE

[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.

Work on mock up screens	-	360 hours - 30 screens X 12 hours per screen
Creation of test plan	-	25 hours
Completion of requirements	-	5 hours
Creation - detailed design document	-	240 hours - 30 screens X 8 hours per screen
Data model	-	20 hours
Project manager duties	-	50 hours
Unknowns	-	70 hours
Total hours	-	770 hours

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:

Because the department will still maintain the processes needed to accept paper forms, we anticipate little actual reduction in department operational costs.

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	$0
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	$0
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	$0
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	$0

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:

Because the department will still maintain the processes needed to accept paper forms, we anticipate little actual reduction in department operational costs.

2. **Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:**

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	$0
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	$0
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	$0
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	$0

3. One Year Citizen Benefit - Quantify t**he estimated one year value of the p**roje**ct to Iowa citizens. This includes th**e "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:

Applications take approximately one hour to complete thoroughly. Online forms will save the citizen time in completing the application and in returning the forms.

Transaction Savings	
Number of annual online transactions:	**2000**
Hours saved/transaction:	**.5**
Number of Citizens affected:	**750**
Value of Citizen Hour	**$10**
Total Transaction Savings:	**$3750**
Other Savings (Describe)	**$0**
Total One Year Citizen Benefit :	**$3750**

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:

Failure to complete this project will result in the department continuing to utilize a solely paper-based process and perpetuating the inefficiency associated with it.

5. Design Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	**$0**	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	**$0**	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		**$ 0**
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		**$3750**
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		**$0**
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	**$3750**	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	**$89700**	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	**0.041**	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	**-95.81**	

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:

By adding the capability for our veterans to apply on-line to the IDVA will greatly improve customer service for our veterans. This allows a veteran the opportunity to apply for a benefit whenever it is convenient for them and in a format that they are more at ease with.

[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: $96,276

Amount of Hosting Requested: $3,600

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	**11/9 -**	**Project Manager, Development Resource**
Coding	**11/9**	**Development Resource**
Data Migration	**12/9**	**Development Resource, Customer, Project Manager**
Testing	**12/9**	**Testers, Development Resource**
Deployment	**1/9**	**Network, System Admin, Web Services**
Project Completion	**1/9**	**Development Resource, Project Manager**

[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 FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost($)	% Total Cost	Cost($)	% Total Cost	Cost($)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	$0	0%	$0	0%	$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	$98,076	100%	$1,800	100%	$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	$98,076	100%	$1,800	100%	$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:

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

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	$		%	$	%	$
Software	$		%	$	%	$
Hardware	$		%	$	%	$
Training	$		%	$	%	$
Facilities	$		%	$	%	$
Professional Services	$		%	$	%	$
ITE Services	$96,276	5	100%	$	%	$19,255
Supplies, Maint., etc.	$		%	$	%	$
Other	$		%	$	%	$
Totals	$96,276		%	$	%	$19,255

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:

This proposal will enhance access to state benefits and will increase IDVAs ability to serve veterans.

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:

- **Enhances IDVA service to veterans and counties;**
- **Utilization of new IT technology;**
- **Reduces processing time delays;**
- **Establishes a searchable database of veterans.**

3. **Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet**

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	$0	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	$0	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		$
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		$3750
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	$3750	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	$19,255	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	.194	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	-10.40	

[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).

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: IDVA will instantly receive an application online which eliminates mail delays and employee data entry errors. Admin screens expedite the tracking process and will stream line the initial entry of a claim if it is mailed in. Searchable data base will allow IDVA to query applicants and run reports on increased use due to the online forms.

2. **Citizen impact**

   Response: Expedited time frame, less potential for error, easier to fill out forms, confirmation of IDVA receiving the application. Counties will be able to assist veterans in filling out the form and submit while they are in the office. Provides greater access to government benefits.

3. **Cost Savings**

   Response: Cost savings will be in time for the veteran and the expense of mailing in the application. IDVA savings will be in paper and printing. This proposal will be a start to a paperless application process.

4. **Project reengineering**

   Response:

5. **Source of funds (Budget %)**

   Response: 100% IOWAccess

6. **Tangible/Intangible benefits**

   Response: Provides an up to date database of veterans and their addresses so IDVA can contact them if new benefits arise. Eliminates a significant amount of paperwork and frees up employees up to do additional tasks. Expedites the application process for both the veteran and IDVA.

Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Design Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
TOTAL DESIGN EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)	

Implementation Phase:

Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	
Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	
Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	
TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)	

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 IowAccess 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 the by 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 IowAccess 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 IowAccess 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:

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

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st	% 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.

Project Name:	**DIA- Child Advocacy Board Modernizing Child Advocacy**	**Change request**	**CR-001**
Urgency:	**HIGH**		
Project Sponsor:	**Richard Moore, Director Iowa Child Advocacy Board**		
Originator:	**Darrell Fremont – DAS-ITE**	**Requested by:**	**Darrell Fremont**
Date requested:	**11/04/2009**		

Project Summary

The ultimate result of this project is expected to be improved safety and permanency outcomes for abused and neglected children being served by Iowa's child welfare system. Project-specific expected result is the development and implementation of Iowa Child Advocacy Online.
Operational improvement results are expected to include:

- a general public accessible website that promotes public awareness of child advocacy issues and includes a volunteer recruitment application and training functions
- a secure website accessible to ICAB staff, volunteers, DHS, Court and other officials designed to facilitate a variety of information exchanges to reduce reliance on paper-based information exchanges and retention practices
- the establishment of a centralized ICAB program operations data system that allows real time updating and accessing by all local offices
- business logic to control the security, storage, backup, and flow of data between office staff, volunteers and the general public
- ICAB capacity to facilitate and participate in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

Justification

Description of Change Requested:	Additional Execution funds to complete project
Reason for Change	Changes to business requirements of the applicaiotn discovered during requirements gathering of the needed reports, added complexity, design change and increased coding effort due to requirement of Laserfice document mangement system, User Interface and design changes made to the view templates to enhance usabilty and functionality of the application, technology upgrades made to the framework. Details of the changes listed on page three of the request

Impact

Impact on Scope:	The original scope of the project has not been impacted
Impact on Schedule:	Resources have been added to complete tasks by 07/2010
Impact on Staffing Effort:	Staff increased from 3 to 6
Impact on Spending:	Total cost of project will be $ 790,900

Approval

Originator/Date	Project Leader/Date	Sponsor/Date	Customer/Date

Implementation Task	Estimate	Change from Original	Increase Amount
Laserfiche integration	350 hrs	From 100 hrs to 450 hrs	$50,800
	Webservice design did not work with Laserfiche product. Had to use the SDK toolkit from Laserfice to create an interface which added more development time. Many technical connection issues arose with proxies, firewalls and networks. There are 5 areas in the application that upload and download documents.		
Increase coding hours	720 hrs	From 1110 hrs to 1830 hrs	$81,000
	Includes: 34 views added to the original 51 views, upgraded technologies [nHibernate, jquery] added and utilized in the coding framework, database changes, and documentation updates.		
Change Control	200 hrs	From 300 hrs to 500 hrs	$22,600
	To cover minor adjustments to customer business requirements that will arise over time.		
Testing	400 hrs	From 200 hrs to 600 hrs	$45,000
	Includes additional testing time for the increased views and commands, update test plan, run test scripts, report errors.		
Rework/Bugs	400 hrs		$45,000
	New request: rework reported errors, document and prepare code releases.		
Migration of current Data	250 hrs	From 600 hrs to 850 hrs	$28,000
	All customer databases [x] includes the Jitterbit tool setup with completed data mapping definitions.		
Reports - 62	50 hrs	From 950 hrs to 1000 hrs	$5,500
User Guide/WIKI	160 hrs	New Request	$18,000
	New Request: customer user guide for training and supporting users with the ability for the customer to update and modify over time.		
		Total Funding Request	$295,900

FINAL SUBCOMMITTEE DRAFT 11/2/09

IOWAccess Advisory Council By-laws

ARTICLE 1. NAME

The name of this body shall be the IOWAccess Advisory Council, hereafter referred to as the IAC.

ARTICLE 2. PURPOSE

The IAC was established by the Code of Iowa, §8A.221.

The IAC acts as an advisory council to promote and consider citizen-focused information technology projects, and services.

In its capacity as an advisory council, the IAC will work to create and provide a service to citizens of the state that will serve as a gateway for one-stop electronic access to governmental information, transactions, and services at state, county, or local levels. In this role, the Council accepts and reviews proposals for funding of electronic projects that benefit the citizens they serve.

More specifically, the IAC shall:

1. Using Concept Paper or Return on Investment submissions by applicable proposing sponsors, and ranking tools incorporated in the IAC Return on Investment analysis tools, provide periodic recommendations to the Director, Department of Administrative Services, as to the appropriateness of proposals for information technology projects that primarily benefit the citizens of Iowa by providing information and services normally achieved through more burdensome means.
2. Review all IAC information technology outsourcing project proposals prior to issuance, and refer to the Technology Governance Board for its action, any projects that exceed the greater of a total cost of fifty thousand dollars or a total involvement of seven hundred fifty agency staff hours.
3. Review and recommend to the technology governance board rates to be charged for access to and for value-added service performed through IOWAccess.
4. Make recommendations to Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for improvements to information technology projects, and to maximize the value of information technology investments by the state. Make recommendations to DAS regarding technology utility services to be implemented by DAS or other agencies.
5. Make recommendations to DAS regarding technology utility services to be implemented by DAS or other agencies.
6. Work with the DAS Finance office to maintain the relevancy of the central budget, proprietary control accounts, and reimbursement funds to information technology.
7. Annually prepare a report to the Governor, the Department of Management, and the General Assembly regarding the total spending on technology for the previous fiscal year, the total amount obligated for the current fiscal year, and an estimate of the amount to be requested for the succeeding fiscal year for all agencies,
8. Review and recommend to the director of the Department of Administrative Services all rules to be adopted by the department that are related to IOWAccess.
9. IAC shall maintain a publically accessible website for sharing minutes, agendas, membership, proposals, budgetary information, and other documentation relevant to its purpose for access by citizens as well as the senate, house of representatives, legislative services agency and the office of the citizen's aide.

10. Advise DAS leadership on related issues as requested.

ARTICLE 3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The IAC members will:

1) Ensure as a council that priority is given to serving the needs of the citizens of Iowa;
2) Advocate for access to government information and services through IOWAccess and for data privacy protection, information ethics, accuracy and security in IOWAccess programs and services. IAC shall maintain a publically accessible website for sharing minutes, agendas, membership, proposals, budgetary information, and other documentation relevant to its purpose.
3) Work for the common good of the State of Iowa;
4) Strive for quality decisions within timeframes provided;
5) Evaluate the Council's effectiveness;
6) Conduct themselves as professionals, including:
    a. Treat each other respectfully;
    b. Work to develop mutual trust; and
    c. Practice active listening;
7) Openly share opinions and expertise.

ARTICLE 4. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The IAC is composed of 14 members appointed by the governor unless otherwise noted:

1) Five representatives of the primary customers of IOWAccess;
2) One representative of the Judicial Branch appointed by the chief justice;
3) One representative of the Executive Branch;
4) One person representing Iowa cities who is actively engaged in city administration;
5) One representative of Iowa counties who is actively engaged in county administration;
6) One representative of the Federal government; and
7) Four representatives of the citizens of Iowa.

Section 2. Except for the representative from the Judicial Branch, members appointed pursuant to Section 1 are subject to confirmation by the senate and shall serve four-year staggered terms as designated by the governor.

Section 3. Members shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in performance of the members' duties in accordance with Iowa Code Section 7E.6 and other currently applicable state law or rule.

Section 4. Substitutes for absent members will not be allowed. Members may attend by telephone or other electronic means.

Section 5. Members can participate in voting if they are present at the meeting or attending the meeting by phone or by other electronic means.

Section 6. Each member is expected to attend and actively participate in meetings:

1) Iowa Code §69.15 Board members - nonattendance - vacancy. Any person who has been appointed by the governor to any board under the laws of this state shall be deemed to have submitted a resignation from such office if either of the following events occurs:

a. The person does not attend three or more consecutive regular meetings of such board. This paragraph does not apply unless the first and last of the consecutive meetings counted for this purpose are at least thirty days apart.

b. The person attends less than one-half of the regular meetings of such board within any period of twelve calendar months beginning on July 1 or January 1. This paragraph does not apply unless such board holds at least four regular meetings during such period. This paragraph applies only to such a period beginning on or after the date when the person takes office as a member of such board.

2) If such person received no notice and had no knowledge of a regular meeting and gives the governor a sworn statement to that effect within ten days after the person learns of the meeting, such meeting shall not be counted for the purposes of this section.

3) The governor may accept or reject such resignation. If the governor accepts it, the governor shall notify such person, in writing, that the resignation is accepted pursuant to this section. The governor shall then make another appointment to such office. Such appointment shall be made in the same manner and for the same term as in the case of other vacancies caused by resignation from such office.

4) As used in this section, "board" includes any commission, committee, agency, or governmental body which has three or more members.

Section 7. The DAS Information Technology Enterprise shall provide a staff person to take notes at the meetings and produce minutes that will be distributed to all members.

ARTICLE 5. OFFICERS AND STAFF

Section 1. The IAC annually shall elect a chair and vice chair from among the members of the council, by majority vote, to serve one-year terms.

ARTICLE 6. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the IAC.

Section 2. The vice chairperson will assist the chairperson in the discharge of the chairperson's duties as requested and, in the absence or inability of the chairperson to act, shall perform the chairperson's duties.

ARTICLE 7. COMMITTEES

Section 1. Chair may authorize or dissolve committees as needed to complete the charter of the IAC.

Section 2. Individuals who are members of the IAC and individuals who are not members of IAC may be appointed by the chairperson to serve on committees.

Section 3. Committees shall organize themselves to be effective.

Section 4. Committees shall provide feedback to the chairperson and the IAC at the Council's request.

Section 5. Committees shall meet, discuss, study and/or resolve assigned issues as needed.

ARTICLE 8. MEETINGS

Section 1. Meetings of the council shall be held no less than bi-monthly for the one-year period following the appointment of all members.

Section 2. Agenda items shall be solicited from the members in advance of an upcoming meeting.

Section 3. An agenda, including those items requiring action, shall be provided five (5) days prior to the meeting to council members and customers. The agenda should also include any information necessary for discussion at the upcoming meeting.

Section 4. A simple majority of the members of the council, including vacant positions, shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5. Meeting shall comply with Iowa Code Chapters 21 and 22, the Iowa open meetings and open records laws.

ARTICLE 9. VOTING

Section 1. Each member has one vote. A quorum, as defined in Article 8, is required to vote on a matter and a majority vote of the quorum shall determine the outcome of the issue being voted upon.

Section 2. IAC bylaws may only be amended by a majority vote of all members.

ARTICLE 10. ADMINISTRATION

Section 1. The IOWAccess Manager, with the assistance of Information Technology Enterprise staff and others as deemed necessary, shall keep the official, current and complete books and records of the decisions, members, actions, meeting minutes, and obligations of the IAC.

Section 2. The IOWAccess Manager shall coordinate meeting notices and locations, and shall keep a record of names and addresses, including E-mail addresses, of the members of the IAC.

Section 3. Any member of the IAC may inspect all books and records for good purposes at a reasonable time and location.

Section 4. The IOWAccess Manager shall update the council on the current operational status of all pending and dormant projects and account balances according to Article 11 below.

ARTICLE 11. ACCOUNTS

Section 1. The IOWAccess Manager shall maintain and regularly update a tracking of charges to project accounts and remaining balances of each account, and an analysis of obligations and unobligated funds available. This analysis may include projections of revenue, spending, costs, and obligations for future periods.

Section 2. Dormant IOWAccess Projects may be adjusted in one of two ways:

1) IOWAccess projects that have not made requests for reimbursement of funds for at least 120 days may be closed by:
    1. Notifying the sponsoring agency of intent to close the account,
    2. Receiving concurrence from an agency representative empowered to provide the agency position on the intent to close the account,
    3. Authorizing DAS Finance to close the account and remit any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund.
2) IOWAccess projects that have not made requests for reimbursement of funds and have not provided status reports for at least 180 days may be closed by:
    1. Notifying the sponsoring agency of intent to close the account,
    2. Closing the account by

a. Receiving concurrence from an agency representative empowered to provide the agency position on the intent to close the account, or

b. A vote to close the account by the Council if the sponsoring agency fails to reply.

3. Authorizing DAS Finance to close the account and remit any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund.

ARTICLE 12. PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Section 1. Meetings should be conducted using Robert's Rules of Order (Revised).

Section 2. The chairperson may elect to use the vice chairperson as parliamentarian.

DRAFT 7/7/09

IOWAccess Advisory Council By-laws

ARTICLE 1. NAME

The name of this body shall be the IOWAccess Advisory Council, hereafter referred to as the IAC.

ARTICLE 2. PURPOSE

The IAC was established by the Code of Iowa, §8A.221.

The IAC acts as an advisory council to promote and consider citizen-focused information technology projects, and services.

In its capacity as an advisory council, the IAC will work to create and provide a service to citizens of the state that will serve as a gateway for one-stop electronic access to governmental information, transactions, and services at state, county, or local levels. In this role, the Council accepts and reviews proposals for funding of electronic projects that benefit the citizens they serve.

More specifically, the IAC shall:

1. Using Concept Paper or Return on Investment submissions by applicable proposing sponsors, and ranking tools incorporated in the IAC Return on Investment analysis tools, provide periodic recommendations to the Director, Department of Administrative Services, as to the appropriateness of proposals for information technology projects that primarily benefit the citizens of Iowa by providing information and services normally achieved through more burdensome means.
    a) As the IAC seeks to provide the highest benefit to its citizen audience, the Council supports projects with the widest range of use across numerous governmental entities. To that end, proposals for information technology projects will be classified into two categories, Enterprise and Agency-Specific:
        1) 50% of available IOWAccess funding shall be reserved for Enterprise project proposals, which will be considered before Agency-Specific proposals. Enterprise projects are those that can be readily shared with more than one governmental entity, with few license or platform restrictions.
        2) The balance of available IOWAccess funding shall be available for either Enterprise project proposals or for Agency-Specific proposals. Agency-Specific proposals are information technology projects in which the resulting software is either incompatible with existing software used at other agencies, or so particular to an agency that its portability to another agency would be inadvisable, impractical, or inefficient, as deemed by the Council.

(Section 1 to be discussed in context of overall review of project/prioritization process for Council.)

2. Review all IAC information technology outsourcing project proposals prior to issuance, and refer to the Technology Governance Board for its action, any projects that exceed the greater of a total cost of fifty thousand dollars or a total involvement of seven hundred fifty agency staff hours. *(See Malcolm's 6/24/09 E-mail explanation).*

3. **Review and** recommend to the technology governance board rates to be charged for access to and for value-added service performed through IOWAccess. *(Reworded to mirror statutory language with bold words as extra based upon 6/27 discussion to stress "review and recommend function of council).*
4. Develop a plan and process to make recommendations to Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for improvements to information technology projects, and to maximize the value of information technology investments by the state. (See Malcolm's 6/24 E-mail explanation).
5. Make recommendations to DAS regarding technology utility services to be implemented by DAS or other agencies. (See Malcolm's 6/24 E-mail explanation).
6. Work with the DAS Finance office to maintain the relevancy of the central budget, proprietary control accounts, and reimbursement funds to information technology.
7. Annually prepare a report to the Governor, the Department of Management, and the General Assembly regarding the total spending on technology for the previous fiscal year, the total amount obligated for the current fiscal year, and an estimate of the amount to be requested for the succeeding fiscal year for all agencies,
8. Review and recommend to the director of the Department of Administrative Services all rules to be adopted by the department that are related to IOWAccess. (Added statutory language added per 6/24 discussion).
9. IAC shall maintain a publically accessible website for sharing minutes, agendas, membership, proposals, budgetary information, and other documentation relevant to its purpose for access by citizens as well as the senate, house of representatives, legislative services agency and the office of the citizen's aide. (Added per 6/24 discussion - statutory language).
10. Advise DAS leadership on related issues as requested.

ARTICLE 3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES (Article 3 re- numbered per priority discussion 6/24 conf. call).

The IAC members will:

1) Ensure as a council that priority is given to serving the needs of the citizens of Iowa; (Reworded per statutory language).
2) Advocate for access to government information and services through IowAccess and for data privacy protection, information ethics, accuracy and security in IowAccess programs and services. IAC shall maintain a publically accessible website for sharing minutes, agendas, membership, proposals, budgetary information, and other documentation relevant to its purpose. (Added this principle per 6/24 discussion - statutory language).
3) Work for the common good of the State of Iowa;
4) Strive for quality decisions within timeframes provided;
5) Evaluate the Council's effectiveness;
6) Conduct themselves as professionals, including:
    a. Treat each other respectfully;
    b. Work to develop mutual trust; and
    c. Practice active listening;
7) Openly share opinions and expertise.

ARTICLE 4. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The IAC is composed of 14 members appointed by the governor unless otherwise noted:

1) Five representatives of the primary customers of IOWAccess;

2) One representative of the Judicial Branch appointed by the chief justice;

3) One representative of the Executive Branch;

4) One person representing Iowa cities who is actively engaged in city administration;

5) One representative of Iowa counties who is actively engaged in county administration;

6) One representative of the Federal government; and

7) Four representatives of the citizens of Iowa.

(Section 1 reworked per 6/24 discussion to mirror statute more closely).

Section 2. Except for the representative from the Judicial Branch, members appointed pursuant to Section 1 are subject to confirmation by the senate and shall serve four-year staggered terms as designated by the governor.

Section 3. Members shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in performance of the members' duties in accordance with Iowa Code Section 7E.6 and other currently applicable state law or rule. (Reworded per 6/24 discussion).

Section 4. Substitutes for absent members will not be allowed. Members may attend by telephone or other electronic means.

Section 5. Members can participate in voting if they are present at the meeting or attending the meeting by phone or by other electronic means.

Section 6. Each member is expected to attend and actively participate in meetings:

1) Iowa Code §69.15 Board members - nonattendance - vacancy. Any person who has been appointed by the governor to any board under the laws of this state shall be deemed to have submitted a resignation from such office if either of the following events occurs:

   a. The person does not attend three or more consecutive regular meetings of such board. This paragraph does not apply unless the first and last of the consecutive meetings counted for this purpose are at least thirty days apart.

   b. The person attends less than one-half of the regular meetings of such board within any period of twelve calendar months beginning on July 1 or January 1. This paragraph does not apply unless such board holds at least four regular meetings during such period. This paragraph applies only to such a period beginning on or after the date when the person takes office as a member of such board.

2) If such person received no notice and had no knowledge of a regular meeting and gives the governor a sworn statement to that effect within ten days after the person learns of the meeting, such meeting shall not be counted for the purposes of this section.

3) The governor in the governor's discretion may accept or reject such resignation. If the governor accepts it, the governor shall notify such person, in writing, that the resignation is accepted pursuant to this section. The governor shall then make another appointment to such office. Such appointment shall be made in the same manner and for the same term as in the case of other vacancies caused by resignation from such office.

4) As used in this section, "board" includes any commission, committee, agency, or governmental body which has three or more members.

Section 7. The DAS Information Technology Enterprise shall provide a staff person to take notes at the meetings and produce minutes that will be distributed to all members.

ARTICLE 5. OFFICERS AND STAFF

Section 1. The IAC annually shall elect a chair and vice chair from among the members of the council, by majority vote, to serve one-year terms.

ARTICLE 6. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the IAC.

Section 2. The vice chairperson will assist the chairperson in the discharge of the chairperson's duties as requested and, in the absence or inability of the chairperson to act, shall perform the chairperson's duties.

ARTICLE 7. COMMITTEES

Section 1. Chair may authorize or dissolve committees as needed to complete the charter of the IAC.

Section 2. Individuals who are members of the IAC and individuals who are not members of IAC may be appointed by the chairperson to serve on committees.

Section 3. Committees shall organize themselves to be effective.

Section 4. Committees shall provide feedback to the chairperson and the IAC at the Council's request.

Section 5. Committees shall meet, discuss, study and/or resolve assigned issues as needed.

ARTICLE 8. MEETINGS

Section 1. Meetings of the council shall be held no less than **bi-monthly** for the one-year period following the appointment of all members. (Clarified as bi monthly – every other month – per 6/24 discussion).

Section 2. Agenda items shall be solicited from the members in advance of an upcoming meeting.

Section 3. An agenda, including those items requiring action, shall be provided five (5) days prior to the meeting to council members and customers. The agenda should also include any information necessary for discussion at the upcoming meeting.

Section 4. A simple majority of the members of the council, including vacant positions, shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5. Meeting shall comply with Iowa Code Chapters 21 and 22, the Iowa open meetings and open records laws.

ARTICLE 9. VOTING

Section 1. Each member has one vote. A quorum, as defined in Article 8, is required to vote on a matter and a majority vote of the quorum shall determine the outcome of the issue being voted upon.

Section 2. IAC bylaws may only be amended by a majority vote of all members.

ARTICLE 10. ADMINISTRATION

Section 1. The IOWAccess Manager, with the assistance of Information Technology Enterprise staff and others as deemed necessary, shall keep the official, current and complete books and records of the decisions, members, actions, meeting minutes, and obligations of the IAC.

Section 2. The IOWAccess Manager shall coordinate meeting notices and locations, and shall keep a record of names and addresses, including E-mail addresses, of the members of the IAC.

Section 3. Any member of the IAC may inspect all books and records for good purposes at a reasonable time and location.

Section 4. The IOWAccess Manager shall update the council on the current operational status of all pending and

dormant projects and account balances according to Article 11 below. (Language added per statute - 6/24 disc).

ARTICLE 11. ACCOUNTS

Section 1. The IOWAccess Manager shall maintain and regularly update a tracking of charges to project accounts and remaining balances of each account, plus an analysis of obligations and unobligated funds available. This analysis may include projections of revenue, spending, costs, and obligations for future periods.

Section 2. Dormant IOWAccess Projects may be adjusted in one of two ways:

1) IOWAccess projects that have not made requests for reimbursement of funds for at least 120 days may be closed by:
    1. Notifying the sponsoring agency of intent to close the account,
    2. Receiving concurrence from an agency representative empowered to provide the agency position on the intent to close the account,
    3. Authorizing DAS Finance to close the account and remit any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund.
2) IOWAccess projects that have not made requests for reimbursement of funds and have not provided status reports for at least 180 days may be closed by:
    1. Notifying the sponsoring agency of intent to close the account,
    2. Closing the account by
        a. Receiving concurrence from an agency representative empowered to provide the agency position on the intent to close the account, or
        b. A vote to close the account by the Council if the sponsoring agency fails to reply,
    3. Authorizing DAS Finance to close the account and remit any balance to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund.

ARTICLE 12. PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Section 1. Meetings should be conducted using Robert's Rules of Order (Revised).

Section 2. The chairperson may elect to use the vice chairperson as parliamentarian.

Malcolm's 6/24 email referenced herein:

Hello IAC by-law committee members,
Dick tells me you want some information from me:

1. Review all IAC information technology outsourcing project proposals prior to issuance, and refer to the Technology Governance Board for its action, any projects that exceed the greater of a total cost of fifty thousand dollars or a total involvement of seven hundred fifty agency staff hours.

The intent of this to clarify that any project using outsourced, i.e., non State, developers will be referred to the TGB if it is over 50K and or more than 750 hours (the current practice). This just documents a current practice.

4. Develop a plan and process to make recommendations to Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for improvements to information technology projects, and to maximize the value of information technology investments by the state.
5. Make recommendations to DAS regarding technology utility services to be implemented by DAS or other agencies.

These are two additional duties. The first is to take an active advisory role, beyond just considering projects. With the Council's overview of projects, they are in a good position to suggest cost-saving measures, consolidation, sharing, etc. that will lead to more efficiency. The second item is similar and needs an explanation. A utility service is a module that can enhance an application. Examples are the ePayment engine allowing credit card processing, an address validation service, a single online authorization and authentication service (Enterprise A&A), etc. Should a project come before the Council, the Council could suggest incorporation of a utility service; again with the same cost-saving/efficiency goal as #4.

Documents used at the Scope Analysis (Concept Paper) and the Planning/Execution (ROI) phases are online at: http://iowaccess.iowa.gov/documents.shtml