

E-Government Services Project Prioritization

For the purpose of this document, a project refers to developing and offering an electronic government (e-government) service. Project rankings are determined by evaluating the value of the service and the resources available for the project. The level of importance in providing the service defines value and the available personnel and funding to complete the project defines resources.

If at any time Colorado Interactive, LLC (CI) does not have sufficient resources to complete all requested projects, the following evaluation will be completed to determine their priority. The grand total of a project will be compared with the grand totals of other projects and the priority will be set based on the highest score taking precedence. To determine the grand total, each item will be ranked by the agency requesting the project, CI and the Executive Director. This ranking will take place in a joint session of all parties to attempt to reach consensus on each item. The exception to this shall be Agency Readiness, which will be self-assessed. If consensus on scoring cannot be reached among the parties, the Executive Director will ask SIPA for input. All parties will be allowed to make their case in front of SIPA.

Each of the following items are ranked from 1 to 5 with 1 having a low level of importance or applicability and 5 having a high level of importance or applicability. This scoring matrix is provided as a guide and can be altered to accommodate extenuating circumstances.

Value Item	Rank 1 - 5
<p>Mandate for the service: Is the federal government, state law, regulation changes, policy changes, or the like mandating the project? If yes, rank the importance of the mandate (could be judged by the severity or risk of non-compliance, or adverse affects to customers by not providing the service) in combination with the need to satisfy the mandate through the e-government services contract (versus other options). Examples: Severe non-compliance penalties and a non-funded mandate would rank 5; Severe non-compliance penalties with funding and other options for completing the project would rank 3; No penalties or adverse affects to customers for non-compliance and a project affecting a small number of customers would rank 1</p>	
<p>Customer benefits and demand/adoption: E-government services must be prioritized based on their value to customers. Customers often request and/or demand services that would be useful to them. Success of similar projects in other states should be evaluated. Customer value can be measured in delivery of information previously not available, or not easily accessed, savings of</p>	

<p>time, savings of money, and the convenience of having the service available 7 x 24 to fit into the customer's schedule. Examples: The information is currently not available and is important information to the customer would rank 5; The service would save the average customer a half-day's time per year (with travel and the time conducting the business) would rank 3; The service would save the average customer \$1 per month with no other major benefits would rank 1</p>	
<p>Agency Business Case: If e-government services are implemented correctly, they add value to the agency providing the service. This value can be measured in a number of ways. If the existing process is paper based and the customer fills out a form then the agency keys the data into a computer system, direct data entry by the customer is measurable staff timesavings. If the information is only available by calling a state agency, and it becomes available online where customers can lookup the information themselves, there is measurable staff timesavings. If the service is providing new service or information currently not available, agencies increase customer satisfaction, which is not a direct cost savings, but increases good will benefiting the agency. Examples: The project will allow the agency to better meet the needs and demands of its customers: with improved access and reliability. The current process has a data entry error rate of 3% which is expected to decrease to less than 1% with the online service would rank 3; The current process will not be affected by the online service (it will be new business) and staff members must learn a different process for the online service would rank 1</p>	
<p>Colorado.gov (portal) benefit: The portal benefits when new services increase the traffic coming to the site, generate good media coverage for the portal, develop strong partner relationships, and create new revenue sources. All of these items are taken into account when ranking the portal benefits. Examples: The service is expected to increase unique visitors to Colorado.gov by 3% would rank 5; The project is with a new partner and will facilitate building a new relationship and the service is for a potential customer base of 25,000 would rank 3; The service is not a revenue generating service and will be high maintenance would rank 1</p>	
<p>Total for Value Items:</p>	
<p>Resource Items</p>	<p>Rank 1 - 5</p>

<p>Weighted 40% of total score</p> <p>Agency Readiness: The agency will <u>self assess</u> their readiness based on their understanding of the scope of the project. Criteria that should be assessed to determine readiness shall include but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personnel—Does the agency have the required number of persons and time available to dedicate to the project. 2. Systems—Are changes necessary: is additional hardware, software required. <p>Examples: The agency planned for the project during their budget cycle and allotted both program and technical staff to the project in their work plan would rank 5; Access to program staff is abundant and the project is a high priority for them, however, access to technical staff is very limited would rank 3; Program staff is not available and staff augmentation with contractors is necessary to complete the project would rank 1</p>	
<p>CI resource requirement: All projects through the e-government services contract are constrained by CI's resources and their ability to complete any given project. The process of ranking projects will only take place in the event CI's resources are not adequate to complete all requested projects. The complexity of a project and the status and technology of any backend system will always enter into CI's resource estimation. Also taken into account is whether a similar type of service has already been developed for Colorado.gov, if not, has a similar service been developed in another NIC state? Examples: NIC has provided the service in several other states and CI can reuse the code and easily implement it in Colorado would rank 5; The project will require a new application be written from scratch, but it is expected to only take one to two weeks of development time would rank 3; The project will require interacting with an old legacy database system that has be patched numerous times to keep it in production and is admittedly on its last legs would rank 1</p>	
<p>Multiple party involvement: A project always becomes more time consuming and complex based on the number of parties that must be involved. This item is to take into consideration resources needed outside of the agency providing the service. These outside resources may be from the federal government, another agency or agencies, local governments, tribal governments, other contractors, and customers. Collaboration, consensus and communication among multiple involved parties become an important factor in ranking projects. Examples: There are</p>	

<p>no other parties involved outside of the program within the agency providing the service would rank 5; The project requires validating one data item from data that is maintained by another agency would rank 3; The project requires adding a new business process at the county level and training each county in that new process would rank 1</p>	
<p>Time urgency: There may be time deadlines due to mandates, funding, staff schedules, or other corresponding business functions (such as registration deadlines). Tight deadlines on one project can adversely affect other projects being developed at the same time. Projects with firm deadlines are a higher risk for CI. Examples: The project has no deadlines would rank 5; The agency would like to have the service put into production during the same week as their planned “awareness campaign” would rank 3; The project must be finished on a certain date mandated by federal law and the deadline is very close to the estimated completion date would rank 1</p>	
<p>Total for Resource Items:</p>	
<p style="background-color: #cccccc;"></p>	
<p>Grand Total:</p>	