I. Project Identification

Project Title: Enterprise Licensing Management System (ELMS) Replacement RFP

Agency 1 Name
Department of Administrative Services

Agency Business Unit
Application Services

Your Name (Submitter)	**Phone**	**Email**
Angela Taetz	860-622-2415	Angela.taetz@ct.gov

Agency Head	**Phone**	**Email**
Donald DeFronzo	860-713-5100	Donald.defronzo@ct.gov

Agency CIO / IT Director	**Phone**	**Email**
Mark Raymond	860-622-2419	Mark.raymond@ct.gov

Agency CFO	**Phone**	**Email**
Jean Michael	860 713-5115	Jean.michael@ct.gov

Project Manager (if known)	**Phone**	**Email**
Dennis Geshel	860-622-2214	Dennis.geshel@ct.gov

OPM Budget Analyst	**Phone**	**Email**
Linda Ecklund	860-418-6358	Linda.ecklund@ct.gov

Agency 2 Name
Department of Consumer Protection

Agency Business Unit
All Divisions

Agency Head	**Phone**	**Email**
William M. Rubenstein	860 713-6053	William.Rubenstein@ct.g

Agency CFO	**Phone**	**Email**
Marie Stearns	(860) 713-6041	marie.stearns@ct.gov

OPM Budget Analyst	**Phone**	**Email**
Melissa Yeich	860 509-6372	Melissa.Yeich@ct.gov

Agency 3 Name

Department of Public Health

Agency Business Unit

All Licensing Units

Agency Head	**Phone**	**Email**
Jewel Mullen, MD	860 509-7101	Jewel.Mullen@ct.gov

Agency CFO	**Phone**	**Email**
Susan Maheux	860-509-7225	Susan.Maheux@ct.gov

OPM Budget Analyst	**Phone**	**Email**
Joan Soulsby	860 509-6347	Joan.Soulsby@ct.gov

Agency 4 Name

Office of Early Childhood

Agency Business Unit

Licensing Division

Agency Head	**Phone**	**Email**
Myra Jones-Taylor		Myra.Jones-Taylor@ct.gov

Agency CFO	**Phone**	**Email**
Pietro Rosato	(860) 713-6418	pietro.rosato@ct.gov

OPM Budget Analyst	**Phone**	**Email**
Leah Grenier	860 509-6421	Leah.Grenier@ct.gov

Agency 5 Name

Department of Agriculture

Agency Business Unit

Bureau of Inspection and Regulation

Agency Head	**Phone**	**Email**
Steven K. Reviczky	860 713-2500	Steven.Reviczky@ct.gov

Agency CFO	**Phone**	**Email**
V. Jean Michael	860-713-5116	jean.michael@ct.gov

OPM Budget Analyst	**Phone**	**Email**
Christopher LeMay	860 509-6206	Chris.LeMay@ct.gov

Agency 6 Name		**Agency Business Unit**
Secretary of the State's Office		Board of Accountancy

Agency Head	**Phone**	**Email**
James Spallone	860 509-6212	James.Spallone@ct.gov

Agency CFO	**Phone**	**Email**
Blanche H. Reeves-Tucker	(860) 509-6166	Blanche.tucker@ct.gov

OPM Budget Analyst	**Phone**	**Email**
Melissa Yeich	860 509-6372	Melissa.Yeich@ct.gov

II. <u>Project Details</u>

A. <u>Project Dates</u>

Proposed Start Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	**Expected Completion Date** (MM/DD/YYYY)	**Project Duration** (in months)
1/31/2015	1/31/2016	12

B. **<u>Project Description</u> -** This information will be used for listings and report to the Governor and General Assembly on capital funded projects.

The current enterprise licensing management system (ELMS), eLicense, is used by multiple agencies (DPH, DCP, SOTS, OEC, and DOAG). Licensing management includes all activities related to licensing, enforcement, and inspections of entities or individuals regulated by the State of Connecticut. An evaluation and report was done as part of a previous IT Investment project and the result was a concensus decision to replace the current system. The findings and recommendations from the report identified multiple areas where the current eLicense system was not meeting business or technology needs.

Given that the future system costs are unknown, an RFP process would help determine implementation and ongoing maintance costs. This request will be the first phase for the project and will just include the activities required to write, publish and evaluate a request for proposal (RFP) to replace the ELMS with a proficient technology driven solution. This application includes information to support the overall objective to replace the current eLIcense system so the benefits of the entire project are clear. We will update the application for implementation costs once the first phase is complete.

C. **Summary.**

Summary - Describe the high level summary of this project in plain English without technical jargon
Phase 1 will consist of: 1. Documenting licensing management requirements 2. Publishing a request for proposal (RFP)to replace the eLicense system 3. Review of responses and selection of a replacement solution 4. Identify implementation and ongoing costs for funding allocation

Purpose – Describe the purpose of the project
The primary objective of this project is to position the enterprise licensing agencies to select a replacement ELMS Solution. This replacement decision will be based on a solution that better meets the long-term enterprise ELMS functions for issuing, maintaining, enforcement, and monitoring licenses. The ELMS product evaluation objectives will be broad with emphasis on a user-friendly and efficient licensing process, while providing additional features and services through the online portal. The technology options for these types of solutions are evolving rapidly. The state desires to assess the marketplace for more efficient and cost effective options. The enterprise agencies are working to refine and document business practices in preparation for the RFP. This effort will position these agencies with appropriate information necessary to make a quantifiable decision when reviewing the RFP responses. Ultimately, this phase will be followed up with an updated Investment Brief application for implementation of the new system.

Importance – Describe why this project is important
The enterprise licensing analysis project had identified several areas where the current ELMS application does not meet the State's needs. The participating agencies have defined a need to identify a more mature solution. The goal is to enhance staff efficiencies, expand technology features, and provide improved public services The following gaps have been identified regarding the current eLicense product: •   The eLicensing solution was not originally designed as an enterprise solution •   Software quality issues continue to impact agency users and consistent public access •   Significant functional gaps exist •   Vendor resources are limited with high turnover •   Enhancements are slow to realize with vendor delays •   Maintenance pricing model is inconsistent with other industry products •   Stability has been inconsistent for over 3 years •   Long-term product viability is in question – the latest feature upgrade has been delayed over one year The eLicense vendor (Iron Data) has not been able to address these failings over the last 3 years and does not portray a level of confidence to continue the relationship. All participating agency sponsors have approved the recommendation to move forward with an RFP effort for replacing the eLicense system based on lost staff productivity, limited public interface features, and continued quality issues with the eLicense product.

Outcomes – What are the expected outcomes of this project

(1) Selection of an ELMS that satisfies mandatory requirements
    (2) Application update for Technology Investment funding for implementation of the selected solution
    (3) Development of a funding and sustainability model that fits within acceptable resources; including potential reallocations.

Approach and Success Evaluation – Provide details of how the success of the project will be evaluated
Prior to this application, an initial consensus vote by all agency sponsors was conducted after a presentation of findings and recommendations from the enterprise licensing analysis project. The stakeholder sponsors approved proceeding with the application for this funding request. This project includes 2 steps: The first step will be to define and document detailed requirements for the replacement RFP. The success of this step will be based on a completed RFP requirements package ready for release to the vendor community . We will only proceed to step 2 if all agencies still have consensus to move forward at the completion of the RFP requirements. The second step includes the release of the RFP, review of responses, and selection of a product. It will also include submitting a new IT Investment Fund Application for implementation. The success of this step will be determined by the selection of the best solution to meet the requirements defined by the business and IT stakeholders and approved funding to proceed with implementation. During each of the steps, a funding and operational model will be developed and revised to support the on-going capability. That information will be used for updated funding application for implementation costs.

D. **Business Goals**. List up to 10 key business goals you have for this project, when (FY) the goal is expected to be achieved, and how you will measure achievement, Must have at least one. Please use action phrases beginning with a verb to state each goal. Example: "Reduce the Permitting process by 50%". In the Expected Result column, please explain what data you will use to demonstrate the goal is being achieved and any current metrics.

Business Goal (Action Phase)	Target FY for Goal	Current Condition	Expected Result
1) Improve staff productivity through implementation of new or advanced ELMS features	2018	System features are limited and have been slow to implement.	New and improved functional features will allow the staff to execute tasks more efficiently. Each division will be able to compare and measure the time required to execute tasks. The expectation is to achieve at least 10% improvement for each functional area.
2) Improve staff productivity due to time lost resulting from system issues	2017	The eLicense system averages 35 to 40 continuous open issues in production. Each issue impacts users differently at an average of 2 hours lost productivity per user per-month.	The target goal for the selected product is to reduce these ongoing issues by 90%. Each agency will be able to track lost productivity by measuring the number of open issues that impact daily work.

Business Goal (Action Phase)	Target FY for Goal	Current Condition	Expected Result
3) Implementation of a mobile inspection solution that will streamline the inspection process for field agents	2017	The eLicense product does not interface with or provide remote inspection features for onsite visits. Some agencies are using manual forms to inspect facilities, while others using laptops with VPN access to view back office information.	The goal is to provide a full featured remote inspection tool that can automate and efficiently process tasks while connected to the system or to be synced upon reconnection. The expectation is that each inspector could save up to 6 hours per month through efficiencies, or perform 15% more inspections.
4) Decrease call volume for licensing and complaint inquiries	2017	The combined call volume for inquires related to licensing & enforcement actions exceed 120,000 per year estimated at over 18,000 staff hours	The goal is to reduce this call volume by 10% through automation of online features. Making the public user interface easier to navigate. The call volume for most agencies can be tracked and measured against the current volume.
5) Decrease staff time spent on re-testing bugs and code release testing	2018	Currently CT receives up to 14 releases and 1 major upgrade per year. Each agency has testing staff tasked with providing user acceptance for all utilized functions. The average enterprise staff dedicated to testing can be 25 to 30 at any time. Usually these are key members within each agency. This process has become burdensome with multiple test passes due to poor quality control by the vendor.	The expectations for quality releases are integral for the product selected. Each agency will still need to perform acceptance testing, but this should occur only once based on vendor quality assurances. The reduction in re-testing should be at least an 80% improvement. Each future release and number of releases will be measured to that goal.
6) Expansion of the ELMS to additional State Agencies	2018	Several agencies have communicated interest in moving to the ELMS, but at this time vendor quality and annual maintenance funding have prevented expansion. Currently 5 agencies with a total of 22 divisions are active in the ELMS.	Once the participating agencies have been migrated into a new solution, additional agencies can be migrated to the ELMS. Migration will be based on priority determined by the enterprise steering committee. At least 2 new agencies or up to 4 divisions are forecasted to move by 2019
7) Define comprehensive detailed requirements that meet all agency ELMS needs.	2015	The functional and non-functional requirements as currently understood are high level and missing detail. A good baseline exists, but will need to be refined.	This project will produce detailed requirements for an RFP that will identify all enterprise needs. The documentation will be approved by each agency to ensure 100% of the requirements have been identified.

E. **Technology Goals**. From a technical perspective, following the above example, list up to 10 key technology goals you have for this project and in which Fiscal Year (FY) the goal is expected to be achieved. Please use action phrases beginning with a verb to state each goal. Example: "Improve transaction response time by 10%".

Technology Goal	Target FY for Goal	Current Condition	Expected Result
Identify Mobile devices compatible with remote connectivity and security features necessary to facilitate Licensing inspections using touch screen technology	2016	The current mobile device standards for CT are still being defined. Several devices have been identified that may meet business needs.	The project should establish devices that will provide all security requirements while providing no restriction to function. The recommended devices will be supported by local or enterprise IT resources.
Provide a standard API for License data history look-ups and extracts to accommodate 3rd party request(s).	2017	Currently the eLicense system allows manual lookups, or custom built automated exports on a one for one basis.	The expectation is to have a standardized data source with an API interface that can be implements easily for the majority of data history request.

F. **Priority Alignment.** The criteria in this table, in concert with other factors, will be used to determine project priorities in the capital funding approval process. Briefly describe how the proposed projects will align with each criterion.

Priority Criterion	Y/N	Explanation
Is this project aligned with the Governor's Key Priorities?	Yes	1. Make state government more user-friendly and efficient for citizens, businesses and municipalities when transacting business with the state 2. Make information about services and state government more available and easy to find on-line; 3. Implement efficient, modern business practices that result in clear and identifiable cost savings and service delivery improvements for state agencies; 4. Increase transparency for the public and policy makers regarding costs, effectiveness and service outcomes within and across state agencies; 5. Reduce the costs to the state regarding its implementation, use and management of technology systems through shared services, applications and hardware across agency boundaries and by other means.
Is this project aligned with business and IT goals of your agency?	Yes	It's an online system used by multiple agencies.
Does this project reduce or prevent future increases to the agency's operating budget?	Yes	The new technology features will create an environment of enterprise efficiencies and automation
Will this project result in shared capabilities?	Yes	The system is currently in use by five agencies and we plan on expanding to other agencies that can take advantage of the enterprise system.
Is this project being Co-developed through participation of multiple agencies?	Yes	The business owners are made up of member agencies currently on the current ELMS including DCP, DPH, DOAG, SOTS, OPM, and DAS.

Has the agency(s) demonstrated readiness to manage project of this size and scope?	Yes	DAS/BEST Enterprise Applications will oversee the project
Is the agency ready to deliver the business value proposed?	Yes	Each agency will have the tools necessary to deliver all business value post implementation.

G. **Organizational Preparedness**. Is your agency prepared to undertake this project? Is senior management committed, willing to participate, and willing to allocate the necessary time, energy and staffing resources? How will the project be managed and/or governed and who will make the key project decisions?

> DAS/BEST is prepared to lead the RFP portion of this project along with stakeholder agencies but there is a long term resource issue that needs to be evaluated before we commit to releasing the RFP. There is a decision point for resources built into the plan. At an enterprise stakeholder meeting on June 6, 2014 the Commissioners or Deputy Commissioners from DCP, DPH, AGR, OEC, and SOTS. provided assurances to participate in this initiative and commit resources.   They also had an understanding that additional resources may be necessary to implement the new system. The eLicense Steering Committee will govern the process and make key project decisions based on recommendations from agency stakeholders.

H. **Project Ramp Up**. If capital funds are awarded for this project, how long will it take to ramp up? What are the key ramp-up requirements and have any off these already been started? For example, has a project manager been identified? Has an RFI been issued? Is a major procurement required such as an RFP?

> One consultant project manager with extensive knowledge of the current enterprise environment is in place and can perform or manage the project tasks. The RFP effort will require additional business analysis resources from the existing IT consulting contract to perform requirements gathering and documentation.

I. **Organizational Skills**. Do you have the experienced staff with the proper training to sustain this initiative once it's a production system? Do you anticipate having to hire additional staff to sustain this? What training efforts are expected to be needed to maintain this system?

> We do not currently have the staff to do this and we contract out for these required skills.
>
> The current ELMS is primarily supported by agencies business staff, internal IT staff, and an enterprise IT consultant.   The agencies have found that the staffing and skills necessary with the existing system require a specialized skill set requiring translation of business needs into a technology solution. The licensing management business process is complex requiring continuous evaluation and implementation as each division expands features. This is a difficult resource skill to train and could be classified as a technical business analyst. The RFP process will provide an opportunity to evaluate the selected solution to determine the level of specialized skills required post implementation. The ELMS stakeholders will evaluate the support resource model to ensure success. Appropriate resource allocation will play an integral role when the phase 2 implementation decision is made. Regular training to maintain the selected system can be facilitated by each agency or by enterprise resources based on the type of training.

J.   **Financial Estimates.** From IT Capital Investment Fund Financial Spreadsheet

Estimated Total Development Cost	Estimated total Capital Funding Request	Estimated Annual Operating Cost	One Time Financial Benefit	Recurring Annual Financial Benefit
265,000	265,000	TBD	TBD	TBD
Explanation of Estimates				
The costs above are for a project manager and a business analyst to work with agencies on the RFP requirements. The one time and recurring benefit estimates will be better defined once the RFP project is completed. The realization of benefits will be experienced only when a replacement solution is implemented.				
Assumptions: Please list key assumptions you are using to estimate project development and implementation costs				
1) The project development cost are for the RFP effort only. Replacement implementation cost will be solidified once the RFP project is completed.				

III. **Expanded Business Case**

A.   **Project Impact.** Beyond the top business goals identified in Section II, 1) What impacts will this project have, if any, in the targeted areas below, 2) What would be the impact of not doing this project, 3) How will the project demonstrate benefits are achieved.

(1) Impact Area (Vision)	Y/N	Description of Project Impact
Will this project provide efficient and easily accessible services for all constituents?	Yes	The business process and new product features implemented will provide the ability to better serve constituents while adding additional online self-service.
Will this project promote open and transparent government with the citizens of the state?	Yes	New and improved online data features will allow the public and licensees to view additional information in real-time once made public.
Will this project establish efficient and modern business processes?	Yes	This replacement project will provide industry leading features and automation to streamline business efficiencies.
Will this project increase accuracy and timeliness of data for policy making, service delivery and results evaluation?	Yes	The project supervision and management reporting requirements will ensure timeliness for decisions based on data presentation and accuracy. Each division will be able to evaluate every aspect of performance as long as it is being captured as part of the business process.

2) What is the expected impact of NOT doing this project?

By not replacing the current licensing solution the following areas would be impacted:
1. Continued losses in staff productivity due to application issues and poor quality code releases
2. Unrealized efficiencies due to unavailable feature enhancements normally provided in other industry products
3. The public interface for constituents will be limited in providing efficiencies.

(3) How will you demonstrate achievement of benefits?

Each participating state agency will provide reports to the enterprise steering committee outlining benefits realized as a result of the implementation of a new ELMS. The report format will be defined by the enterprise steering committee with the assistance of the project manager post implementation.

B. **Statutory/Regulatory Mandates.** 1) Cite and describe federal and state mandates that this project in intended to address. 2) What would be the impact of non-compliance?

(1) Statutory / Regulatory Mandates:

HB 6705 (2013 session) created mandatory on-line renewal for Nurses, Doctors and Dentists.
This change took place in the Governor's public health implementer bill. HB 6705, section 139. Here is the link to the bill: http://www.cga.ct.gov/2013/ACT/PA/2013PA-00234-R00HB-06705-PA.htm

(2) Impact of non-compliance:

The current eLicense system is compliant with this mandate. There are, however, concerns related to reliability of the eLicense application in providing online self-services.

C. **Primary Beneficiaries.** Who will benefit from this project (citizens businesses, municipalities, other state agencies, staff in your agency, other stakeholders) and in what way?

The following primary beneficiaries are listed in order of most impacted:
1) Agency Staff
2) Citizens & Businesses
3) Other state agencies
4) Organizations that utilize data in the system

Important:

- **If you have any questions or need assistance completing the form please contact Jim Hadfield or John Vittner**
- **Once you have completed the form and the** IT Capital Investment Fund Financial Spreadsheet **please e-mail them to Jim Hadfield and John Vittner**

John Vittner, (860) 418-6432; John.Vittner@ct.gov
Jim Hadfield, (860) 418-6438; Jim.Hadfield@ct.gov