

# Web Portal Project Fee Report

**Submitted to:**

**House Committee on Ways and Means**

**By**

**Harry Bell, Director of Web Services  
Department of Information and Innovation**

**February 4, 2015**

# Contents

- Background ..... 4
- Business Model ..... 4
  - Evolution of the Business Model ..... 5
  - Appropriateness of the Business Model ..... 5
    - The Self-Funded Model Features ..... 6
    - Traditional Model Features ..... 6
    - Software as a Service Model ..... 7
- The Web Portal Project’s First Nine Years ..... 7
  - Population ..... 7
  - The State’s Intentions ..... 7
  - Business Model Unfamiliarity ..... 8
  - Remediation ..... 8
- Recommendations ..... 9
  - Limited capacity ..... 9
  - Funding ..... 9
  - Approval of Fees ..... 10
  - Stakeholder Discomfort ..... 10
- Conclusion ..... 11
- Web Portal Project Fee-based Services ..... 12
- Service Details ..... 14
  - DMV Express (2005) ..... 14
  - Bizfile (2005) ..... 14
  - Court Dockets (2004) ..... 15
  - VTPay (2004) ..... 15
  - Park Reservations Payments ..... 15
  - Motor Vehicle Records (MVRs) (2007) ..... 16
  - Vermont Court Pay (2007) ..... 16
  - Attorney Licensing - CC & ACH (2007) ..... 17
  - eCabinet (2010) ..... 17
  - Vital Records (2008) ..... 17
  - BGS Purchasing Card Training (2008) ..... 18

Criminal Convictions Records (2008) ..... 18

DPS - Police Reports (2009) ..... 19

Mobile Home Park Registrations (2009) ..... 19

Event Registration (2010) ..... 19

Labor (2011) ..... 20

Medical Licensing Payments (2012) ..... 20

Liquor Moodle Training (2012) ..... 21

Reinstatement Payment (2008) ..... 21

IRP/IFTA (2010) ..... 21

Property Transfer Tax Returns (2011) ..... 22

Agriculture (2011) ..... 22

DMV Payport (2012) ..... 23

DMV Motorcycle (2013) ..... 23

OCS EzPay4Kids (2015) ..... 23

Tax eCurrent Use (2015) ..... 24

## Background

In October, 2006 the state launched the Web Portal Project. This project embodies the state's initiative to bring efficiency and standardization to common processes within state government. It also represented an opportunity to bring the state fully into the digital age.

The project was initiated to benefit all state branches, organization, partners, and citizens. It was intended to improve customer satisfaction and greatly reduce transaction costs for the state. Before this initiative a wide variety of independent systems using divergent technologies provided Web services for the various organizations in state government. The Web Portal Project now provides a common solution, development environment, and Web hosting environment available to the entire state.

The premise upon which the Web Portal Project is based is that there is value in streamlining access to state services and making them available 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. In exchange for providing this value, to both the state and those who wish to engage with it, the vendor is compensated via a small fee on each transaction. In 2006 the state began a relationship with a vendor in pursuit of this goal.

The vendor selected was National Information Consortium (NIC) a company with similar arrangements with 30 other states and several other political jurisdictions including cities and counties. Over the last nine years several successful projects have provided a foundation for the Web Portal Project. The NIC affiliate, Vermont Information Consortium (VIC) is located in Montpelier, employs eight individuals and has produced more than 160 services for the state.

In 2012 the contract with VIC expired and a new RFP was created. VIC again entered the process and was selected as the vendor. The new contract was signed in June, 2013.

## Business Model

The business model for the Web Portal Project is based on providing a service that improves a business process enough for the user, the state or for both, to a degree that a user, or the state, would be willing to pay a small fee to use the new access method rather than the traditional access method. These small fees are then used to support ongoing development, support and maintenance for these services and for the development of further services. This also allows the vendor to apply resources to developing services that do not require a fee.

In some states all fees are paid by the user by statute. In this case the logic is that anyone using the service should pay for the service. Other states have some services where the user pays the fee and others where the state pays. In states where this is true fees tend to be paid by the state in cases where asking the user to pay creates a strained relationship, such as asking a taxpayer to pay an additional fee when paying their taxes. No states currently have a system where all fees are paid by the state.

In Vermont there are 47 services where there is a fee collected by the vendor. Of these, 19 require the user to pay some, or all, of the fee and 36 require the state to pay some, or all, of the fee. As of the end

of December 2015 there were approximately 164 total online services including websites, funded and unfunded, available online via the project.

In the nearly 10 years the project has been operating the total value of the development time provided to the state has been approximately \$10 million. This includes over 36,000 developer hours or 900 weeks of developer time of which 45% was devoted to fee-based services. This includes only development hours the project has also provided hosting, support, maintenance and PCI compliance, for which hours are not tracked.

## Evolution of the Business Model

There are competing views on how the fees for services in this system should be handled. As mentioned above the original concept behind the business model was that the benefits provided by the services would be such that users of the system would voluntarily use the new electronic method rather than the traditional in person, or paper based method of transacting business with the state, even at a slightly higher cost. There have since been other points of view expressed that challenge this model.

The state has a strong incentive for people to begin using electronic transactions rather than traditional methods. This transition:

- reduces errors
- reduces paper use
- increases efficiency
- makes payment instantaneous
- reduces staff hours devoted to customer service
- reduces reentry of data

Because of this the state is motivated to encourage electronic transactions. An additional fee paid by those using the electronic alternative is then seen as a demotivating factor.

There is also concern that with only certain transaction requiring additional fees that some constituencies might come to feel that the system is unfairly burdening them for the benefit of others.

It has been suggested that the business model be modified to address these concerns.

## Appropriateness of the Business Model

The Legislature requested a report from the Department of Information and Innovation (DII) on the appropriateness of the self-funded business model for the state of Vermont. There are several measures that we can use to determine appropriateness. One measure is how well the model works as compared to other methods of funding. Another would be to compare how the model works for Vermont as compared to other jurisdictions using the model. A final method would be to examine how well the model meets the state's needs.

## The Self-Funded Model Features

The Web Portal Project is primarily a development project in that the end goal is to have Web services developed and available online. There are several features inherent in this model.

- Funding for the entire system comes from some percentage of each financial transaction
- Compliance with PCI standards for online transactions is provided
- Hosting is provided
- Maintenance is provided
- Upgrades are provided as needed, for some services annually
- System is in the cloud and therefore disaster Recovery is provided
- System is in the cloud and therefore continuity of operations is provided
- Code can be augmented and reused by the development team who wrote it
- Ongoing familiarity with systems by original developers
- Developers motivated to produce maintainable systems since they will have to support them
- Development of additional projects that have no associated revenue
- Capacity limited by participation
- No alternate funding for projects
- Projects require initial phase for SOW creation and approval of any additional fees

## Traditional Model Features

The traditional model that the state has used for funding Web development has been contracting with outside vendors to produce Web based systems. There are several recent examples of this model in use especially in the development of the Vermont Vacations site. Features inherent in this model include:

- Technical staff dedicated to a single project
- As many concurrent projects as needed can be carried out by various vendors
- Funding from any source including grant monies can be used
- There is an ongoing cost for transaction processing above development costs
- Hosting by either the state or external vendor is an ongoing cost
- Maintenance of the system is an ongoing cost
- Upgrades require a new RFP and contract, may go to different vendor
- Continuity of operations for any system needs to be planned and implemented by the state
- Disaster recovery for any system needs to be planned and implemented by the state
- Work by wide array of developers results in varying methodology and complexity in maintaining code
- State staff responsible for maintaining systems from multiple external sources
- Projects require extended initial phase for preparation of RFP and contract negotiation.

## Software as a Service Model

More and more services required by state government are available as paid services from providers who host their systems on the Internet. The most commonly cited example of this is email. There are ever increasing types of services that fall into this category. The features of this model include:

- Cost is, typically, based on usage
- Hosting is provided
- Maintenance is provided
- System is in the cloud and therefore disaster Recovery is provided
- System is in the cloud and therefore continuity of operations is provided
- No support required by state staff
- Limited customization so that state policy might have to adapt to the service
- Limited services available, although increasing constantly
- Lack of choice in available vendors

## The Web Portal Project's First Nine Years

The Web Portal Project has had substantial success in its first nine years of activity. There have been several forces that have had a negative impact on its ability to function as intended.

### Population

The first item is innate to the State of Vermont and is an obstacle unique to our state. Vermont's population is one of the smallest of any state. This has direct consequences on the ability of the Web Portal Project to succeed. Taking as an example a popular service for registering vehicles, Vermont has only a little over 270,000 cars registered to individuals. At the rate of \$1.50 per transaction the annual gross revenue for this transaction is \$400K. For even Vermont's New England counterparts Maine and New Hampshire, the numbers are more than 600,000 cars and potential revenue of nearly one Million dollars. For a state like Massachusetts with 3.5 million cars the gross revenue for this one service would be more than the entire gross revenue for Vermont's entire Web Portal Project. Extend this over all services and it becomes clear that the development effort remains the same for each service as in other states but the revenue returned for that effort is significantly less.

### The State's Intentions

The second item that has caused some dysfunction with the project has been the state's varying intentions for the project. For the first several years the project proceeded as intended. At some point the state altered its direction and decided to change the contract and allow time and materials work to be paid for directly rather than through a fee based system. The underlying cause for this was the desire to use one-time funding to complete projects, a method not easily supported by ongoing fees. As a result, the ongoing support of the project, which fees would provide, was subordinated to one time payments for rapid project development. This ultimately weakened the project once the influx of funds stopped and were not replaced by ongoing fees.

A similar second wave of disruption was caused by the creation of the Challenges for Change (C4C) initiative. This initiative resulted in the rapid development of several targeted systems to take advantage of the sudden influx of funds made possible by C4C. Again this altered the normal process of service development and actually delayed several fee based systems in favor of systems that had short term funding. Again these changes in the relationship between the vendor and the state were driven by the state's priorities. Most of these C4C projects were abandoned at some point and as a result a great deal of development time was wasted on services that were never utilized or were launched but provided no ongoing funding.

Combined these alterations of the working relationship between the state and the vendor significantly weakened the project and diminished the progress that otherwise would have been possible in creating ongoing funding. This has resulted in reduced capacity and delays in projects for the entire state. There also remains an ongoing tension in the Web Portal Project not being able to accept projects with short-term funding opportunities.

### Business Model Unfamiliarity

A third, ongoing, issue that has impeded the project from the beginning has been the discomfort the project has caused for decision makers in the state. This discomfort has taken many forms. Some have been uncomfortable with additional fees not approved directly by the legislature. Some have taken issue with using statements of work under a master contract rather than individual contracts as a basis for a project. Some have been concerned about the very business model itself simply because it is so alien to the way the state has always conducted business. These concerns, taken together, have caused the project to progress at a slower rate than might otherwise have been possible.

A fourth issue that caused significant problems for the project was the perception that work under the contract was free and therefore developers time was not valuable. As a result of this perception, service owners within the state felt no compunction about providing incomplete or erroneous specifications. They often ignored timelines, failed to produce required materials and failed to verify requirements until development was complete, resulting in frequent redevelopment. As a result projects were regularly delayed and new projects postponed.

### Remediation

Over the last six years the state has observed and corrected several issues that became apparent with the Web Portal Project. The following issues have been addressed to some degree:

- Varying state intentions
- Stakeholder discomfort
- Resource misallocation

In the case of varying state intentions as regards the Web Portal project the state has created new contract in which the only funding mechanism will be ongoing fees. This will have the effect of removing short term funding from the possible funding sources but will also assure that the project does not see the boom and bust cycle caused by varying state priorities.

Stakeholder discomfort has been reduced considerably by familiarity but still persists in some aspects of the project, particularly the issue of additional fees. The work that has been done for several state entities, particularly Tax and DMV, has greatly reduced the discomfort for their staff. This has not been so for entities that have, as yet, little or no experience with the project.

The issue of resource misallocation, caused primarily by the misunderstanding that project resources are “free,” will be addressed in the upcoming contract. The new contract will specify that any new project will need to have a complete functional design before development can begin. It is hoped that this requirement will eliminate the vague requirements and unproductive redevelopment will be greatly reduced or eliminated.

## Recommendations

While it is clear that there are several impediments to the use of the self-funded model in Vermont the benefits to using this model as compared to the other options available seem clear. There are however several alterations that can be made to the service that would ameliorate the issues that the project faced in its first six years.

### Limited capacity

The capacity of the project has been adversely affected by two primary issues. The first is the size of Vermont’s population and the relatively small number of transactions as compared to larger states. The second is the misuse of project resources by state staff.

The small size of the state obviously cannot be directly addressed. The state can, however, take action to move more electronic transactions into the project at a faster rate to increase total transactions. As the total number of transactions increase the total number of developer hours available will also increase allowing more concurrent development.

The misuse of project resources within the project to date has been primarily caused by unclear or incomplete project requirements. The new policy to require specific functional requirements will help remediate this problem. This policy has been enacted through the new contract for the Web Portal Project. The state created this requirement to decouple the design function from development in order to increase efficiency in the use of developer resources. Only when designs are in place will developer time be devoted to a project. This will assure that the limited and valuable developer hours are not used for business analysis and requirements gathering, as it has in the past.

### Funding

Another area that has caused the project to falter has been the state’s varying intent in the use of the project. This pressure by state officials to allow time and materials work through the project has surfaced several times and has resulted in inconsistent funding and disruptions in planned projects in favor of sudden priorities. The original contract was written to provide funding solely through self-funded projects but was amended by the state on several occasions to allow other funding. The new contract expressly forbids this type of funding.

Upon further experience the state has decided to pursue a compromise between the two extremes. The original contract was somewhat derailed by the approval of straight time and materials work being acquired through the contract. The new contract sought to correct this by requiring only fee based funding. It has become clear that many state projects that might have benefited from the Web Portal have not been able to use that option because a significant portion of the funding for the project is via grant money with a timeline for use. Obviously grant funds cannot be retained and doled out over years in fee payments. They must be expended in a given time. Because of this the state has proposed a highbred system where a certain percentage of the development costs of a project can be paid by the state upfront and the rest recouped through ongoing fees. This solution will prevent the disruption caused by pure time and materials work and still allow entities with time limited grant funds to participate in the portal. The exact details of the change have not been worked out as yet but the intent is to include the new language in the contract extension that will be completed by 6/2016.

### Approval of Fees

One of the major incentives to using the Web Portal Project to implement the state's eGovernment projects was that using an in-place contract meant that as soon as design specifications were created development could begin. For services that require an additional fee this advantage was nullified by the way Vermont chose to implement the approval process. In most states using this model there is a single step approval process for new fees. Vermont chose to implement, at first, a two stage process, and eventually a three stage process to approve fees. The process today involves a Web Portal Board meeting, a request to the Governor's office to recommend the fee to the Joint Fiscal Committee or the Legislature and finally either an approval, rejection or a request to present the fee to the committee at the next scheduled meeting or to the Legislature via the fee bill. This extended process has the effect of nullifying one of the key benefits that the project provides to the state, nimble development.

The Legislature has made it clear that approval of fees charged by a third party for access to state services is to be treated identically to fees charged by the state itself. Due to this decision the intent is to standardize the fee system so that a single approved fee rate is available to any new project and only projects that are not able to be adequately funded by the standard rate would need to pursue the approval process. An item will be placed in the fee bill for 2016 that would establish this rate for all new projects and for any existing services that would prefer to adopt the new standard.

This change would provide the ability to move more quickly to development but still provide full oversight for all fees.

### Stakeholder Discomfort

There have been two primary sources of stakeholder discomfort, the first having to do with fee approval and the second having to do with the business model. The first of these has already been addressed in the recommendation for fee approvals.

The second issue, discomfort with using a non-standard business model, can be addressed with outreach and further training. The new policy surrounding the Web Portal Project envisions this type of outreach to state entities with fee based services that could be incorporated into the project. As more

and more state entities move Website content into the projects Web hosting environment we also make an effort to educate the staff about using the project for extending eGovernment.

## Conclusion

The Web Portal Project has clearly enabled the state to achieve an eGovernment presence at a greater rate than would have been possible in its absence. That said, there are several features of the business model that have caused problems and have needed to be adjusted. Further adjustment will need to be made in the future in order for the project to be of maximum benefit. Even with this remediation there will continue to be challenges in pursuing this model.

The alternative to continuing with this model however would include its own challenges. If the state were to decide to abandon this course and turn instead to the traditional model for funding state eGovernment development, there would be a substantial downside. First the change would require that the services currently being funded through portal fees would need to immediately be funded from some other source. This would include contracting for hosting and maintenance, PCI compliant payment processing and for assistance in migrating the services to the new hosting environment. The change would also mean that projects currently under development would be suspended until such time as these projects could complete the RFP/contracting process. All non-fee based projects would be cancelled unless funding could be identified to continue development, again through the RFP/contracting process.

The transition would also mean that the state Web Content Management System that hosts many state Websites would no longer be supported. An alternate hosting arrangement would need to be developed for these sites. A payment plan for this service would have to be created so that participating agencies could pay directly for the hosting and support they currently receive at no additional cost.

Finally, the change would mean that the state would no longer have a staff of experienced Web developers who know the state's services intimately, to respond with update and upgrade requests. Instead, what have been simple requests would need to be treated as new projects and either go to RFP or be arranged as an SOW to an existing retainer contract. This would add considerable complexity to several services, especially those for Tax and DMV which tend to have regular service updates due to change in state statute.

The benefits of the project have been significant and, with adjustments, should increase in the future. The project does have certain weaknesses that are inherent to the business model that will persist. However, any business model will have its own benefits and drawbacks and so trading the features of one model for the features of another is likely to have little net benefit. The cost in converting from one model to another, however, would be significant both in funds and opportunity cost. Given the success of the model to date and the significant cost of changing development strategies maintaining the current business model would appear to be in the best interests of the state.

## Web Portal Project Fee-based Services

There are, in general, four types of services under the Web Portal Project. The types of services are based on how they are funded.

Services that predate the Web Portal Contract were brought into the project under the existing terms agreed upon by New England Interactive (NEI) and the state prior to 2006 when the Web Portal Contract was created. These services were created and terms agreed to prior to the Web Portal Contract and were negotiated by the service owners and NEI directly. The terms of these services were brought into the Web Portal Project intact at the time of its creation.

Pre-contract services include:

- DMV Express - 2005
- Bizfile - 2005
- Court Dockets - 2004
- VTPay - 2004
- Park Reservations payments - 2004

The Web Portal Board was created to allow the setting of fees outside the normal fee system of the state. Some services have used this funding method to allow development of online transactions that otherwise would have not been financially possible. Such fees must be vetted by the Web Portal Board, recommended by the Governor's Office and approved by the Joint Fiscal Committee or Legislature.

Services where the user pays an additional fee approved by JFC include:

- Motor Vehicle Records (MVRs) - 2007
- Driver's License Reinstatement Payment - 2008
- IRP/IFTA trucking permits - 2010
- Property Transfer Tax Returns - 2011
- Agriculture Permits - 2011
- DMV Payport – 2012
- EzPay4Kids – 2015

Some state entities have statutory authority to collect funds to offset the cost of transactions. These entities include the Judiciary and the Secretary of State's Office. Some services for these entities have used this authority to approve user paid fees.

Services where the user pays an additional fee approved by a state entity include:

- Vermont Court Pay, Judiciary - 2007
- Attorney Licensing, Judiciary - 2007
- Vital Records, Secretary of State - 2010

The final service type is one where the state pays the transaction fee from within the statutory fee. These services have been developed with the advice and consent of the Web Portal Board but formal approval is not required.

Services where the state pays the transaction fee include:

- BGS Purchasing Card Training - 2008
- Criminal Convictions Records - 2008
- DPS - Police Reports - 2009
- Mobile Home Park Registrations - 2009
- Labor - 2011
- Medical Licensing Payments - 2011
- Liquor Moodle – 2012
- DMV Motorcycle – 2013
- Tax eCurrent Use - 2015

## Service Details

Services that predate the Web Portal Contract were brought into the program under the existing terms agreed upon by New England Interactive (NEI) and the state prior to 2006.

Note: In the following summaries the "Development Value" is not a direct reflection of outlay for services. Because direct billing is not used in this project there is no accounting record to refer to for individual hours by developer by project. Because of this we have used an industry average of \$125/hour for a full service IT service provider. Industry average for development alone would be closer to \$100/hour but the vendor is also providing multiple services beyond simple development including PCI compliance on all financial transactions, hosting, maintenance, upgrades and customer support, thus the higher number.

### DMV Express (2005)

**Description:** Vehicle registration service

**Department:** Department of Motor Vehicles

**Amount of the fee:** \$1.50

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Pre-contract

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 666,007

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$82,729.17

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$82,335.06

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$440,292.68

**Development Hours:** 4223

**Development Value:** \$ 532,555

**Estimated ROI:** 12 years

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:**

### Bizfile (2005)

**Description:** Service for businesses to file taxes electronically.

**Department:** Tax

**Amount of the fee:** 2% (for payments over \$200) \$1/transaction

**Fee Paid By:** Tax pays \$1, user pays 2% fee on amounts over \$200

**Approval:** Pre-contract

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 90,007

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$89,269.70

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$114,851.67

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 476,115.67

**Development Hours:** 3,667

**Development Value:** \$ 462,993

**Estimated ROI:** 8 years

**Actual ROI:** 10 Years

**Comments:**

## Court Dockets (2004)

**Description:** Service provides electronic requests for Court Dockets

**Department:** Judiciary

**Amount of the fee:** \$1000/month

**Fee Paid By:** Courts pays \$1000/month

**Approval:** Pre-contract

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 12

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$ 12,000

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$ 12,000

**Net Revenues to end of FY 12:1** \$144,000

**Development Hours:** 1327

**Development Value:** \$ 170,524

**Estimated ROI:** 15 years

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:**

## VTPay (2004)

**Description:** Electronic tax filing

**Department:** Tax

**Amount of the fee:** 1.65% + \$.20/transaction and \$1/transaction

**Fee Paid By:** Department pays \$1, user pays \$.20 plus 1.65%

**Approval:** Pre-contract

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 15,413

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$ 25,273

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$ 25,080

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$70,213

**Development Hours:** 444

**Development Value:** \$ 60,118

**Estimated ROI:** 12 years

**Actual ROI:** 10 Years

**Comments:**

## Park Reservations Payments

**Description:** Payment Processing for reservations

**Department:** Forests Parks and Recreation

**Amount of the fee:** 1.7% + .20/transaction

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Pre-contract

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 20557

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$18,305.15

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$20,806.20

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 43,690.43

**Development Hours:** 100

**Development Value:** \$ 17,180

**Estimated ROI:** 1 Year

**Actual ROI:** 1 Year

**Comments:** This service was operating on an agreement that is eight years old and due to changes in the credit card industry has been operating at a loss for several years. The service was renegotiated in 2013 to begin using the 3% fee rate.

### Motor Vehicle Records (MVRs) (2007)

**Description:** Service to provide driver's license data to the insurance industry

**Department:** Department of Motor Vehicles

**Amount of the fee:** \$4.00

**Fee Paid By:** Business Customers, primarily data aggregators

**Approval:** 11/9/2006 JFC

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 264,735

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$1,021,896.00**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$1,058,940.00

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$8,885,599

**Development Hours:** 420

**Development Value:** \$ 57,180

**Estimated ROI:** N/A

**Actual ROI:** 1 month

**Comments:** The foundation of the Web Portal Project in Vermont, as for most states is the Motor Vehicle Records Request Service. This is a government to business service that provides access to DMV driver records for insurers and clearing houses. This service automated what had been a cumbersome process for both the state and the businesses.

### Vermont Court Pay (2007)

**Description:** Service allowing the payment of Court imposed fines electronically.

**Department:** Judiciary

**Amount of the fee:** \$3.75

**Fee Paid By:** User

**Approval:** Court-approved 2007

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 43035**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$15,606.04

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$17,849.43

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$173,459.55

**Development Hours:** 540

**Development Value:** \$ 72,180

**Estimated ROI:** 4 Years

**Actual ROI:** 4 years

**Comments:** The Judiciary Branch has statutory language that allows them to recover the cost of electronic transactions involving their business processes. It was deemed redundant to grant approval

for fees that the Judiciary already had the authority to collect. Therefore the JFC did not review these fees.

### Attorney Licensing - CC & ACH (2007)

**Description:** Service to allow attorneys to relicense electronically.

**Department:** Judiciary

**Amount of the fee:** \$10, \$20 for paper processing

**Fee Paid By:** Licensee

**Approval:** Court-approved 2007

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 1304

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$ 11,385

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$ 12,295

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 57,646

**Development Hours:** 810

**Development Value:** \$ 105,930

**Estimated ROI:** 19 years

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:**

### eCabinet (2010)

**Description:** Payment Processing

**Department:** Judiciary

**Amount of the fee:** \$0.50

**Fee Paid By:** User

**Approval:** Court-approved FY 2010

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 413

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$ 170

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$ 207

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$427

**Development Hours:** 50

**Development Value:** \$ 10,930

**Estimated ROI:** Subsidized Service

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:** While this service has an associated fee the fee will probably never compensate for the development/maintenance of the service.

The Secretary of State also has statutory authority to collect fees for processing. This was used for their lone service.

### Vital Records (2008)

**Description:** Service to request Vital Records (birth, marriage, death certificates, etc) electronically.

**Department:** Vermont State Archives and Records Administration (VSARA)

**Amount of the fee:** \$2.00

**Fee Paid By:** User  
**Approval:** SOS-approved FY 2011  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 3443  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$6,074.00  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$9,457.00  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$47,544  
**Development Hours:** 480  
**Development Value:** \$ 64,680  
**Estimated ROI:** 10 years  
**Actual ROI:** N/A  
**Comments:** Figures include upgrades

### **BGS Purchasing Card Training (2008)**

**Description:** Training Service for Purchasing Card users  
**Department:** Department of Buildings and General Services  
**Amount of the fee:** \$40/month  
**Fee Paid By:** Department  
**Approval:** Department pays  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 12  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$ 480  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$ 480  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 2160  
**Development Hours:** 32  
**Development Value:** \$ 8,680  
**Estimated ROI:** 20 years  
**Actual ROI:** N/A  
**Comments:**

### **Criminal Convictions Records (2008)**

**Description:** Service to accept requests for Criminal Conviction Records electronically.  
**Department:** Department Public Safety  
**Amount of the fee:** \$2.75  
**Fee Paid By:** Department  
**Approval:** Department pays  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 21131  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$44,030.25  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$58,069.00  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$289,743.5  
**Development Hours:** 240  
**Development Value:** \$ 34,680  
**Estimated ROI:** 2 Years  
**Actual ROI:** 3 Years  
**Comments:**

## DPS - Police Reports (2009)

**Description:** Service to electronically request Police Reports.

**Department:** Department Public Safety

**Amount of the fee:** \$2.50

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Department pays

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 564

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$872.50

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$765.00

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 5,662

**Development Hours:** 120

**Development Value:** \$ 19,680

**Estimated ROI:** 20 years

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:**

## Mobile Home Park Registrations (2009)

**Description:** Electronic registration of Mobile Home lots

**Department:** Agency of Commerce & Community Development (ACCD)

**Amount of the fee:** \$1.00

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Department pays

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 144

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$6,540.00

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$6,571.00

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$46,090

**Development Hours:** 500

**Development Value:** \$ 67,180

**Estimated ROI:** 10 years

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:** Figures include upgrades in FY 2010 and FY 2012.

## Event Registration (2010)

**Description:** Event Registration System

**Department:** Enterprise

**Amount of the fee:** 3% + \$1

**Fee Paid By:** Agency

**Approval:** Agency pays

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 373

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$ 0

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$385.06

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 748

**Development Hours:** 300

**Development Value:** \$ 42,180

**Estimated ROI:** N/A

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:**

### Labor (2011)

**Description:** Payment Processing

**Department:** Labor

**Amount of the fee:** 2.2% + \$3

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Agency pays FY 2011

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 94

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$611.83

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$1,482.45

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$2,938

**Development Hours:** 120

**Development Value:** \$19,680

**Estimated ROI:** Subsidized Service

**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:** While this service has an associated fee the fee will probably never compensate for the development/maintenance of the service.

### Medical Licensing Payments (2012)

**Description:** Service allowing electronic renewal of medical licenses

**Department:** Health

**Amount of the fee:** 2.2% + \$3

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Agency pays FY 2011

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 2702

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$1,751.18

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$10,782.11

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$30,121.84

**Development Hours:** 80

**Development Value:** \$ 14,680

**Estimated ROI:** 3 Years

**Actual ROI:** 2 Years

**Comments:**

## Liquor Moodle Training (2012)

**Description:** Service to schedule training sessions for liquor retailers and staff

**Department:** Department of Liquor Control

**Amount of the fee:** \$2.50/course

**Fee Paid By:** Department

**Approval:** Agency pays FY 2012

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 4344

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$8,942.50

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$10,845.00

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$25,740.00

**Development Hours:** 100

**Development Value:** \$ 17,180

**Estimated ROI:** 2 Years

**Actual ROI:** 2 Years

**Comments:**

## Reinstatement Payment (2008)

**Description:** Online driver's license reinstatement after paying court fees

**Department:** Department of Motor Vehicles

**Amount of the fee:** \$2.00

**Fee Paid By:** Licensee

**Approval:** 11/13/2007 by JFC

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 8,139

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$16,708.00

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$16,232.00

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$69,652

**Development Hours:** 180

**Development Value:** \$ 27,180

**Estimated ROI:** 6 Years

**Actual ROI:** 5 Years

**Comments:**

## IRP/IFTA (2010)

**Description:** The International Registration Plan (IRP) is a registration reciprocity agreement among states of the United States, District of Columbia, and provinces of Canada providing for payment of apportionable fees on the basis of total distances operated in all jurisdictions.

The International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) is also a reciprocity agreement among states of the United States, District of Columbia, and provinces of Canada providing for payment of fuel taxes.

This service provides electronic processing of the relevant permits.

**Department:** Department of Motor Vehicles

**Amount of the fee:** \$5.00

**Fee Paid By:** User

**Approval:** 9/10/FY 2010 by JFC  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 1,702  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$11,020.00  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$11,600.00  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$46,375  
**Development Hours:** 560  
**Development Value:** \$ 74,680  
**Estimated ROI:** 9 years  
**Actual ROI:** N/A  
**Comments:**

### Property Transfer Tax Returns (2011)

**Description:** Property Transfer Tax process and payment. Includes service for Town Clerks.  
**Department:** Tax  
**Amount of the fee:** \$5.00  
**Fee Paid By:** User  
**Approval:** 9/10/FY 2010 by JFC  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 1,615  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$69,815.00  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$79,295.00  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 286,310  
**Development Hours:** 1800  
**Development Value:** \$ 229,680  
**Estimated ROI:** 6 years  
**Actual ROI:** 4 Years  
**Comments:**

### Agriculture (2011)

**Description:** Service to apply for Agriculture permits electronically  
**Department:** Agency of Agriculture. Food and Markets  
**Amount of the fee:** 2%, plus \$1/item  
**Fee Paid By:** User  
**Approval:** 5/31/FY 2011 by JFC  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 422  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$2,940.50  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$2,334  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 8,118.5  
**Development Hours:** 1200  
**Development Value:** \$ 154,680  
**Estimated ROI:** N/A  
**Actual ROI:** N/A

**Comments:** 2013 will be the first full year for this service. Pieces of it have rolled out over the last two years.

### DMV Payport (2012)

**Description:** Over-the-counter credit card processing

**Department:** Department of Motor Vehicles

**Amount of the fee:** 2.5%

**Fee Paid By:** Card owner

**Approval:** 1/4/FY 2012 by JFC

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 69738

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$33,259.50

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$76,518.71 **Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 152,295

**Development Hours:** 60

**Development Value:** \$ 12,180

**Estimated ROI:** 1 year

**Actual ROI:** 9 months

**Comments:**

### DMV Motorcycle (2013)

**Description:** Offer motorcycle rider training to anyone who wishes to enjoy the sport of motorcycling. The Program offers instructional courses to make your motorcycling safer and more enjoyable.

**Department:** DMV

**Amount of the fee:** \$5

**Fee Paid By:** Agency

**Approval:** Agency Pays

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 1126

**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$5,810.00

**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$6,225

**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$16,710.00

**Development Hours:**

**Development Value:**

**Estimated ROI:**

**Actual ROI:**

**Comments:**

### OCS EzPay4Kids (2015)

**Description:** A convenient and secure way to pay child support online. Users can make a payment to the Vermont Office of Child Support (OCS) using a credit or debit card 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

**Department:** DCF

**Amount of the fee:** \$2 for ACH and \$5 Credit Card

**Fee Paid By:** Agency

**Approval:** May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013 by JFC

**FY 2015 Transactions:** 3495  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$0  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$ 14,748  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$ 14,748  
**Development Hours:**  
**Development Value:**  
**Estimated ROI:**  
**Actual ROI:**  
**Comments:**

### Tax eCurrent Use (2015)

**Description:** A comprehensive online workflow service for landowners to apply and enroll their land online to the Department's successful Current Use Tax program. The online service allows landowners, consulting foresters, and town clerks to input and track important information about land parcels to help manage the program more effectively.

**Department:** Tax  
**Amount of the fee:** \$70  
**Fee Paid By:** Agency  
**Approval:** Agency pays  
**FY 2015 Transactions:** 1494  
**FY 2014 Net Revenues:** \$0  
**FY 2015 Net Revenues:** \$  
**Net Revenues to end of FY 15:** \$104,580  
**Development Hours:**  
**Development Value:**  
**Estimated ROI:**  
**Actual ROI:**  
**Comments:**