

### Summary

Over the past decade state and local governments have increasingly used information technology to support government operations. Many have developed intergovernmental information systems that perform only one business function or satisfy one program need. The result is a growing number of individual systems for government to government (G2G) business relationships at the state and local levels.

This project seeks to create an Internet Gateway (or a single point of passage) to test and evaluate mechanisms for G2G business relationships among state and local government organizations in New York State.

The prototype will channel three separate G2G business processes involving state agencies and a number of local governments through one common access point. The project is designed to test whether such a gateway would provide state, county, and municipal governments with greater efficiency, higher quality data, and more consistent and coordinated services. Throughout the project, the Center will examine the policy, management, technology, and financial factors that influence the development of the prototype.

### Publications & Results

#### Reports and Working Papers (4)



#### Constructing the New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype: A Technical View Fri, 01 Apr 2005

This report summarizes the technical development of the New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype. Each phase is highlighted including, prototype design, development, testing, and support. Also shared are lessons learned and considerations for future development.

The New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype was built to test the idea of a single point of contact for government-to-government (G2G) work among multiple state and local governments in range of policy areas. The Prototype channeled multiple G2G business functions through a secure, single sign-on, role-based system accessible through the Internet. The goal of the Prototype was to assess management, policy, technology, and cost implications likely to be associated with the development of a full-scale G2G system and to understand what would be necessary for state, county, and municipal governments to realize greater efficiency, high quality authentic data, and more consistent and coordinated services.

#### The New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype Project: Current Practice Research Thu, 01 Jul 2004

In the fall of 2002, the Center for Technology in Government (CTG) at the University at Albany conducted current practice research to identify and examine existing government to government (G2G) portal projects.

In the fall of 2002, the Center for Technology in Government (CTG) at the University at Albany conducted current practice research to identify and examine existing government to government (G2G) portal projects. The purpose of this research was to determine if single sign-on intergovernmental portals, that channel business functions across programmatic areas and levels of government, exist in New York State or in other states. And, if they do exist, what are the policy, management, technological, financial, and other factors that influenced their development. Further, this research was to help inform the development of an intergovernmental prototype project at CTG.

#### Bridging the Enterprise: Lessons from the New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype

Sat, 01 May 2004

This project report details the Gateway Prototype project from conceptualization and development to findings and recommendations. The Prototype was developed to create a single point of contact among state and local governments to test and evaluate mechanisms for government-to-government (G2G) business relationships.

The New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype was built to identify, demonstrate, and evaluate key factors associated with the design, development, and deployment of a single point of contact for G2G work among state and local governments. The Prototype development was conducted in three stages. The first focused on the refinement of the idea of a gateway and the selection of applications to be included in the Prototype. The second stage was the development of a Prototype (the Gateway and three business applications), and the final stage consisted of Prototype testing and refinement. During these three stages, the project participants were organized into specialized teams and partnered with corporate software development teams. Together, they then tested the Prototype.

### New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype Demonstration

Thu, 01 Apr 2004

This online demonstration shows the features and functions of the New York State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype. The Prototype was built to identify, demonstrate, and evaluate key factors associated with the design, development, and deployment of a single point of contact for G2G work among state and local governments in New York State.

## Results

### Lessons in Intergovernmental IT Governance

December 2004 > [Download PDF](#)

CTG is a member of the national Partnership for Intergovernmental Innovation (Pi2). In July 2004, the State-Local Gateway project was presented at a Pi2 workshop on intergovernmental IT governance. The workshop report, *Lessons in Intergovernmental IT Governance*, was prepared by CTG Director Sharon Dawes and includes a presentation given by Program Manager Meghan Cook. It highlights leadership, culture, stakeholders, and stewardship as elements of effective intergovernmental work.

## Interim Results

### Ideal Characteristics, Benefits, and Barriers Associated with a State-Local Internet Gateway

Although the State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype Project is not a full system, the thinking is to work towards a vision of an ideal Gateway for G2G business relationships. Two exploratory discussion meetings were held in September and November 2002 with over 20 state and local representatives to discuss the ideal characteristics, benefits, and barriers associated with developing a perfect State-Local Internet Gateway for New York State. The following information was generated by this group (which has since been identified as the Advisory Committee):

#### IDEAL CHARACTERISTICS

##### Governance and Strategy

- State and local organizations jointly govern the Gateway. The governing structure includes fair representation of state, county, and municipal stakeholders. It features open communication channels, participatory decision processes, and trouble-shooting and problem-solving mechanisms for resolving differences.
- Decisions are driven by real business needs. Each application addresses the information, management, and process needs associated with a significant business function that is useful to all relevant state and local organizations. Each application offers value right from the start-up phase, even with less than full participation of all state and local agencies.
- The Gateway is affordable to all interested participants. The costs associated with adopting and using the gateway are not prohibitive to any state agency, county, or municipality.
- The Gateway is financially solvent. The gateway is designed to offset initial investments and ongoing costs by

future cost reductions to all participants.

- Security policies protect the Gateway from threats and misuse. Policies are in place that protect the Gateway from external threats and limit access and use according to roles associated with specific functional requirements.

### Content

- All data are high quality, accurate, and authentic. All data are cleansed, and data sources and metadata are available to check for "fitness for use" as well as authenticity.
- Information and applications are dynamic and current. The resources and functions of the Gateway are constantly updated to provide new or improved information, tools, and services.
- Content is modular, flexible, versatile, and open to improvement. The information and applications that are part of the gateway follow a standard set of conventions and are continually evaluated for usability and improvement under a variety of local conditions. New business-driven information resources and applications are added regularly.

### Design and Usability

- The Gateway is easy to use for people with varying levels of skill. The gateway is transparent and simple to use with a common vocabulary, single sign-on, and low technical skills required for users. It is accompanied by solid training programs and support mechanisms.
- Applications are responsive to the needs of users. Applications are designed from the user or customer point of view and provide on-line help, and immediate, real time confirmation of the success of a transaction.
- The Gateway is highly reliable and available to all state and local users. Useful connectivity is available to all participants, including basic infrastructure from desktop equipment and software to network speed and bandwidth.
- Security technologies protect it from both internal and external threats. All standard security measures are in place to protect the infrastructure, transactions, and data from internal abuse and external threats.
- The overall design is modular, flexible, versatile, and open to improvement. The design is fully envisioned, but built in a modular fashion that delivers both early and long-term benefits and does not require the full participation of all state and local agencies to operate successfully. The gateway follows an evolutionary development strategy where ongoing evaluation leads to continual improvement.
- Takes advantage of existing efforts. Where existing projects or applications that address shared processes and business needs already exist, they are extended into the gateway or modified as needed.

## BENEFITS AND BARRIERS

### Benefits

- Efficiency - It will save time and money and reduce the manual workload by achieving economies of scale. It will allow for the creative use of funds already allocated in budgets. It will be built as much as possible on existing IT and communication systems. It will also promote quicker dissemination of information at all levels of government.

- Improved Coordination and Consistency - Shared processes, common data definitions, and more logical programmatic connections would support better coordination between the state and local levels, more consistency in program design, and a more consistent level and quality of service delivery.
- Data Quality and Access - Well-defined, consistent, complete, accurate, and shared data will allow the re-use of the same information to satisfy multiple demands and support greater data integration and use for multiple users. Improved data management will reduce costs and promote wider responsibility for information stewardship across the government.

### Barriers

- Cost - There are serious concerns about the size of the initial and ongoing costs of a gateway and who will pay for what.
- Challenges of Complexity - Multiple and conflicting state business rules and practices prevent needed coordination across multiple partners. Because so many programs are federally defined, these rules and practices are not always within the state's authority to change. In addition, the diversity of local governments is very wide and their capabilities and practices are far from uniform from place to place. Finally, many legacy systems are in place that cannot be replaced or significantly changed in the near future.
- Politics - Support for a State-Local Internet Gateway will have to compete for support among many other governmental priorities and there will be difficulty maintaining political support across the election cycles of so many agencies and jurisdictions. Concerns about turf, control, and management combine with questions about who will have authority to do what. Agencies may resist opening their data sources to new uses or users.

### State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype Project Working Assumptions for the Project and Team

**\*This list is a work-in-progress and will be updated periodically by the Prototype Development Team.**

### Prototype Scope

- We aim to build, test, and evaluate a prototype Gateway for G2G business transactions. **Phase One** is to identify and document the content and structure. **Phase Two** is to build, test, and evaluate the prototype.
- Phase one of the project is to define the prototype. We define a "prototype" as a system built for a proof of concept. It is not a full-scale system or even a pilot. A prototype essentially identifies, demonstrates, and evaluates the key management, policy, technology and costs implications. A prototype is also built to identify the value proposition all participants.
- In order for the prototype to generate enough useful results, it must demonstrate how multiple organizations at different levels of government work together. It must also demonstrate how different kinds and sizes of local governments in different parts of the state would participate.
- In order for the prototype to generate enough useful results, it must also focus on at least two different business processes in two different domains.

### Project Participation

- We will strive to have 2-3 state agencies and about 6-10 local governments to actively participate in the design and testing of the prototype as part of the prototyping team
- We define "local" as including counties, cities, towns, and villages. We refer to cities, towns, and villages collectively as "municipalities."
- State, county, and municipal participants are all critical to the success of the project. Design decisions will take their different needs and capabilities into account.
- State and local agencies will be both customers and suppliers of information and services to the gateway; neither is exclusively the customer of the other.
- CTG will take responsibility for selecting and coordinating corporate partners to take part in the prototyping effort.

### Management and Process of the Project

- CTG will take responsibility for leading and managing both phases of the project.
- In order to remove barriers to participation in the prototype, CTG will take responsibility for identifying and applying for funding for local government involvement in phase two.
- The organizations involved in the prototype design and test will need to meet face-to-face on a regular basis, as well as communicate electronically.
- A larger group of interested state and local organizations will serve as an advisory committee and will do most of its business via email.

### Investigation

- The project will investigate existing portal-type projects and include information gathered by the NYS Office for Technology's (OFT) "Bridge the Gap" analysis in the investigation.
- The State-Local Internet gateway Prototype Project will investigate and document the full cost structure of developing and implementing the prototype.

## Press Releases & News Stories

## Press Releases

CTG's Internet Gateway Prototype Tests New Efficiency and Coordination of State and Local Government Information Systems

Thu, 20 May 2004

University at Albany Receives AT&T Foundation Grant To Fund Advanced System to Help Government Agencies Link Information

Mon, 06 Oct 2003

Center for Technology in Government Builds Partnership to Enhance Intergovernmental Info Systems

Tue, 22 Jul 2003

## News Stories

CTG Study Models Organizational Behavior

dgOnline News

September 2003

State-Local Prototype Teams Test G2G Internet Gateway Concept

Open Forum, Volume 16, Numbers 7/8, pp 7-8

July/August 2003

## Partners

### Government Partners

#### Prototype Development Team

- NYS Agriculture and Markets
- New York State Office of Real Property Services
- NYS Office of the State Comptroller
- Broome County, New York
- Essex County, New York
- Monroe County, New York
- Ontario County, New York
- City of Canandaigua, New York
- City of Rochester, New York
- City of White Plains, New York
- Town of Bethlehem, New York
- Town of Binghamton, New York
- Town of Canadice, New York
- Town of Colonie, New York
- Town of Gardiner, New York
- Town of Union, New York

### Corporate Partners

- AT&T

## State-Local Internet Gateway: Prototype Project

---

- CGI Information Systems & Management Consultants, Inc.
- Keane, Inc.
- Microsoft Corporation

## Academic Partners

- David Landsbergen, Chair, Doctoral Studies Committee, Ohio State University

## Center for Technology in Government

- Sharon S. Dawes, Project Director
- Meghan Cook, Project Manager
- Dubravka Juraga, Research Associate
- Chris Pagano, Project Associate
- Ben Schwartz, Graduate Assistant
- Derek Werthmuller, Director of Technology Services

## Advisory Committee

Joe Aiello

Consultant, Digital Towpath - Niagara Mohawk

Gregory Benson, Jr.

Executive Director, NYS Forum for Information Resource Management

Thomas R. Bodden

Manager, Research & Information, Association of Towns of State of New York

Tim Bortree

Chief Information Officer, Monroe County

Carmella T. Carnevale

Technology Enterprise Accounts Manager, NYS Office for Technology

Sydney Cresswell

Director, Intergovernmental Solutions Program, University at Albany/SUNY

Dolores Dybas

Director, Information Systems, NYS Department of Agriculture & Markets

Patricia Favreau

Town Clerk, Town of Berne

Carole Francis

Statewide Applied Technology Advisor, NYS Office of the State Comptroller

Michele Hasso

Project Coordinator, NYS Office of the State Comptroller

Ed Hemminger

Chief Information Officer, Ontario County

Julie Holcomb

## State-Local Internet Gateway: Prototype Project

---

City Clerk, City of Ithaca

Geof Huth

Manager, Records Service Development, NYS Archives

Alan Kowlowitz

Public Technology Analyst, NYS Office for Technology

David Landsbergen

Chair - Doctoral Studies Committee, Ohio State University

Julie Leeper

Assistant Director of Strategic Policies, Acquisitions & E-Commerce, NYS Office for Technology

Robert Lilly

Director, Information Systems, Essex County

Carolyn May

Director, Community Development & Corporate Giving, Niagara Mohawk

Kim McKinney

Director of Information Technology, Broome County

Charlie Murphy

Assistant Secretary of State for Community Development, Department of State

Kathleen Newkirk

Town Clerk, Town of Bethlehem

Gene Pezdek

Director of Information Services, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation

Karen Prescott

AT&T

Thomas Ruller

Associate Programmer Analyst, State Education Department

Bruce Sauter

Chief Information Officer, NYS Office of Real Property Services

Laurie Savage

Assistant to the First Deputy Secretary of State, Department of State

Wendy Scheening

Manager, Information Systems, NYS Department of Agriculture & Markets

Gregory Smith

Chief Information Officer Division of Local Government, Services and Economic Development

NYS Office of the State Comptroller

John Woodward



County Clerk, Schenectady County

## Participants

### State Agencies

#### NYS Agriculture and Markets

- Mary Lou Acheson, Senior Computer Operator
- Patricia Arthur, Clerk I
- Roberta Brooks, Principal Clerk
- Jeffry Huse, Assistant Director of Animal Industry
- Wendy Scheening, Manager, Information Systems

#### NYS Office of Real Property Services

- Colleen Benson, Real Property Analyst III
- Sally Cooney, Real Property Analyst IV
- Tom Rutnik, Associate Computer Programmer Analyst
- Bruce Sauter, Chief Information Officer

#### NYS Office of State Comptroller - Division of Local Government Services and Economic Development

- Joan Darcy, Sr. Programmer & Computer Analyst
- Michele Hasso, Project Coordinator
- Carole Francis, Statewide applied Technology Advisor
- Gregory Smith, Chief Information Officer

### Local Governments

- Tim Bortree, Chief Information Officer, Monroe County
- Richard Brown, Director of Development and Planning, City of Canandaigua
- Carolee Conklin, City Clerk, City of Rochester
- Diane Conroy-LaCivita, Deputy Town Clerk, Town of Colonie
- Bonnie Drake, Town Clerk/Tax Collector, Town of Canadice
- Barbara Fiala, County Clerk of Broome, Broome County
- Ed Hemminger, Chief Information Officer, Ontario County
- Robert Lilly, Director, Information Systems, Essex County
- John H. McDonald, Town Assessor, Town of Union
- Kim McKinney, Director of Information Technology, Broome County
- Anne McPherson, Deputy City Clerk, City of White Plains
- Michelle Mosher, Town Clerk/Tax Collector, Town of Gardiner
- Kathleen Newkirk, Town Clerk, Town of Bethlehem
- Susan Pufky, Assistant Director, Real Property Tax Service, Broome County
- Laura Kay Wharmby, Clerk/Treasurer, City of Canandaigua
- Judy Zurenda, Town Clerk, Town of Binghamton

### CGI Information Systems & Management Consultants, Inc.

- Ashish Advani, Consultant
- Duane Benson, Technical Architect
- Bill Cunningham, Business Development Director
- Lorna Ganong, Director of Consulting Services
- Ed McGinley, Consultant
- Afzal Mohammed, Senior Consultant
- Brian Peek, Senior Consultant
- Mandy Prezioso, Senior Consultant

### Keane, Inc.

- Bob Bush, Senior Consultant
- Christopher Desany, Technical Architect
- Joann Dunham, NYS Program Manager
- Teresa Gillooley, Project Officer

### Microsoft Corporation

- Bill Branch, Client Executive, NYS

## Funding Sources

This project is funded by a portion of CTG's New York State budget allocation.

## Original Scope of Work

The State-Local Internet Gateway Prototype Project seeks to create an Internet Gateway (or a single point of passage) to test and evaluate mechanisms for G2G business relationships among state and local government organizations in New York State.

The prototype will channel three separate G2G business processes from three state agencies through one common place. The project is designed to test whether such a gateway would provide state, county, and municipal governments with greater efficiency, higher quality data, and more consistent and coordinated services. Throughout the project, the Center will examine the policy, management, technology, and financial factors that influence the development of the prototype.

The project will be completed in two phases. **Phase One** will include the generation of a set of characteristics, benefits, and barriers to achieving an "ideal" State-Local Internet Gateway in New York State. In addition, CTG will lead an investigation into similar projects in New York State and elsewhere.

Finally, several state agencies and local governments will form a prototyping team to define the structure and content of the prototype.

More specifically, **Phase One** deliverables are as follows:

- Analysis of existing efforts in NYS that link state agencies and local governments in a G2G relationship.
- Documentation and analysis of the policy, management, technology, financial and other factors that influence the development of a State-Local Internet Gateway in at least one other state.
- Definition of a structure, or architecture, for a State-Local Internet Gateway in New York.
- Definition of the information and transaction content to be included in the prototype.
- A proposal for moving into Phase Two of the project, including garnering corporate partner support, and seeking funding for local government involvement for Phase Two of the project.

In **Phase Two**, CTG will lead, in conjunction with corporate partners and the prototyping team, the development, testing, and evaluation of the prototype.

The following is the approximate time frame for each phase:

- Phase One will continue until Spring 2003
- Phase Two will commence in Spring 2003 and end in Summer 2004

## Related Web Sites

### The Intergovernmental Solutions Program

<http://www.albany.edu/igsp/>

A partnership between the University at Albany's Rockefeller College of Public Affairs & Policy and New York State to develop a professional learning community focused on intergovernmental effectiveness. Program goals are to capture and share knowledge about how successful intergovernmental work occurs.

### Partnership for Intergovernmental Innovation (PI2)

[http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?contentId=8739&contentType=GSA\\_OVERVIEW](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?contentId=8739&contentType=GSA_OVERVIEW)

This intergovernmental innovation group of federal, state, and county government officials was formed in 1999 to provide intergovernmental innovators a resource to overcome barriers in process, policy, and regulation, and to serve as a platform for discussion and collective action.

### Office of Intergovernmental Solutions

[http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?contentId=12662&contentType=GSA\\_BASIC](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/contentView.do?contentId=12662&contentType=GSA_BASIC)

The Office of Intergovernmental Solutions is part of the US General Services Administration. It aims to build a community of intergovernmental managers to identify, analyze, and help solve major issues affecting electronic governments in the 21st century. This Web site is a place where government officials can go to learn about practices in other governments to find sources of information and experts in related initiatives.

## Contact Information

Center for Technology in Government  
University at Albany, SUNY  
187 Wolf Road, Suite 301  
Albany, NY 12205  
(518) 442-3892 (phone)  
(518) 442-3886 (fax)

Meghan E. Cook

Project Manager

(518) 442-3892