2010 Supplemental Budget Request (SBR) Format for Activities in Support of Technology Based Overpayment Prevention, Detection, and Collection Infrastructure Investments

Name of Project: The naming convention for each project is State Abbreviation-Project Name-Project Priority-UIPL Number. The state abbreviation is the two digit alphabetic code, the name of the project is the name assigned by the state, the priority of the proposal (if more than one is submitted) is the priority order designated by the state, and the UIPL number is the number located on page one of this UIPL.

Amount of Funding Request for this Project: Provide the total amount of funds requested for this individual project.

State Contact: Provide name, telephone number, and e-mail address of the individual who can answer questions relating to this proposal.

Project Description: Provide a brief description of the project explaining how it will help the state to prevent, detect and/or collect overpayments.

Alignment with USDOL Priorities: Explain how this project aligns with one of the Department's funding priorities located in item number five (5) of this UIPL.

Project Timeline: Provide a list of the milestone dates for this project. The timeline should include development of the scope of work, the designation of specific tasks to appropriate parties, the issuance of a request for proposal, if appropriate, the projected start date for programming the new system, the projected dates to begin and to complete testing and the projected date for full implementation of the system.

The weight of this element is 20 percent of the total score.

Description of Costs: Provide an explanation of all costs included in the proposal. The need for each item should be explained in detail.

> **Staff Costs for Agency and Contract Staff:** States must use the table format below to request state or contract staff. The project should clearly explain which costs are for state staff and which costs are for contractor staff.

Type of Position	Total Hours	Cost Per Hour	Total

> **Hardware, Software, and Telecommunication Equipment:** Provide an itemized list of hardware, software and telecommunications equipment including the cost per item and the number of each item requested. A description of each item should be

included with any information needed to identify the specific item and a description of the size and capacity of each item, if applicable.

Type of Position	Total Hours	Cost Per Hour	Total

Other: Identify each item and provide the expected cost per item.

Summary of All Costs Requested

Staff	
Item	
Other	
Total	

The weight of this element is 20 percent of the total score.

Strategic Design: The strategic design should provide evidence of a thorough analysis of current operations and should show how the design will meet the needs of the state. The description could include an explanation of the overpayments that are currently not being addressed or the collections that are not accomplished because the proposed automated system is not operational. The state should explain how it has determined that this system would be the most beneficial to its operation. This explanation might include a list of other overpayments systems that are operational such as the National Directory of New Hires.

For example, the state should:

- Identify the data that will be received from the data matching, e.g., name, date of birth, address, etc.
- Estimate the amount of overpayments the system will prevent or detect in a year.
- Estimate the percentage of claimants that will be part of the data matching system.
- Describe the data system(s) that the state will use to match claimant records.
- Indicate how often the data match will be conducted.
- Describe the assurance(s) that the state has received from the owner(s) of the data which demonstrate a willingness to participate in the proposed data exchange.

The weight of this element is 30 percent of the total score.

Measurable Improvement Expected in UI Operations: Identify the areas in which overpayment prevention, detection or collection will be improved and improper payments reduced and/or on-going costs reduced through implementation of the proposed project. All improvements and cost reductions must be quantified. For example, if it is anticipated that overpayments will be collected more quickly with new

system, the measurable improvements should identify the anticipated time savings per claim and the percentage of overpayments that will be affected by the new system.

The expected return on investment should be explained over a five-year period. To determine this amount, states should estimate the saving through reductions in improper payments, enhanced collection of overpayments, reductions in staff processing costs or other savings that will occur with each calendar quarter after the date of implementation. The projected date of implementation should be used to determine the savings over the five-year time period, which will begin in January 2, 2011, and end December 31, 2016. If the project will be fully operational by January 1, 2012, the savings projections would cover a four-year time period. The costs in the proposal, excluding matching funds from the state, should be deducted from projected savings. The narrative should explain how savings were calculated.

The weigh of this element is 30 percent of the total score.

Additional Points for Cost Matching:

Additional points will be awarded based on any matching funds provided by the state for the project. The proposal must describe the matching funds using the cost breakout in the section Description of Costs above. The points will be scaled based on the percentage of matching costs that the state proposes to contribute as follows:

- 80% or greater   5 points
- 60% to 79%   4 points
- 40% to 59%   3 points
- 20% to 39%   2 points
- 05% to 19%   1 point