

Project Closeout Report

Project Name: Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) - Phase 1 Feasibility Study

Agency: North Dakota Department of Health (DoH)

Business Unit/Program Area: Women Infants and Children (WIC)

Project Sponsor: Kristi Miller

Project Manager: Brandi Fagerland

Objectives		
Project Objectives	Measurements	
	Met/ Not Met	Description
<p><u>Business Need/Problem 1:</u> USDA/FNS has mandated the implementation of EBT as the delivery method of food benefits for WIC by October 1, 2020. USDA/FNS requires that each state must first conduct an EBT feasibility study before implementation.</p> <p><u>Phase 1 Objective 1.1:</u> Complete an EBT feasibility study.</p>	Met	<p><u>Measurement 1.1.1:</u> The Planning Contractor will deliver a final version of the feasibility study to the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor will provide acceptance of the feasibility study.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> The Planning Contractor did deliver a feasibility study that was reviewed by FNS and accepted by the Project Sponsor.</p>

Project Closeout Report

<p><u>Business Need/Problem 1:</u> USDA/FNS has mandated the implementation of EBT as the delivery method of food benefits for WIC by October 1, 2020. USDA/FNS requires that each state must first conduct an EBT feasibility study before implementation.</p> <p><u>Phase 1 Objective 1.3:</u> If the North Dakota WIC Director makes the decision to implement EBT, then complete, review, and approve an IAPD. Also, complete the grant request for funds for implementation and author an implementation contractor RFP.</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p><u>IAPD Measurement 1.3.1:</u> The Project Sponsor will present the IAPD to the WIC Director for approval to submit to the FNS regional office.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> The Project Sponsor presented the IAPD to the WIC Director who approved submission to the FNS regional office for their review.</p> <p><u>IAPD Measurement 1.3.2:</u> The WIC Director will present the IAPD to the FNS regional office for approval to prepare the grant request.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> Since the start of the project, the IAPD has now become the requesting vehicle for FNS EBT funding.</p> <p><u>Grant Measurement 1.3.3:</u> The Project Sponsor will present the grant application for implementation funds to the WIC Director for approval to submit to the FNS regional office.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> n/a (See IAPD Measurement 1.3.2)</p> <p><u>Grant Measurement 1.3.4:</u> The WIC Director will present the grant to the FNS regional office for approval to submit to USDA.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> n/a (See IAPD Measurement 1.3.2)</p> <p><u>Grant Measurement 1.3.5:</u> After receiving approval from the FNS regional office, the WIC Director will submit the grant application to USDA for funding.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> n/a (See IAPD Measurement 1.3.2)</p> <p><u>RFP Measurement 1.3.6:</u> The Project Sponsor will present an implementation contractor RFP to the WIC Director.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> The RFP was taken out of scope for the project because while authoring the IAPD, it became evident that DoH WIC would be best served to cooperatively work with another state or consortium of states to implement EBT. DoH WIC will utilize another consortium or state's contract and thus an RFP is not necessary.</p>
---	------------	--

Schedule Objectives

Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Actual Schedule (in Months)	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Not Met	12 months	14 months	19 months	58% Behind	36% Behind

Project Closeout Report

The final schedule variance is primarily due to a couple of factors.

The first factor was that in order to complete the draft of the IAPD, Maximus and DoH WIC felt it was important to get ahold of the cost data from a Wyoming RFP process that was in progress. This information impacted the technology decision that needed to be made. As a result, the IAPD draft could not be completed until this data was available and analyzed. This factor caused an 8 week or 14% schedule delay.

The second factor was that FNS asked for a 60 day IAPD review period. Their review period actually turned out to be 102 days. This caused a 6 week or 11% schedule delay.

Budget Objectives

Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Budget	Final Baseline Budget	Actual Costs	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	\$259,697	\$326,663	\$270,673	4.2% Behind	21.5% Ahead

Major Scope Changes

The contract with Maximus outlined two optional deliverables (IAPD and RFP) that were originally not planned to be within the scope of the project. In July of 2013, both optional deliverables were added to the scope of the project. After the IAPD was completed it became clear that the RFP would not be needed. Then in January of 2014, the RFP was taken back out of scope for the project.

Lessons Learned

- There is a risk of delay in FNS review times. For this project, the FNS reviews, at times took more than the 60 days that FNS requests for review periods.
- Expect the unexpected because the industry is evolving and FNS regulations are still being developed. For example, this project was impacted by continuous enhancements to retailer systems and the farm bill.
- All EBT feasibility planning projects usually result in writing an RFP but the option to work with other states or agencies was realized and thus an RFP not necessary.

Success Stories

- Wyoming wrote into their contract the ability for other states to piggy-back off of their contract.
- North Dakota WIC leveraged information from their value-added resellers to estimate the level of retailer enablement necessary.