Agency Information Technology Projects
FY2005-07 Biennial Budget

November 2004

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Contents

1. List of Projects Ranked by the Education Council

2. List of Projects Ranked by the State Government Council

3. List of Projects as Ranked by the Submitting Agency

4. Project Summary Sheets for All Projects

Project #	Agency	Project Title
05-01	Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts
05-02	Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System
05-03	Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy
13-01	Department of Education	Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming, and Training
25-01	HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar
25-02	HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT
25-03	HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)
25-04	HHSS	Compudata
25-05	HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)
25-06	HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System
25-07	HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and Program
25-08	HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System
25-09	HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan
27-01	Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)
27-02*	Department of Roads	Document Management System
27-03	Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System
27-04	Department of Roads	Financial System Update
27-05*	Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface
27-06	Department of Roads	PioneerNET
27-07	Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System
37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation
37-02	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims
37-03	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication
51-01	University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade
65-01	DAS - CIO	Security Audits

* After consultation with the agency, these projects were not ranked based on insufficient information and other reasons.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
FY2005-2007 Information Technology Project Proposals
Education Council Ranking

	Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2005-06	FY2006-07	Funding Source (General / Cash / Federal)	New Funds or Continuation or Both	Score
1	13-01*	Department of Education	Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming, and Training	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000		New	85
2	51-01	University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade	$ 925,000	$ 925,000	General	New	92

* EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The Education Council encourages continued efforts to seek other funds and to work with providers to keep annual (recurring) costs to schools at or about the same rate as they currently pay. If this funding request is not successful or only partially successful, there is an additional risk that schools will cease to participate in distance learning and the network upgrade project due to increased costs. However, that same risk exists if the system is not upgraded with State sponsorship and the annual costs increase significantly when a new contract comes due. We encourage the NITC, its work groups, task groups, and councils to continue to coordinate discussions to find a mutually beneficial solution for the telecommunications providers and the educational community.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
FY2005-2007 Information Technology Project Proposals
State Government Council Ranking

	Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2005-06	FY2006-07	Funding Source (General / Cash / Federal)	New Funds or Continuation or Both	Score
1	65-01	DAS - CIO	Security Audits	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	Cash	New	92
2	25-09	HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan	$ 655,700		50% Fed 50% Gen	Continuation	87
3	05-01	Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	$ 294,866	$ 456,148	Cash	New	85
4	27-06	Department of Roads	PioneerNET	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,500,000	Cash & Earmarked ITS Funds	New	82
5	25-07	HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and Program	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,500,000	50% Fed 50% Gen	Continuation	81
6	05-03	Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	$ 125,000	$ 125,000	General	New	79
7	27-07	Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System	$ 750,000	$ 50,000	Cash	New	78
8	25-08	HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	$ 281,600	$ 477,000	50% Fed 50% Gen	Continuation	76
9	25-06	HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System	Total 12.2M	Total 12.4M	50% Fed 50% Gen	Continuation	75
*	27-05	Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface	$ 75,000	$ 75,000	Cash	Continuation	74
10	37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	$ 55,900	$ 56,290	Cash	New	74
11t	25-02	HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT	0.5-5Million	0.5-5Million	Federal	New , not yet obtained	72
11t	37-02	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims	$ 58,250	$ 6,508	Cash	New	72
13	25-01	HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar	$ 1,249,110	$ 45,475	Cash	Continuation	71
14	25-04	HHSS	Compudata	$ 536,585	$ 83,485	Cash	Continuation	70
15t	25-05	HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)	$ 30,000,000	$ 20,000,000	90% Fed 10% Gen	New	69
15t	37-03	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication		$ 534,066	Cash	New	69
17	27-03	Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System	$ 750,000	$ 750,000	Cash	New	68
18	27-04	Department of Roads	Financial System Update	$ 150,000	$ 150,000	Cash	Continuation	63
19t	25-03	HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)	Total 16M	Total 16M	66% Fed 34% Gen	Continuation	55
19t	27-01	Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	Cash	Continuation	55
21	05-02	Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	$ 992,737	$ 342,737		New	53
*	27-02	Department of Roads	Document Management System	$ 150,000	$ 200,000	Cash	Continuation	29

* After consultation with the agency, these projects were not ranked based on insufficient information and other reasons.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
FY2005-2007 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Agency Priority Ranking)

Project #	Agency	Project Title	Agency Priority	Score
05-02	Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	1	53
05-01	Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	2	85
05-03	Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	3	79
25-05	HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)	1	69
25-06	HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System	2	75
25-03	HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)	3	55
25-07	HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and	4	81
25-09	HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan	5	87
25-02	HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT	6	72
25-01	HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar	7	71
25-04	HHSS	Compudata	8	70
25-08	HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	9	76
27-05	Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface	1	74
27-04	Department of Roads	Financial System Update	2	63
27-07	Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System	3	78
27-06	Department of Roads	PioneerNET	4	82
27-03	Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System	5	68
27-01	Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)	6	55
27-02	Department of Roads	Document Management System	7	29
37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	1	74
37-02	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims	2	72
37-03	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication	3	69

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	$294,866.00	$456,148.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Sections 24-228, R.S.S. 2003 (District Court) and 24-514, R.R.S. 1943 (County Court) provide the statutory basis for furnishing equipment to the trial courts.

Dedicated terminals were installed for all district and county court employees as JUSTICE was deployed. Subsequently, most organizations have switched to personal computers rather than terminals. The AS/400 has evolved, dropping Office Vision, which courts used via their terminals for E-Mail, word processing, and calendars. After exploring options, the JUSTICE team agreed with IMS to use standard E-mail, Outlook, and Microsoft Word to replace Office Vision. This will require personal computers rather than terminals. Personal computers will also be required to display graphical images, including documents which have been electronically filed or scanned and stored as images. PCs will also be required to allow JUSTICE to move to a graphical interface.

Courthouses have been rewired statewide to support IP communications. At least one personal computer has been installed in every court to allow the court to be in contact via E-mail. We must now complete the replacement of terminals.

Judges and their staff members (some district judges have bailiffs, secretaries, or both) require personal computers to efficiently complete their work and take full advantage of some JUSTICE enhancements. This plan includes the cost of providing a personal computer to every trial court judge and every court employee.

Computers are leased through the Department of Administrative Services. A dedicated terminal costs $24 per month; a personal computer costs $56 per month, and a laptop personal computer costs about $85 per month. We plan to replace about one third of the remaining dedicated terminals each year during the 2005 fiscal year, which will increase costs by $121,960 including the new DAS E-Mail service. This cost increases to just over $254,000 when all terminals have been replaced.

Personal computers will be installed for each trial court judge and staff member beginning in July, 2005, and is expected to cost $117,000 with E-Mail service in fiscal 2006 and about $155,500 in the next and subsequent years.

Please note the Court will make a separate request in the expansion budget to place personal computers in courtrooms to allow courts to use a new JUSTICE enhancement to streamline the workflow of the courts and eliminate repetitive data entry. Those personal computers are not included in this request.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
5. Training		$ 12,000.00				$ 12,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	$ 190,080.00	$ 281,708.00	$ 454,646.00	$ 454,646.00	$ 454,646.00	$ 1,835,726.00
8.4 Other		$ 1,158.00	$ 1,502.00	$ 1,502.00	$ 1,502.00	$ 5,664.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 190,080.00	$ 294,866.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 1,853,390.00
Cash Funds	$ 190,080.00	$ 294,866.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 1,853,390.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 190,080.00	$ 294,866.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 456,148.00	$ 1,853,390.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	13	14	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	23	24	23.7	25
V: Technical Impact	19	19	18	18.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	8	8.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	8	7	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	13	16	13.0	20
			TOTAL	**85**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are valid and need to be met. This project should be considered a requirement. - Project objectives address a critical underlying infrastructure need that is prerequisite to accomplishing the business related objectives of the court.	- Not sure whether this project is listed in their Information Technology plan.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- All statements are valid. Old terminals are obsolete. - Technology being replaced is obsolete and unavailable. Failure to implement the project places the court at considerable future risk. Where PC's used to be a luxury, they are now a standard part of all technical infrastructures.	
V: Technical Impact	- Most popular software is planned for these systems. Implies systems will be replaced every 3 years which is common. Move to IP network is also the standard for State Networks. - The court is simply extending their technical strategy that is already in place and is proven successful.	- Doesn't list specific hardware brand, models, speed, etc. Assumption is the hardware will be the latest technology. - The project addresses one technical infrastructure layer and does not discuss or reference other critical areas such as high speed communications.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Looks like there is sufficient support for the project, both from the Supreme Court and from IM Services. Proposed training should be sufficient for most people, but some may need more than just computer based training. - Project sponsor is identified.	- Milestones/deliverables not defined. Preliminary implementation plan could use more definition. - Does not discuss judges acceptability of PC's on their desks and the willingness to use the future applications that they will support.
VII: Risk Assessment		- There are probably additional risks related to training and education. - Risks such as the ability of court staff dependant on technology to perform their duties because of the failure of existing "terminal equipment" and the delay in implementing future business objectives could have been elaborated on.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Leasing provides a good mechanism to place equipment under an equipment replacement cycle.	- Although financial information is provided, it does not detail the hardware that will be purchased. Can not determine if spending is appropriate without the detail on number of devices that will be purchased. No answers to questions to 16 and 17. - Terms of lease were not discussed so could not determine whether Yrs 2 through 4 were locked in by agreement or if inflation was taken into account. Details in Executive Summary do provide additional information. Location in budget request not identified.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	$ 992,737.00	$ 342,737.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

A review of Juvenile case processing by the Supreme Court's Court Improvement Project (CIP) Coordinator resulted in recommendations to better monitor individual case processes, overall court processing times, and better track individuals. The State Court Administrator decided to acquire and install a separate juvenile case management system for the use of the three Separate Juvenile Courts and possibly for the county courts which sit as juvenile courts. This decision was made to avoid development efforts needed to provide this functionality and so the system can be delivered quickly.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
1. Personnel Costs		$ 137,737.00	$ 137,737.00	$ 137,737.00	$ 137,737.00	$ 550,948.00
7. Other Operating Costs		$ 75,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 375,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware		$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00	$ 120,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 750,000.00	$ 75,000.00	$ 75,000.00	$ 75,000.00	$ 975,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 992,737.00	$ 342,737.00	$ 342,737.00	$ 342,737.00	$ 2,020,948.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	12	4	9.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	20	9	14.7	25
V: Technical Impact	14	13	0	9.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	4	5.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	9	4	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	10	7	9.0	20
			TOTAL	**53**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The section on goals and objectives provides a detailed list of requirements. - Project proposal seeks to improve juvenile court case monitoring by the courts. This would promote the court's oversight of juveniles involved in abuse and neglect cases. - There are direct recommendations for some functionality from ASFA but that does not necessarily transfer to specifications.	- The Agency IT plan presents two projects relating to juvenile case processing. One is to acquire a separate system to serve the juvenile courts. The other is the modification of JUSTICE. It is not clear how these two options will be evaluated. What criteria will be used to choose between the two options? - The project cites the Supreme Court's Court Improvement Project, and specifies court compliance with the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) as justification for the request. However, federal and state law mandates that compliance with ASFA requirements as specified in the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) is the sole function of the Department of Health and Human Services. ASFA

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		does not mandate court processing requirements. The goals and objectives specified in this section are SACWIS requirements currently under development by the Department of Health and Human Services. Their development by the courts would be duplicative, and could not be submitted to the federal government as evidence of compliance. As the federal and state ASFA agency, only HHSS can report to the federal government, and federal compliance reviews will be of the HHSS system. The burden of compliance and potential loss of funding does not fall on the court. - No discussion of examining options. Replacement of JUSTICE outside of counties without separate juvenile courts unclear.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Improvement in the court's case juvenile processing system will allow better management of juvenile cases. The project recommends "a needs analysis...to identify system enhancements that are needed/desired by the larger court system…within the state's unified court system." The CIP report listed three options as detailed in the proposal. These options should be pursued prior to the purchase of a software system.	- The primary justification appears to be compliance with the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act. What is the deadline for complying, and how will the federal government enforce this mandate? Do any metrics exist that illustrate the extent and severity of problems in Nebraska? The CIP consultants presented three options for further evaluation. That evaluation is essential to developing the business case. - While noting the need for a comprehensive study, this proposal appears to acquire a system first, and then determine court needs. Within the proposal, there is no discussion of how the new juvenile system would integrate with the 90 county courts sitting as juvenile courts that currently use JUSTICE as the case management system. Even assuming that the court would meet the ASFA requirements, there is no discussion on how the court would report their results to HHSS for subsequent reporting to the federal government. - The long term assessment seems key to the recommendations but it is not clear if it will be included int his project.
V: Technical Impact	- Relies on consultant's recommendations (assuming they are solid) while acknowledging many unknowns.	- The project will impact JUSTICE and the interfaces with major systems in other agencies. The magnitude of the impact, including costs, should be evaluated before choosing a solution. - This section does not describe a technical impact, and only references "Web-based system" technology. - Why web-based? (no evaluation of other options in IV) An RFI would have provided a lot of information on feasibility and options as well as the information requested in #7. Detailed specifications & requirements needed. HHSS may have a lot of that data.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The proposal describes a supreme court effort to identify juvenile court requirements. - Commercial acquisition can address many support issues. Committee review will allow for broad input but an RFP is time consuming.	- Information regarding milestones, deliverables, training, and ongoing support are not known. - Absent a comprehensive plan for juvenile courts, the project fails to detail an implementation plan. Rather, the plan seeks to acquire a new system but lacks detail on the functions that the system must provide. - Specification development processes, product reviews (RFI, vendor queries, etc) and interface specifications should be discussed at length. While commercial application can ease many aspects there is a lot of up front work required.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The proposal correctly lists risk factors and potential complications for the courts unified court system.	- Some of the requirements of the new system, such as tracking relationships among individuals are similar to functionality in the N-FOCUS system

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Recognizes the difficulties in customizing COTS software.	maintained by HHS. Duplication of functions and data would create another risk of keeping information in both systems synchronized and accurate. There is also a risk that the new system may not support the many interfaces that now exist between JUSTICE and systems in other agencies. - The supreme court has announced support for a juvenile court system modeled after drug courts. The project request contemplates the acquisition of a computing system, yet neither the CIP report nor the project request addresses how the system would be used to support the proposed new juvenile court system. Presumably, the new juvenile court structure would place more emphasis on intervention, treatment, and family services. This would imply that courts would work closely with the service provider, perhaps in a role other than adjudication. A new technology system should be developed to support the new court structure once it is defined.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Services delivered to juveniles is currently a high priority to the state, and the juvenile courts are an intregal part of these services. This project has the potential to improve judicial oversight of those services. Rather than simply purchase software, an alternative project would be for the courts to work directly with HHSS to clearly define the role of the juvenile court when modeled after a drug court and its relationship to HHSS as the primary service provider. Further, the court could assist with the state's compliance with ASFA by partnering with HHSS to to define how the courts could assist with the implementation of SACWIS requirements, including data exchange, document creation, storage and retrieval, case tracking and compliance, and notifications of pending court actions. Further, the project should include court interfaces to HHSS case tracking, case management, Indian child welfare, and intervention plans for use by the court in reviewing compliance. The supreme court has expressed a need to reexamine its role in the juvenile justice system, perhaps beyond adjudication. A technology request should identify requirements to meet this new vision. There is a need to strengthen the existing juvenile court system. This project appears to transfer the burden of ASFA compliance from the agency designated with that responsibility to the courts.	- What is the basis for the $750,000 estimate for a new system. Does this amount include costs for configuration or modifications to meet Nebraska's requirements? Does it include the cost of data conversion or interfaces? - The budget request is composed of two major components, personnel and technology. The request is for the purchase of software licenses and support systems. The cost of integrating this juvenile system with the court's case management system is not addressed, even though these concerns are raised in the project narrative. - No breakdowns. Unclear if staff will develop specs, write RFP, train, implement, etc. Probably unable to make acquisition in one year. No justification or source for cost estimates (acquisition or ongoing or staff) and unknowns (hardware, roll-out,etc).

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

JUSTICE, the current trial court automation system, was designed and built in the early 1990s. Dramatic changes in technology have occurred, but JUSTICE has not been modified to include many of those advances. The Court asks for funds to retain an expert, independent consultant. The result will be a review of how well JUSTICE satisfies the needs of trial courts, and will provide guidance in deciding how long to expect to continue to use JUSTICE and when the Court should move to a new automation system using the latest technology.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.4 Other	$ -	$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00			$ 250,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00			$ 250,000.00
General Funds		$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00			$ 250,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS		$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00			$ 250,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	14	11	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	14	20	20	18.0	25
V: Technical Impact	16	18	20	18.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	7	8	7.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	9	8	8	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	15	16	14.7	20
			TOTAL	**79**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals and projected outcomes are clear. The proposed study is an essential part of the life cycle of IT investments. A periodic evaluation of requirements, costs, best practices, and options is important. - Goals, etc. are well defined. Door to enhancing existing Justice System was left open. Development of a long range technical plan is critical to the success of the trial court system.	- The project outcomes should include a cost benefit study of the different options under consideration (modify JUSTICE, build a replacement system, buy a replacement system, or do nothing). The study should look at potential changes to processes that would improve the operations of county and district courts. - Measurement methods are too general to assure that the consultant is progressing successfully. In reviewing the Supreme Courts IT Comprehensive Plan, I could not find direct discussion about the need to take a comprehensive look at the trial court system.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- This section should list specific deficiencies with JUSTICE cited in the studies by the National Center for State Courts and National Center for Juvenile Justice. How significant are these

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		deficiencies? What are some of the major features of the ASFA as they impact courts? - While this section discussed the benefits of a "revitalized" trial court system, it did not answer the question "Why use an outside consultant?". Likewise the other solution did not discuss the use of existing court staff to perform the analysis.
V: Technical Impact	- Analysis projects of this type do not typically have an immediate technical impact, so I awarded all points.	- The impact on other systems that share data with JUSTICE should also be addressed.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project sponsor was identified. At this point in the project definition stated milestones and deliverables are adequate.	- What is the projected timeline for the study? Will external stakeholders (attorneys, prosecutors, law enforcement) be involved? - There was not a statement that the stakeholders have "bought into" participating in the project.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Risks were well stated.	- Each risk could have been addressed individually with respect to mitigation.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Will the $250,000 amount be adequate for the scope of services? Some comparison with other studies would help to determine if this amount is reasonable. Section VII indicated that the State Court Administrator would provide temporary court staff to allow participation of senior staff in the study. Is this cost included in the $250,000? - Detail was not provided to determine if costs such as travel, lodging, etc. are included in the cost projection. Detail was not provided to determine whether temporary staff costs are included. Location in budget request not identified.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Education	Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming, and Training	$10,000,000	$10,000,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming and Training Project intends to capitalize on the three strategic initiatives of the NITC in order to improve the access, content and training opportunities of distance learning to address the essential education expectations for all Nebraska schools. These initiatives include:

- Network Nebraska. The primary objective of Network Nebraska is to develop a broadband, scalable telecommunications infrastructure that optimizes the quality of service to every public entity in the State of Nebraska. Potential benefits of Network Nebraska include lower network costs, greater efficiency, interoperability of systems providing video courses and conferencing, increased collaboration among educational entities, and better use of public investments. Specific technologies required: Network routers that can ensure differentiated qualities of service for various data applications.

- Statewide Synchronous Video Network. This initiative will establish an Internet Protocol-based, high bandwidth network that will interconnect all existing and future distance learning and videoconferencing facilities in the state. Benefits include greater sharing of educational courses and resources; more efficient use of available resources; and one-to-many videoconferencing capabilities for alerts and emergency situations. Specific technologies required: School site routers, Aggregation point routers, School site Codecs (Coder-Decoders), School LAN upgrades, Distance learning scheduling/management system.

- Nebraska eLearning Initiative. This initiative will promote the effective and efficient integration of technology into the instructional process and will utilize server-based course management software to deliver enhanced educational opportunities through web-based instruction. A standards-based eKnowledge repository will provide students and teachers equitable access to rich instructional resources. Specific technologies required: Primary and Secondary course management software servers, Digital content library, School site content servers, eKnowledge repository server.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Network Nebraska

Account Description	FY 06 Adj Req	FY 07 Adj Req	Ongoing
Backbone Transport Costs (preK-12)	$ 500,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 1,500,000
Subtotal	**$ 500,000**	**$ 1,000,000**	**$ 1,500,000**

Statewide Synchronous Video Network

Account Description	FY 06 Adj Req	FY 07 Adj Req	Ongoing
School Site Router Hardware	$ 800,000	$ 800,000	$ 0
School Site Router Maintenance	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000
Aggregation Point Router Hardware	$ 1,300,000	$ 0	$ 0
Aggregation Router Maintenance	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
School Site Codec Hardware	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,500,000	$ 0
School site Codec Maintenance	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
Ancillary Equipment/LAN upgrades	$ 1,200,000	$ 1,700,000	$ 500,000
Scheduling/Management system	$ 745,000	$ 725,000	$ 350,000
Training and Support	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
Subtotal	**$ 6,395,000**	**$ 5,575,000**	**$ 1,700,000**

eLearning Initiative and Knowledge Repository

Account Description	FY 06 Adj Req	FY 07 Adj Req	Ongoing
Course Mgt Software Licensing	$ 60,000	$ 100,000	$ 160,000
Primary, Secondary Server/Licensing	$ 175,000	$ 330,000	$ 295,000
Discovery Digital content library	$ 125,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000
Site-based content servers	$ 1,650,000	$ 1,650,000	$ 0
Content server installation	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 0
Training and Support	$ 245,000	$ 245,000	$ 245,000
eKnowledge Repository	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000
Acute content shortage resources	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000
Subtotal	**$ 3,105,000**	**$ 3,425,000**	**$ 1,500,000**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	14	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	25	20	25	23.3	25
V: Technical Impact	16	20	18	18.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	8	9	7.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	8	10	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	15	19	14.7	20
			TOTAL	**85**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The narrative provides a good overview of the scope and intent of the project. - Strong tie to the objectives of the Ed Council - Outcomes and beneficiaries very well defined. Outcomes are clearly in line with current NITC direction of Network Nebraska in terms of traffic aggregation, collaboration and open standards support.	- The narrative does not include any indication of how the content will be provided. The infrastructure must be put in place to deliver content, however, the content must be readily available and it is not clear how this content will be developed. - Statewide scheduling system is not a given and may not be needed; proposal seems very "centralized" compared to a more robust, regionalized, redundant which would be more a efficient transport bandwidth. - While measurement and assessment methods do appear to be a bit weak they are simply a construct of methods from other projects which are well defined. While this is nominally a weakness it is not a functional problem.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- The narrative provides solid fiscal and technical justification for moving forward with this proposal. - The potential benefits to the project are truly phenomenal. In addition to the well stated benefits of the project there is a significant but more esoteric benefit to be gleaned. This project would play a significant role in bridging the digital divide not only from and education perspective but also in a secondary way from an economic development perspective. The presence of high bandwidth IP services in local telco/cable COs will facilitate availability of those services to business, local government and private customers as well as K12.	- Overlooks the value of the current installed infrastructure when only states $20M; tendency to oversell benefits--may not be lower network costs; expand on opportunities there will be; minimizes tech support/role of ESUs; QoS of "carts"--don't oversell
V: Technical	- The narrative provides information on how the	- The narrative does not adequately provide an

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Impact	proposed technology offers a better technical fit for K12 schools along with an indication of the greater cost-effectiveness of this solution. - Better use of current bandwidth; in line with current state standards/recommendations - Distance learning specifications are well defined for a document at this level	indication of how "server farms" will be used and the content they will house. Most importantly, ongoing costs of these server farms are not mentioned nor is there any indication of inducements for teachers to provide content. - Network design vague; providers may determine design and price based on $$ available; centralized vs. distributed design a concern (related to eLearning initiative). - E-Learning implementation guidelines are not well defined. While a general plan is in place no standards are specified to guarantee interoperability or upgrade protection.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The narrative addresses the minimum technical information with some mention of the content that will be delivered. - For a document at this level of development this is fine - though obviously there is a tremendous amount of detail work and problem solving that is glossed over.	- The narrative does not adequately address incentives for content development or how this will be funded. - overly optimistic about moving remaining schools not using statewide backbone--July 1, 2005 not possible.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The narrative provides some overview of likely barriers to adoption as the local level. - There are very few risks to this approach from a technology point of view. In fact - this approach moves from a very high-risk implementation (the current non standardized aging implementation) to a standardized lower risk model. The assessment that risk will be in terms of end user buy-in is very accurate and seems to be appropriately anticipated and addressed.	- The narrative does not adequately factor in the likely resistance of those urban districts that may not see the value of distance learning within their district. - overlooks power of local control attitude of local regional DL coordinators; big political battle looms.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The narrative provides an accurate overview of how the proposed monies will be spent. - Seems to be reasonable assuming skilled and progressive project management. Good project management and implementation team leadership will be an absolute key to both functionality and staying under budget. This cannot be done in a business as usual fashion but must be designed up as a scalable open standards based future proofed solution - which is not a model that K12 has consistently adopted in the past.	- The notion of achieving postalization of Internet rates in this fashion puts the State in a position of funding schools differentially. Further, unless the plan is tied to consolidation practices the full economic benefit cannot be realized. Finally, no incentive is provided to urban districts that might be interested in producing content if there were financial incentives. - without knowing actual network design, costs of network questionable; schedule system dollars need not established.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The Education Council encourages continued efforts to seek other funds and to work with providers to keep annual (recurring) costs to schools at or about the same rate as they currently pay. If this funding request is not successful or only partially successful, there is an additional risk that schools will cease to participate in distance learning and the network upgrade project due to increased costs. However, that same risk exists if the system is not upgraded with State sponsorship and the annual costs increase significantly when a new contract comes due. We encourage the NITC, its work groups, task groups, and councils to continue to coordinate discussions to find a mutually beneficial solution for the telecommunications providers and the educational community.

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The narrative does not include any indication of how the content will be provided. The infrastructure must be put in place to deliver content, however, the content must be readily available and it is not clear how this content will be developed. ***This is an excellent question and due to the brevity and technical nature of the I.T. project proposal, it was not described in detail. The content or programming portion of the proposal will be addressed through several different mechanisms in order to achieve equitable educational opportunity.*** ***First, the Synchronous Video Network Upgrade will allow each school the capacity to send and receive multiple, simultaneous videoconferencing channels in order to enhance their course exchange with other schools. The NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group has been discussing the implementation of an entrepreneurial approach to course origination that would stimulate content development for small and large schools. The same system also allows ad hoc, just-in-time videoconferencing to occur with science centers, museums, and informal education centers from all over the country.*** ***Secondly, the eLearning Initiative (Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget) identifies purchase of a Discovery Digital content library which is the rich media resources that will be accessible to every school, teacher and learner for immediate download or for enhancement of web-based courses.*** ***Thirdly, the eLearning Initiative provides for an eKnowledge Repository that functions as the digital storehouse for teacher-developed and commercial content. Searchable, retrievable, and compliant with SCORM standards, the courses, modules, or units of instruction will be able to be exported to the Repository from any major course management software server. Also, the eLearning Initiative identifies $250,000 per year for acute content shortage resources. This may include the purchase of distance learning teacher contracts who can offer a variety of video and online courses (e.g. Foreign Languages, Calculus, AP courses) to a number of schools across the State throughout the day. It also allows for purchase of content from commercial providers (e.g. Class.com, NovaNet)*** - Statewide scheduling system is not a given and may not be

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
	needed; proposal seems very "centralized" compared to a more robust, regionalized, redundant which would be more a efficient transport bandwidth. ***NDE agrees that a statewide scheduling system may not be needed. Regionalization of education programming is an attractive option to reach self-sufficiency and one that is being discussed by the Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group; either within community college areas or within a consortium of schools or Educational Service Units.*** ***True, early results from the IP-based video system used by the Southeast Nebraska Distance Learning Consortium show that school-to-school interaction and course exchange can occur without a scheduling system. However, to facilitate a true Statewide Synchronous Video system, some mechanism needs to be put in place to allow other communities of interest to interface with education and to allow outside entities to view scheduled usage and open opportunities to use videoconferencing facilities without having to place a phone call or e-mail to each site coordinator.*** - While measurement and assessment methods do appear to be a bit weak they are simply a construct of methods from other projects which are well defined. While this is nominally a weakness it is not a functional problem. ***Indeed, each Initiative within the overall project proposal will have its own measurement and assessment methods. The "increased number of educational opportunities and instructional resources should translate into increased student progress and achievement and more equitable learning for students all over the State" is the overall goal that would also lend itself to subsequent measurements.***
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Overlooks the value of the current installed infrastructure when only states $20M; tendency to oversell benefits--may not be lower network costs; expand on opportunities there will be; minimizes tech support/role of ESUs; QoS of "carts"--don't oversell ***Although the third paragraph in this section refers to very large bandwidth (DS3 or 45 megabit connections), the wording probably does not adequately address the foresightedness of the original projects to trench fiber to 95% of Nebraska's high schools. The "lower network costs" refers to the cost comparison between upgrading as an entire system versus upgrading as individual schools, ESUs or distance learning consortia.*** ***Under Item #5 Networking, it is true that ESUs have done a great job with Internet aggregation, consolidating 500+ school districts into eight major Internet aggregation points. Network***

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
	Nebraska has the capacity to take that arrangement one step further; to allow all schools to combine their Internet demand with other public entities in order to get even lower pricing. Case in point, Network Nebraska's Internet1 unit pricing has decreased by 55% over the past 14 months through leveraged buying power. ***The Quality of Service of the interactive IP video service delivered through the mobile carts will largely be ensured through dedicated bandwidth and packet management software within Network Nebraska or out over Internet2. Only when the videoconferencing connection is made over the commodity Internet will the signal be considered as 'best effort'.***
V: Technical Impact	- The narrative does not adequately provide an indication of how "server farms" will be used and the content they will house. Most importantly, ongoing costs of these server farms are not mentioned nor is there any indication of inducements for teachers to provide content. ***The content that will be housed is the course content that will be developed and stored by individual teachers.*** ***The Financial Analysis and Budget section does mention $295,000 ongoing for acquisition, maintenance and growth of the primary and secondary servers and licensing. Currently, the NWSDAC purchasing consortium for K-12 has one dual-processor server with a capacity to serve 20,000 users. The primary/secondary server farm strategy would link several servers together for course management software and content management while using several load balancing database servers on the front end. The technology of these systems is emerging. Regionalized or distributed design of content and course management services is also an option, in order to scale to 150,000 users statewide.*** ***The planned use "server farms" is intended to provide a server architecture that is more scalable and cost-effective when supporting large numbers of users. Traditional large servers require a large up-front investment in a big server environment, and then smaller investments in extra RAM, processors, network interfaces, etc. up to a point, when another large server is required to replace or complement the original. Server farms, on the other hand, require a larger initial investment in a hardware-based load balancer and a number of servers, but theoretically avoid the long-term capacity/performance cap because as more capacity is needed (or as a machine fails), one simply adds another small server into the farm & extend the capabilities. It is also easier to establish fail-over systems and redundancies***

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
	with server farms because they are more modular. Due to the more modular nature of server farms, ongoing costs are expected to be more modest. - Network design vague; providers may determine design and price based on $$ available; centralized vs. distributed design a concern (related to eLearning initiative). ***Detailed network design documents have not been rendered. Early design options from providers suggest a 45mbps ATM infrastructure to each school within a region with aggregation routers used to partition the Internet1 and Internet2 to the statewide backbone.*** ***The eLearning network design will likely be more centralized at the beginning of the project, with one or 2 distributed sites at ESU's that could be used for fail-over or better performance for western Nebraska locations. As the project matures, the network would be widely distributed out to the ESU's with multiple fail-overs, with a problem with the machines or network at one ESU failing over to access the servers at one of the other ESU's.*** ***Ideally, the eLearning network design would complement the larger Network Nebraska Initiative as well--expanding as the network does, and providing value to the institutions that buy in to the project.*** - E-Learning implementation guidelines are not well defined. While a general plan is in place no standards are specified to guarantee interoperability or upgrade protection. ***In terms of technology, there are well-established interoperability standards that vendors must comply with in order to be competitive. Strong compliance with these standards must be a criterion for selection of a vendor. In terms of standards of content across institutions in Nebraska, the eLearning Initiative will work with member institutions to establish these standards.*** ***A few examples of interoperability standards are http://imsproject.org/ and http://www.adlnet.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=ADLTechnologies (SCORM standards being an important example of ADL technologies). SCORM represents a collection of specifications and standards that are built upon standards taken from other organizations [such as IMS] and extends their capabilities.*** ***There are four parts to the SCORM standard: (i) the content description, (ii) the API which is a set of methods that enable***

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
	the use of contents by any kind of SCORM compliant Learning Management System (LMS), (iii) the data model, that enables data to be stored in a way related to the use of the content by a LMS, and, (iv) Metadata (LOM), to standardize the attributes which describe the learning content. ***SCORM's main advantage is that it is based on a stable technical standard that is XML. The SCORM API implemented by the learning content object (also called SCO or Sharable Content Object) provides total independence from the LMS.*** ***The eLearning Initiative and eKnowledge Repository will rely on SCORM standards for each Learning Management System (LMS) that interacts with it.***
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The narrative does not adequately address incentives for content development or how this will be funded. ***At the outset of the project, the licensing, training, and implementation of course management software for teachers and students will take priority. During the first two semesters of implementation for teachers, they will be converting their existing web material to the course management software system and also be writing new material on the course management system to supplement each of their courses. Once a critical mass of experienced users has been established (2006-08), the content development incentives can be established, primarily at the local level. The Financial Analysis and Budget section does prescribe $250,000 per year for development of acute content shortage resources as well as $300,000 per year for administration of the searchable eKnowledge Repository.*** - overly optimistic about moving remaining schools not using statewide backbone--July 1, 2005 not possible. ***"It is possible that 90%-100% of the remaining school districts could join the network as early as July 1, 2005, pending e-Rate approval and reimbursement." IS an optimistic projection and is also quite feasible.*** ***The State of Nebraska school districts, with the help of the ESUs, have already aggregated themselves into eight Internet purchasing units (ESUs 13-14; ESUs 10, 11, 15, 16; ESUs 1, 2, 7, 8, 17; ESU 3; ESU 9; ESU 18; ESU 19; ESU 4, 5, 6). Of these eight purchasing units, two are already on Network Nebraska (ESUs 10, 11, 15, 16; ESU 18), representing 164 school districts and about 80,000 students. Serious discussions are already underway with the other six purchasing units and each of their Internet Service Provider contracts are either up for bid in 2005-06 or the units are considering purchasing a***

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
	portion of their Internet service from Network Nebraska in order to take advantage of Internet2.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The narrative does not adequately factor in the likely resistance of those urban districts that may not see the value of distance learning within their district. ***Correct, resistance could be considerable as long as urban districts continue to view "distance learning" as a series of static classrooms with one course exchanged per class period with one origination site and up to three receive sites. The network upgrade would not only preserve these assets but also add perhaps hundreds of IP video units from carts, desktops, and laptops, enabling students, teachers, and administrators routine access to "just-in-time" learning or videoconferencing. It would also allow unprecedented access to web-based content and totally online classes offered by a remote origination point.*** ***The resulting network of 267 largely rural districts on 45-meg or 100-meg, flexible use circuits allows many entrepreneurial possibilities.*** ***Urban districts may want to explore marketable services addressing acute content shortages, training, advanced courses, and staff development to smaller districts. They are also in a unique position to partner with informal education entities from urban centers (e.g. Henry Doorly Zoo, Folsom Children's Zoo, SAC Museum, etc…) to offer ad hoc content to rural districts.*** - overlooks power of local control attitude of local regional DL coordinators; big political battle looms. ***A number of task group and work group meetings have been held to address the concerns of the DL coordinators. The discussions have focused on increased networking potential to achieve enhanced educational services for every school. The proposed 45 or 100mbps flexible use circuits to every school that carry web-based classes and multiple IP videoconferences will technologically accommodate this goal, regardless of the political or jurisdictional challenges. Providers have shared that the overall network upgrade project is most feasible by using a federated approach that upgrades all the affected schools at the same time, even before their current contracts expire.***
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The notion of achieving postalization of Internet rates in this fashion puts the State in a position of funding schools differentially. Further, unless the plan is tied to consolidation practices the full economic benefit cannot be realized. Finally, no incentive is provided to urban districts that might be interested in producing

	Agency Response to Reviewer comments in *bold italics*
Section	**Weaknesses**
	content if there were financial incentives. ***The preK-12 Backbone Transport funding attempts to recognize that in order to establish a statewide education network, some intrastate transmission of data would be necessary. Those cost algorithms have not been discussed or allocated. The FY06- FY07 amounts simply create a funding placeholder to make data transport on the backbone non-cost-prohibitive.*** - without knowing actual network design, costs of network questionable; schedule system dollars need not established. ***The estimated costs for the wide area high bandwidth networking and the scheduling system were derived from industry and provider quotes.***

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar	$ 1,249,110	$ 45,475

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

AIMS TO AVATAR – REGIONAL CENTER INFORMATION SYSTEM

- Lincoln Regional Center, Hastings Regional Center, and Norfolk Regional Center and Beatrice State Development Center are engaged in a State Psychiatric Hospital data system conversion from "Advanced Institutional Management Systems" (AIMS) to the Creative Socio-Medics (CSM) Corporation software called "Avatar". The goal of this project is to replace existing functionality for a system that is being discontinued and establish a standard electronic patient record. The Avatar system will include modules that address practice management, clinician workstation, and client funds management.

FUNDING SUMMARY

SCHEDULE 2(a)
CSM PROGRAMS

License Products	Qty (1)	Unit Cost	Cost	Annual Maintenance
AVATAR (2)				
Patient/Practice Management	Site wide		$ 284,800	$ 56,960
Clinician Workstation	Site wide		587,400	17,480
Patient Trust Funds	Site wide		43,200	8,640
HL7 Interface	3	$ 25,000	75,000	15,000
Wiley Libraries (4)	100			15,000
Total Avatar Licenses			**$990,400**	**$113,080**
AIMS Purchase Credits			(750,000)	
Net License Costs			**$ 240,400**	**$ 113,080**

1. Quantity represents named users or login with access rights to the CSM Programs; provided on a site-wide basis for the PM, CWS and Trust Funds applications
2. Avatar licenses will be installed on separate databases or servers for each of the following facilities:

   Beatrice State Developmental Center
   Hastings Regional Center
   Lincoln Regional Center
   Norfolk Regional Center
   Central Office or other location (test server installation)
3. Wiley libraries are acquired on an annual fee basis; a total of 100 books comprised of as many as four libraries may be acquired under this Agreement. Additional copies may be purchased for a period of two years from the date of this agreement for an annual fee of $150 per book.

Licensee may acquire the following products for a period of two years at the following prices:

PRODUCT	QTY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	ANNUAL FEE
SQL Middleware	6 facilities	$ 8,700	$ 52,200	$ 10,440
Set-Up Fees	N/A	N/A	$ 15,000	
Master Patient Index	1	15,000	15,000	3,000

SCHEDULE 2(b)
THIRD PARTY PROGRAMS

DESCRIPTION

3rd Party Licenses	**Qty**	**Unit Cost**	**Cost**	**Annual Maintenance**
InterSystems Cache' Version 4.1.3 for Windows 2000	253 (1)	$ 510	$129,030	$28,387
Total 3rd Party Licenses	253		$129,030	$28,387

Note:

- Quantity reflects concurrent processes required to support the number of named users distributed across the number of databases/servers defined in Schedule 2(a), inclusive of a test server. Total represents 229 defined concurrent application processes and 24 test user processes.

SCHEDULE 2(d)

INSTALLATION SERVICES

Professional Services	**Qty**	**Rate**	**Cost**
Project Management	1440	$ 188	$ 270,000
Software Installation/Engineering (1)	96	$ 175	$ 16,800
Training of Trainers (2)	480	$ 150	$ 72,000
End-User Training (3)	160	$ 150	$ 24,000
Implementation Services			
File Build Consulting	130	$ 150	$ 19,500
RADPlus Forms Development	160	$ 150	$ 24,000
Go-Live Support (4)	320	$ 150	$ 48,000
Grand Total – Installation Services	**2786**		**$474,300**
GAP Analysis Credit			($30,000)
Total Installation Services			**$444,300**
Optional Services (5)			
Project Management for Rollout	720	$ 188	$ 135,000
End-User Training	480	$ 150	$ 72,000

This issue updated 3-11-04	**Regional Centers and BSDC**	**Total to Date Invoice & Payments**	**Annual Software Maintenance**
AVATAR Product Licenses - Schedule 2a			
Practice Management	$284,800		$56,960
Clinician Workstation + Order Entry	$587,400		$17,480
Client Funds Management System	$43,200		$8,640
Wiley Libraries (4) 100 user manuals @ 150.00 per			$15,000
HL-7 Interfaces: Outbound LifeCare Pharmacy/ ADT + Reports	$75,000		$15,000
AIMS Purchase Credits and Enhancement Fees	*-$750,000*		
Total CSM License Costs	**$240,400**		$113,080
Total with Enhancement Fees of $16,233.00			**$129,313**
Database License - Schedule 2b			
Third Party Cache Licenses (253x$510 concurrent users)	$129,030		$28,387
Total Third Party Licence	**$129,030**		**$28,387**
Professional Services Fees - Schedule 2d			
Project Management	**$270,000.00**		
Project Management for Rollout			
Software Installation / Engineering	**$16,800**		
Training- Technical Support	**$0**		
Training the Key Users	**$0**		
Training the Trainers	**$72,000**		
Training the End Users	**$24,000**		
Implementation Services			

File Build Consultation	**$19,500**		
RADPlus Forms Development	**$24,000**		
Go-Live Support	**$48,000**		
GAP Analysis Credit	-$30,000		
Total Professional Services	**$444,300**		
Software Development - Schedule 2(e)			
GAP Analysis Items	$108,220		
SQL Reporting	$40,260		
Interface Development	$39,600		
Conversion	$19,800		
Order Entry Conversion	$19,800		
Total Development Costs	**$227,680**		
Expenses for Travel and Living	**$50,000**		
Total Contract Budget	**$1,091,410**		**$157,700**
Federal Reporting (50 Veterans Home Reports)	$0		
Servers(6)	$90,000.0		
Desktops	$3,300.0		
Crystal Reports (2 copies)	$3,200.0		
LifeCare Pharmacy Interface Delivery Costs	$100,000.0		
Network Cable	$6,000.0		
Data Communication Costs	$0.0		$2,400
Software Escrow Agreement	$250.0		$2,400
Total Additional Costs			
OPTIONS			
PDA (350 per)			
SQL Middleware for 5 facilities	$52,200		$10,440
Set Up Fees	$1,500		
Master Patient Index	$15,000		$3,000
Data Warehouse			
Oracle Standard Edition for MPI	$11,250		1856

Annual Maintenance (4 facilities) 45475

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	10	10	11.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	16	16	16.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	10	13	13.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	5	6	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	5	6	6.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	18	13	16.7	20
			TOTAL	**71**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives listed	- Measurement / assessment seem more like expected outcomes. Connection to agency comprehensive IT plan not clear. - No discussion on beneficiaries and expected outcomes
IV: Project	- Support from LB 1083 for reform and current	- Not a lot of information provided.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Justification / Business Case	product is not supported	- Tangible and intangible benefits not clear. No alternatives solutions described.
V: Technical Impact	- Use of test server to work out issues before implementing into live systems. - Appears to be extensive technical information taken from the Avatar implementation information	- Nothing expressed about future growth / adaptation plans. - No specific technical information on what will be used for this project. Lots of options given. Minimum standards listed in Avatar manuals will limit the actual usefulness of the equipment. Not enough information to determine if equipment will be appropriate for all tasks. Information provided for #8 is actually a continuation of expected answer for #7 (technical description). No discussion on reliability, security and scalability.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Training and implementation responsibilities are detailed. Deliverables and timeline are detailed. - Good list of stakeholders and project members. Extensive milestone task list, but there are questions on dates. Support information appears to be from contract and appears to be related to the contract support.	- Doesn't really explain the preliminary plan. Dates in timeline indicate this project will be almost complete before the funding is available in July 2005. No mention of support for hardware or any other future needs.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Indications of a gap analysis (however it was over 2 years ago).	- Risks / barriers not identified. - Barriers and risks not included.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Capital budget very detailed. Operational budget described in detail. - Extensive financial information provided. Appears to be directly out of the contract.	- Is there room in their operational budget for these ongoing costs? - No discussion on increased FTE support. Moving from a single AS400 to multiple, decentralized intel servers will probably require more personnel time. No discussion on replacement costs.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT	0.5-5Million	0.5-5Million

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Bio-terrorism threats have prompted a variety of technology needs. Today there are two major systems and IT supporting roles for BT. First, the National Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS) is a CDC based system to advance the development of efficient, integrated, and interoperable disease surveillance at federal, state and local levels. Second is the Health Alert Network (HAN) that is an essential system developed by HHSS to communicate critical information rapidly to Nebraska's health care partners.

During the next three years, the technology will be aimed at providing better and more secure communications among all the state partners. There will be needs for better data bases to work from. Systems will have to be more secure with redundancy built in.

FUNDING SUMMARY

HHSS BT money expected in FY05 ranges from $9-18 million. Similar amounts may be available in FY06 and FY07. The amount for technology has not yet been determined.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	15	12.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	15	25	20.0	25
V: Technical Impact	15	12	13	13.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	5	6	5.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	5	8	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	12	12	20	14.7	20
			TOTAL	**72**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Expands communications to larger part of Nebraska health sector. - The objectives of the project were laid out as to what they planned to do.	- No measurement / assessment methods to define success. No relationship to agency comprehensive IT plan given. - The goals were not identified very clearly and the beneficiaries were not included at all.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Federal funds used to minimize direct fiscal impact to Nebraska.	- Specific benefits not clear. Alternatives not clear. - The four lines that were provided in this area did not address any of the questions related to justification. I could never tell if this was a federal mandate or not. Even the wording indicates that the initiatives were not well defined.
V: Technical Impact		- Technology and implementation not clear. Future growth / adaptation not clear. - There were no technical initiatives described. Nothing in the document indicated reliability, security or scalability for anything being described. - Very little information was provided.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- No list of deliverables or timeline. No training or staff development planned. - There is no plan included.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- Very little information was provided.
VII: Risk Assessment		- Only risk / barrier identified is state policy. - The entire project appears to be described as a risk.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Substantial federal funds available for the project.	- No specific costs listed. How much state money is being requested? No ongoing costs listed. - There is no financial analysis or budget. The entire proposal appears to be a place holder for the possibility of getting BioTerriorism dollars.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)	Total 16M	Total 16M

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support) is designed to support centralized collection and disbursement of Child Support payments. Previously, child support collection and disbursement is handled by Clerks of the District Court in each county. The Federal government, through the 1996 PRWORA (Welfare Reform) legislation mandates centralization of child support collection/disbursement. Programming of CHARTS was completed in 2001 and implemented in December 2001.

Nebraska was required to implement a statewide application. The effort included coordination and integration of CHARTS, the State Distribution Unit (Treasurer's State Payment Center), JUSTICE (the court information system) and Douglas County.
CHARTS is used by the Child Support program to enforce child support orders and collect child support money for children. The state's Child Support collections have increased.

CHARTS Child Support Activities include:

- Location of Absent Parents
- Establishment of Paternity
- Establishment of Orders for Child Support and Medical Support
- Enforcement of Child/Medical Support
- Review and Modification of Court Orders
- Monitor Child Support Orders
- Collection and Distribution of Support Payments
- Interface with NFOCUS
- Interface with other state systems
- Interface with national systems
- Cooperation with Other States

The 2005 CHARTS work plan has been created. The work packages are subject to change if emergency issues arise.

FUNDING SUMMARY

CHARTS	Charts Budget FY'04 Actual	Charts Budget FY '05 Budget	Charts Budget FY '06 Budget	FY '07 Budget
Processor	2,135,880	$ 2,159,325	$ 2,159,325	$ 2,159,325
DB2	1,594,969	1,769,048	1,945,952	2,140,547
Printing 1 part	196			
Tape Mounts	58,396	59,611	61,102	62,629
Job Setup	268,114	268,114	268,114	268,114
Disk Storage	709,244	762,438	819,620	881,092
Job Output	12,949	12,949	12,949	12,949
LAN/Device Fee	-			
Fixed Function Term Conn.	420	576	-	-
Direct SNA Comp. Conn.	-	-	-	-
Direct Access	-			

Online Viewing	1,704	1,704	1,704	1,704
CICS	46,880	33,932	35,289	36,701
CICS Test	262	188	196	196
Printing 2 part	-			
Overlays/Page Print	27,057			
CMS-R22 Processor Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-R22 Proc. Non-Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-Local Printing 1part	-			
CMS-Tape Mounts	-	-	-	-
CMS-File Recovery	-	-	-	-
CMS-Disk Storage	26	26	26	26
CMS-Job Print	-			
Outbound E-Fax	-	-	-	-
Outbond Long Distance E-Fax	-	-	-	-
NT Application 2	-	-	-	-
Lotus Notes Apps Trans	18	44	44	44
Lotus Notes Storage	0	29	29	29
Accounting/Admin Support	9,600	12	12	12
Job Scheduler	210	210	210	210
Monthly Server Support	30,720	30,720	30,720	30,720
IT Support	-	-	-	-
Systems Prog/Senior	-	-	-	-
SWI Maintenance	-	-	-	-
AMC-Print Lines	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Classes	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Room Rental	-	-	-	-
Computer Paper/Ribbons/Misc	-	-	-	-
Software License (SAS)	-	-	-	-
Tape Cartridge	5	1	1	1
Vendor Software	-	-	-	-
Secure ID Card	65	1	1	1
Contract/Programmer/PCLan	-	-	-	-
Westlaw Mo. Software	-	-	-	-
Direct Software Cost	23,050	-	-	-
Misc.	8,993	8,993	8,993	8,993

Total	$ 4,928,759	$ 5,107,920	$ 5,344,287	$ 5,603,293
Staff Cost				
Contractors	$ 4,535,994	$ 4,947,452	$ 4,969,018	$ 4,969,018
FTE	$ 1,452,085	$ 2,774,983	$ 2,785,575	$ 2,785,575
Total Staff Cost	$ 5,988,079	$ 7,722,436	$ 7,754,593	$ 7,754,593
DCS	$ 210,684	$ 210,684	$ 210,684	$ 210,684
Sub Total	$ 11,127,521	$ 13,041,040	$ 13,309,564	$ 13,568,570

HHS Budget Cost (only)	**$ 1,639,679**	**$ 2,693,373**	**$ 2,693,373**	**$ 2,693,373**
IMService - IS & T Grand Total	**$ 16,025,827**	**$ 15,734,413**	**$ 16,002,937**	**$ 16,261,943**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	13	13	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	15	23	18.0	25
V: Technical Impact	1	12	0	4.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	1	6	5	4.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	1	5	0	2.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	15	18	14.3	20
			TOTAL	**55**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Good History of the CHARTS project - The list of objectives in Section III reflect a detailed plan of what will be accomplished. - The 2005 work plan is clear. It appears that several business and technical objectives have been effectively balanced.	- Where is the description of the new project proposal we are to review?? This is a project request form not a report form. Lots of acronyms that make no sense to me. - The measurement and assessment section lists increased child support collections/disbursements as the only metric for verifying whether the project outcomes have been achieved. Although that is the primary purpose of the CHARTS application, other possible metrics would include efficiency of staff, accuracy, compliance with state and federal requirements, system performance, and system operating costs. - Less insight is provided for future years -- I assume the issues will be similar but the specific objectives will be based on current business needs at that time. I suggest the project consider using the Federal incentive metrics for assessing success since increased collections will likely occur with or without the planned enhancements.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- The answer to question 4 lists six general benefits to justify $16M in expenditures, no information is provided for question 5, and the information for question 6 implies that FSA88 and PRWORA mandate every aspect of the project. This section should indicate the relative benefits, type of benefits, and magnitude of effort for the proposed outcomes. How will the work be prioritized? What would be the consequences of not achieving some of the outcomes? What would be the consequences of reducing the ongoing level of support by $1M or $2M, for example? - Consider tangible monetary benefits related to federal performance bonuses
V: Technical Impact		- No answer - total loss of points - No information is provided for either questions 7 or 8. Very likely, none of the changes to the system will have a major technical impact, except

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		for some of the performance improvements and new interfaces with DOL and other systems. If so, this should be stated, and any other issues in questions 7 and 8 should be addressed. - Not answered
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Excellent work plan. - Major milestones and timelines are addressed for fiscal years 05 and 06.	- There is no information regarding questions 9, 11, and 12. - Items 9, 11 and 12 are not addressed. Fiscal year 2007 is not included.
VII: Risk Assessment		- No answers - No information is provided for questions 13 and 14. - The items were not addressed.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Very hard to make sense out of it. Seems awfully expensive - This appears to be the entire operational budget for the CHARTS application, rather than just the costs of the proposed enhancements. Estimated cost for each enhancement or group of enhancements would be more useful.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Compudata	$ 536,585	$ 83,485

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

State of Nebraska Veterans' Homes are engaged in a data system conversion and maintenance agreement upgrade. The Veterans' homes will be converting from two existing systems, "Advanced Institutional Management Systems" (AIMS) and Compudata, to a new release of Compudata Software. The new Compudata software offers improved functionality in the areas of Admissions, Discharges and Transfers (ADT/Census), Billing, Resident Funds, Accounts Receivable, General Ledger, Care Plans, Physician's Orders and MDS/User-defined Assessments. The Minimum Data Set (MDS) feature, which is crucial for a facility's success or failure in both PPS reimbursement and state or federal surveys, is of particular interest to the Veterans' homes.

FUNDING SUMMARY

ONE TIME CONTRACT COSTS	GIVH	NVH	WNVC	TFVH	CO	Upon Execution	Upon Delivery of Software	Upon Final Acceptance	Total
Financial Software Costs									
Exhibit A II.-A.: Software **License** Fee	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000		$50,000	$50,000		**$100,000**
Exhibit A II.-A.: **Custom Programming w/ Interfaces**						$15,600	$15,600		**$31,200**
Exhibit A II. -B: **Oracle Conversion** Fee									
Exhibit A II. -C: Monthly Maintenance Patient Accounting									**$24,000**
Exhibit A II. -D: Oracle License ($295x283)	138	70	23	47	5				
Exhibit A IV. - Electronic Laser Forms (8) license						$2,800			**$2,800**
Software On Site Installation (Financial Package)									
Exhibit B IV A: On Site Installation Assistance (22 days)	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$10,000		$12,000		**$12,000**
Exhibit B IV B: On Site File Server Installation (2 days per server)	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000		$10,000		**$10,000**
Exhibit B IV B: Visit Expenses for 5 people							$5,000		**$5,000**
Maintence Upgrade to Windows Oracle									
Exhibit C **CHC Software Conversion to Oracle**	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$0.00	$14,000			**$14,000**
Exhibit C **Oracle Workstation Licenses (283x$295.00)**	$40,710	$20,650	$6,785	$13,865	$1,475	$83,485			**$83,485**
Exhibit C **MidRange Data Conversion to Oracle**	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000		$8,000			**$8,000**
Exhibit C **Custom Programming & Interfaces**									
Exhibit C **On Site Tech Services: Initial Data Conversion**	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000		$8,000			**$8,000**
Exhibit C **On Site Tech Services: Visit Expenses**							$5,000		**$5,000**
Exhibit C **On Site Clinical Training Services (4**	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000		$4,000			**$4,000**

session)								
Exhibit C **On Site Clinical Services: Visit Expenses**						$5,000		**$5,000**
Exhibit C **On Site Financial Training Services**	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000	$16,000			**$16,000**
Exhibit C **On Site Financial Services: Visit Expenses**						$5,000		**$5,000**
Exhibit C **On Site Technical: Go-Live Conversion**	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$10,000			**$10,000**
Exhibit C **On Site Technical: Go-Live Visit Expenses**						$5,000		**$5,000**
Total								**$348,485**
Servers	1	1	1	1	1			$75,000
Desktops 35 for GIVH and 14 for TFVH	$38,500			$15,400				$53,900
Crystal Reports (2 copies)								$5,200
Pharmacy Vendor Interface Program Cost LC / CHT								$34,000
AIMS Resident Data Conversion CSM / CHT								$20,000
Total Additional Costs								**$188,100**
Total Budget								**$536,585**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	10	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	21	15	16	17.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	10	13	13.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	6	6.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	6	6	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	10	13	13.3	20
			TOTAL	**70**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Reduces 2 systems to 1. Success determined by external audit. - Including the information in the Executive Summary, this section is pretty explanatory.	- Connection to agency comprehensive IT plan not clear. - Not sure if measurement methods will verify project outcomes. Goals also refers to information not available in this proposal (exhibit d of contract).
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- Tangible and intangible benefits not clear. - Very little information provided for any of these questions. #4 and #6 have the same answer and #5 does not have any strengths or weaknesses related to alternative solutions
V: Technical Impact	- Use of test server to work out issues before implementing into live systems.	- Nothing expressed about future growth / adaptation plans. - Answer to question #7 is the same as #1. Answer to question #8 appears to be what should

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		have been included in #7. No discussion on present technology and no answers to the questions in #8
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Training and implementation responsibilities are detailed. - Good description of project teams and training. Contract support information provided.	- No timeline supplied. - No preliminary plan for implementing the project, no milestones/project plan identitifed. Ongoing support for servers, staff time and costs not identified.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Project appears to have support of several people in the agency.	- Risks / barriers poorly identified. - Not sure a lot of effort was put in to identifying the risks/barriers and their importance.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Capital budget very detailed. - Good table of financial information	- Operational budget not described. Oracle is a maintenance-intensive system. Is there expertise on staff? How much will the annual license fees be? Is there room in their operational budget for these ongoing costs? - Some columns do not add up correctly, no ongoing costs identified,

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)	$30,000,000	$20,000,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Note: Please see the Quarterly NITC Reports for full information on the planned release schedule and priorities established for the MMIS system. This report is an attempt to highlight some significant change requests.

- MMIS Procurement. Process all MMIS claims. The new system will provide enhanced claims processing functions, thereby increasing claims productivity and accuracy; greater client/user flexibility allowing program changes to be made more efficiently. Implement process allowing web healthcare transactions. It will also provide the tools to manage and distribute work, track and report all customer contacts, and provide a portal for providers and clients to obtain and share needed information with HHSS.

- Implement DSS/MRS/SURS. - Tracking and reporting process/storage to support health care data analysis services; provides software to develop a range of reporting and data analysis tools.

- Implement new HIPAA Regulations – NPI – National Provider Identification – federal regulation

- Managed Care ASO Vendor

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY'04	FY '05	FY '06	FY '07
MEDICAID	Actual	Budget	Budget	Budget
Processor	1,053,534	$ 1,284,000	$ 1,284,000	$ 1,284,000
DB2	1,532	840	924	924
Printing 1 part	67,541			
Tape Mounts	151,065	165,000	169,125	173,353
Job Setup	155,939	165,000	165,000	165,000
Disk Storage	435,114	504,000	541,800	582,435
Job Output	23,731	34,800	34,800	34,800
LAN/Device Fee	-			
Fixed Function Term Conn.	5,148	4,896	-	-
Direct SNA Comp. Conn.	-	-	-	-
Direct Access	-			
Online Viewing	842	960	960	960
CICS	472,935	32,400	33,696	35,044
CICS Test	29,112	25,944	26,982	28,061
Printing 2 part	214			
Overlays/Page Print	22,781			
CMS-R22 Processor Prime	1	2	2	2
CMS-R22 Proc. Non-Prime	0	1	1	1
CMS-Local Printing 1part	-			
CMS-Tape Mounts	-	-	-	-

CMS-File Recovery		-		-		-		-
CMS-Disk Storage		12		24		24		24
CMS-Job Print		-						
Outbound E-Fax		-		-		-		-
Outbound Long Distance E-Fax		-		-		-		-
NT Application 2		-		-		-		-
Lotus Notes Apps Trans		1,627		2,400		2,400		2,400
Lotus Notes Storage		56		56		56		56
Accounting/Admin Support		-		-		-		-
Job Scheduler		441		1,800		1,800		1,800
Monthly Server Support		-		-		-		-
IT Support		-		-		-		-
Systems Prog/Senior		-		-		-		-
SWI Maintenance		-		-		-		-
AMC-Print Lines		-		-		-		-
IMS Training-Classes		-		-		-		-
IMS Training-Room Rental		-		-		-		-
Computer Paper/Ribbons/Misc		5		5		5		5
Software License (SAS)		-		-		-		-
Tape Cartridge		23		23		23		23
Vendor Software		-		-		-		-
Secure ID Card		65		65		65		65
Contract/Programmer/PCLan		-		-		-		-
Westlaw Mo. Software		-		-		-		-
Direct Software Cost		-		-		-		-
Misc.		4,967		4,967		4,967		4,967
Total	$	2,426,683	$	2,227,183	$	2,266,630	$	2,313,920
Staff Cost								
Contractors	$	1,864,431	$	2,824,088	$	2,836,796	$	2,836,796
FTE	$	713,517	$	2,148,893	$	2,158,993	$	2,158,993
Total Staff Cost	$	2,577,947	$	4,972,980	$	4,995,789	$	4,995,789
DCS	$	210,684	$	210,684	$	210,684	$	210,684
Sub Total	$	5,215,314	$	7,410,847	$	7,473,103	$	7,520,393
HHS Budget Cost (only)	$	116,303	$	275,000	$	275,000	$	275,000
IMService - IS & T Grand Total	$	5,331,617	$	7,685,847	$	7,748,103	$	7,795,393
Expanison budget						30,000,000		20,000,000
Final Budget	$	5,331,617	$	7,685,847	$	37,748,103	$	27,795,393

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	13	11	11.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	23	20	19.3	25
V: Technical Impact	12	13	18	14.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	7	8	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	0	0	0	0.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	18	18	16.3	20
			TOTAL	**69**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes		- The goals and objectives assume that the reader is familiar with the problems of the existing MMIS. An explanation of those deficiencies would help provide an understanding of the goals. It is not clear that the outcome would be a complete replacement of the existing MMIS. The measurement and assessment methods are too abbreviated for the magnitude of the project. No information is provided for question 3. - The timeframe to achieve the objectives is not clear. Consider metrics that will illustrate the improvement in claims processed without intervention and the increase in the number of detected fraud cases.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Current federal mandate (NPI) is identified.	- The information in Section IV is not adequate to explain or justify a $50M project. The answer to question 4 (project justification) should provide more detail and explanation of why the MMIS needs to be replaced. It should acknowledge that recent improvements to meet HIPAA requirements achieved the goal of avoiding possible penalties and lawsuits, but did not rectify the fundamental problems of an aging system. The answer to question 5 (other solutions) should provide an overview of the consultant's study and the four options that were evaluated. The answer to question 6 should explain the federal mandate, deadline, and problems with compliance. - Consider identifying tangible monetary benefits like reduced case processing costs and increased fraud recovery. - Item 3 - Assume that a new system does provide some efficiency, productivity, cost reductions/ratios, etc? ex - system expected to handle same volume at x% less cost?
V: Technical Impact	- Some description of the approach is included	- The information in section V is not adequate for a $50M project. What are the hardware, software, and communications requirements -- or will these be determined after a solution is chosen through competitive bidding? Will the technology of the new system be superior to the existing MMIS and why? No information is provided for question 8 regarding the proposed technology. - Technical impact is not well described. Technical requirements are missing. This may be

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		a consequence of the current stage of the project's planning efforts. Item 8 is not addressed. - Item 7 - Could be more effective and provide context if contrasted today's environment with proposed?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- The information is rather sketchy, even considering the project is still being defined. Regarding question 9, who is the project sponsor, and what approach will be used to insure stakeholder acceptance? Given the size of the project, will there be a formal project team and what project management methodology will be in place? Is there a need for outside assistance with vendor selection, contract negotiations, or independent verification and validation? - Most of the information is not available at this stage of the planning cycle. - Item 9 & 10 - Recognize no firm schedule, but perhaps could layout some hi-level timeline for major activities (ex - RPF Development, Solicitation, Selection, System Development, Implementation, etc..)
VII: Risk Assessment		- No information is provided regarding risks or strategies to minimize risks. The magnitude of a project to replace the state's Medicaid Management Information System requires early and frequent attention to risks. This section should not be ignored, even considering the early stages of planning.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Granted, this is in the early stages of planning, but what is the basis for the estimated $50M in costs? No information is provided regarding the need for new FTE or ongoing operational costs. - CICS projection is likely $300,000 understated - What is expansion budget in figures? Maybe add footnote about those costs given they're pretty significant?

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System	Total 12.2M	Total 12.4M

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Nebraska Family On Line Client User System (N-FOCUS) is an integrated eligibility, case management, benefit and service delivery system supporting major client service programs.

Note: Please see the Quarterly NITC Reports for full information on the planned release schedule and priorities established for the N-FOCUS system. This report is an attempt to highlight some significant change requests.

N-FOCUS is currently implementing 19 large projects plus other project level work areas:

1. A78 project completes the conversion of the Expert System software (AION) from version 7 to version 9.5. Remaining work and enhancements to the logic will be a large part of the Expert System work in the November 8, 2004 major release;
2. Web Enablement to determine the feasibility of meeting the business need to access N-FOCUS remotely;
3. Child Support Referral: A project level enhancement to the automated referral from N-FOCUS to the CHARTS system;
4. Behavioral Health: The decision has been made to incorporate the support community based mental health services into N-FOCUS functionality. A committee has reviewed many options available to HHSS based on compatibility and funding issues and N-FOCUS was the system of choice. This review was initiated due to the passage of LB1083;
5. Disaster Recovery;
6. Heath Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA): Since N-FOCUS currently pays some medical claims and stores medical information such as diagnoses for state wards and developmental disability clients, it falls under HIPAA regulations (transaction and code sets, privacy and security);
7. Print Architecture (Phase Four) which creates a new and improved approach to creating and printing correspondence;
8. Reporting Architecture;
9. Foster Care Review Board (FCRB): A project level enhancement to add required functionality for the FCRB to N-FOCUS. This is due to a finding in the federal SACWIS review mandating that FCRB functionality be part of the SACWIS (N-FOCUS) system.;
10. Protection and Safety Reform Project: The P&S Division is considering significant changes to the Intake process for child welfare. If the decision is made to proceed, there would also mean significant changes to the system including Intake, Case Plan, Court Report, etc. Some of this individual work will end up being project level work in itself, such as a redesign of Court Report and Legal Actions.
11. SVES (State Verification Eligibility System) Internet Application: Technical staff continue to test the access control stored procedure. IMS staff is working on changes to the SDX (State Data Exchange – automated exchange with Social Security Administration) display. The goal is to have all SVES users off the CICS application and converted to the web application.
    N-FOCUS Eligibility Summary windows: Enhancements are being made to these windows.
12. N-FOCUS Inquiry Internet Application: We would also like to obsolete the CICS inquiry application and convert all current users to the web application. IMS/DAS and N-FOCUS staff are coordinating this effort.;
13. HHSS Web Development: This is a technical research project involving all three major applications (MMIS, CHARTS and N-FOCUS). Research is ongoing on possible directions and overall architecture for HHSS web application development. A pilot has been chosen from the MMIS application.;

14. Performance Monitoring Review: A research effort within N-FOCUS to review how and why we capture performance information. This will include ensuring that solutions are implemented for previous CICS runaway task problems as well as current CICS usage reporting anomalies.;
15. Citrix and Expert System Compatibility: Although this effort will not be fully supported until post A78 implementation, technical research is in place with both N-FOCUS and IS&T staff to initiate some performance testing to determine how many users may be supported on a super sized Citrix server.;
16. Information Services Management has announced the elimination of their support to two automated systems: Impact Printing is scheduled for elimination on June 30, 2004 and the VM system is scheduled for elimination on June 30, 2005. N-FOCUS has several print jobs that use Impact Printing. Overall HHS, has many jobs still using the VM system. N-FOCUS staff is in the process of repriotizing other work to make the necessary transitions.;
17. Adult Protective Services (APS): A project level enhancement to add functionality to fully support the APS program within N-FOCUS. The time frame on this project is pressed by the IMS elimination of support for the VM system on which their current system resides
18. State Ward Accounts: A project level enhancement to add transfer functionality for tracking state ward funds from the AIMS system to N-FOCUS. The decision to do this was based on two issues: this is a SACWIS requirement and the AIMS software is being converted to AVATAR software;
19. Supervisory Database: N-FOCUS staff were instrumental is setting up a Lotus Notes database to help SSW Supervisors track case reviews, errors, etc. in support of the project to reduce errors in the Food Stamp program area. N-FOCUS staff also helped establish a database for Employment First (EF) supervisory review. Analysis is in progress to incorporate this review functionality into N-FOCUS to avoid having data in multiple locations.

In addition, there are several other projects underway that do not have as widespread an impact but still involve significant work:
1) AFCARS/SACWIS: Annual APDU is required to support ongoing funding and gain certification.;
2) FICA: Ongoing annual work. Impact printing project will directly affect this functionality.;
3) LIS (Licensing Information System): N-FOCUS has work to support this project;
4) Purge/Archive/Retrieval
5) Training Viewlets: Redesign of how we build and maintain the N-FOCUS training image;
6) Robohelp: Researching moving this to a web application.; and
7) XP Operating System; Office OX: IS&T initiative that will directly affect N-FOCUS. Initial staff research in progress.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY'04	FY '05	FY '06	FY '07
N-FOCUS	**Actuals**	**Budget**	**Budget**	**Budget**
Processor	**1,238,691**	**$ 1,248,421**	**$ 1,248,421**	**$ 1,248,421**
DB2	**4,202**	**4,763**	**5,239**	**5,239**
Printing 1 part	**6,287**			
Tape Mounts	**177,653**	**178,289**	**182,746**	**187,314**
Job Setup	**201,861**	**201,861**	**201,861**	**201,861**
Disk Storage	**411,767**	**442,649**	**475,848**	**511,537**
Job Output	**7,837**	**7,837**	**7,837**	**7,837**
LAN/Device Fee	**-**			
Fixed Function Term Conn.	**-**			
Direct SNA Comp. Conn.	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Direct Access	**-**			
Online Viewing	**698**	**698**	**698**	**698**

CICS	3,132,204	2,760,000	2,870,400	2,985,216
CICS Test	20,643	14,931	15,528	16,149
Printing 2 part	-			
Overlays/Page Print	27,576			
CMS-R22 Processor Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-R22 Proc. Non-Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-Local Printing 1part	-			
CMS-Tape Mounts	-	-	-	-
CMS-File Recovery	-	-	-	-
CMS-Disk Storage	6	6	6	6
CMS-Job Print	-			
Outbound E-Fax	-	-	-	-
Outbound Long Distance E-Fax	-	-	-	-
NT Application 2	4,680	12	12	12
Lotus Notes Apps Trans	4,003	10,006	10,006	10,006
Lotus Notes Storage	214	268	268	268
Accounting/Admin Support	-	-	-	-
Job Scheduler	-	-	-	-
Monthly Server Support	-	-	-	-
IT Support	-	-	-	-
Systems Prog/Senior	-	-	-	-
SWI Maintenance	-	-	-	-
AMC-Print Lines	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Classes	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Room Rental	-	-	-	-
Computer Paper/Ribbons/Misc	-	-	-	-
Software License (SAS)	-	-	-	-
Tape Cartridge	9	2	2	2
Vendor Software	-	-	-	-
Secure ID Card	65	1	1	1
Contract/Programmer/PCLan	-	-	-	-
Westlaw Mo. Software	-	-	-	-
Direct Software Cost	237,526	-	-	-
Misc.	1,064	1,064	1,064	1,064

Total	$ 5,476,986	$ 4,870,808	$ 5,019,938	$ 5,175,632
Staff Cost				
Contractors	$ 3,118,819	$ 2,874,396	$ 2,883,908	$ 2,883,908
FTE	$ 2,352,467	$ 2,948,900	$ 2,959,974	$ 2,959,974
Total Staff Cost	$ 5,471,286	$ 5,823,295	$ 5,843,882	$ 5,843,882
DCS	$ 210,684	$ 210,684	$ 210,684	$ 210,684
Sub Total	$ 11,158,956	$ 10,904,788	$ 11,074,504	$ 11,230,198

HHS Budget Cost (only)	**$ 1,089,004**	**$ 1,223,141**	**$ 1,223,141**	**$ 1,223,141**
IMService - IS & T Grand Total	**$ 12,247,960**	**$ 12,127,929**	**$ 12,297,645**	**$ 12,453,339**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	8	13	13	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	10	22	23	18.3	25
V: Technical Impact	10	16	18	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	8	10	8.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	8	9	7.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	18	18	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**75**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The 19 objectives are well documented.	- This is a catch all application. Perhaps they need up to 19 forms rather than one. Is it all or nothing? Each of the 19 need to be judged or prioritized, in my view. They do not describe the measurement of assessment methods to be used. No idea how this relates to their agency comprehensive plan. - Timeframes for delivery of the 19 objectives are unclear as are the relative priorities of the objectives. Consider metrics that measure program (business) outcomes. - A large project (or program?) hard to quantify in this document. Would it make more sense to focus on more of the immediate incremental steps instead of the broad spectrum of what's scoped?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- Did not answer the question - what other alternatives were considered. They list a lot of programs but which ones have which mandates? - Consider identifying specific monetary benefits such as reduced costs due to duplication of benefits or avoidance of federal penalties. Benefits are stated in general terms -- consider including specifics related to the Governor's initiatives such as behavioral health and child protection.
V: Technical Impact	- Scalability is addressed.	- So what? How does the requested project enhance or change what they currently have? #8 - If this is true, why are they requesting more $ for upgrading? - Technical elements are not well described nor is conformity with standards. - Given system originally deployed in 1996, maybe add some more verbiage to better explain how system/architecture has evolved to leverage newer technologies over time?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Several milestones are identified.	- Why are they asking for more $ when they state this is all in production? - No milestones for calendar years 2006 and 2007 are identified.
VII: Risk	- Strong process for involving stakeholders to set	- They need to expand the "sound-bytes" to

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Assessment	priorities. - Steering Comm good idea to manage changing priorities/issues	answer the question. They need to rate their relative importance
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- For a 12 million dollar request, it is hard to approve based on the information provided. Very week document. Very hard to figure out the budget, to many unknowns. - If contractor costs that high through 2007 (at least as high as FTE), are there other options to minimize that requirement cost?

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and Program	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,500,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project proposes to replace one-fourth of the personal computers (PCs) and standard software packages in use by HHSS (Health and Human Services System) per year. HHSS operates approximately 5600 desktop PCs in 150 locations across the state. Many of these PCs are old and well past their warranty coverage. Use of old PCs and outdated software hinder job performance for the user. The PCs are slow, the user can only have one program open at a time, many software programs will not run and they experience continual problems causing downtime and requiring a technician to come on-site to repair.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through **effective** health and human services. The availability of a reliable PC is essential to HHSS staff performing their job to serve the public of the State of Nebraska.

This is primarily a PC replacement plan and IS&T (Information Systems and Technology) Management would like to have the flexibility to use these funds to upgrade the standard applications as they become outdated or unsupportable.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of developing a Technical Plan that recommends a technical infrastructure that will be scalable, reliable, and efficient.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Included in the continuation budget is $1.5 million per year for Desktop upgrades.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	13	13	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	23	19	20.0	25
V: Technical Impact	17	16	17	16.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	9	8.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	8	8	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	16	14	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**81**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very clear goals and objectives.	- A listing of historical metrics of PC trouble calls, upgrade problems and other measurements would strengthen the section on assessment methodology.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- If available, actual downtime statistics and the percent that stems from old PCs would help document the business case.
V: Technical Impact		

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		
VII: Risk Assessment		
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- The budget requests $1,500,000 to replace 25% of 5,600 desktops, or slightly more than $1,000 per desktop. Is this amount consistent with current prices?

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	$281,600.00	$477,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Vital Records unit is charged with maintaining the official records for all birth, death, marriage, divorce, and fetal death events that occur in Nebraska. The new system will support the automation of on-line registration of events, use electronic signatures in issuance of vital records, provide standardization, integration of databases, efficient management and rapid responses to citizens, governmental agencies, businesses and others requesting vital event information. The proposed project is an upgrade to the current Vital Records system already in place.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
5. Training	$ 69,000.00	$ 22,800.00	$ 36,000.00			$ 127,800.00
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	$ 72,000.00	$ 148,800.00	$ 346,000.00			$ 566,800.00
8.2 Software	$ 975,300.00	$ 110,000.00	$ 95,000.00			$ 1,180,300.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 1,116,300.00	$ 281,600.00	$ 477,000.00			$ 1,874,900.00
Cash Funds	100%	100%	100%			
TOTAL FUNDS						

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	13	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	22	19	21	20.7	25
V: Technical Impact	15	14	16	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	9	6	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	5	8	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	14	15	14.0	20
			TOTAL	**76**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals are achievable and represent a benefit to both the agency and the public. - Clear statement of expected outcomes and assessment methods; identifiable/measurable benefits; benefits are widespread	- The assessment does not include any indication of user feedback to determine the impact of improvements. - A listing of the major functions and requirements of a "comprehensive information system" for vital records would provide a better understanding of the project. - Project appears to be driven in part by federal mandates, not always the best reason to do something but something that can't be ignored; without reviewing entire agency IT plan, it is difficult to assess how this project rates in the

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		overall agency plan.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- The review provides a succinct high-level list of the benefits of proceeding with this project. - Business process improvements are clearly identified; potential for increased federal reimbursement based on performance is a strong point.	- The review does not include any detail as to the nature of the "shrink-wrapped" applications that were assessed nor does it provide insight as to the primary reason for the selected application. - How much money could be generated by improving the timeliness of data submitted to the Federal government? Is there a penalty for not complying with the federal mandate for reporting additional information in 2005? How much staff time and other costs will be saved by eliminating paper processes and having to scan documents? Will hospitals and other major users benefit by eliminating paper? - Federal mandate as a project driver is unfortunate but real; it appears that a sole-source contract may be anticipated, which must be done properly under state contracting procedures and is likely to be scrutinized if a bid process is not pursued.
V: Technical Impact	- The narrative provides an indication that the solution is consistent with existing technology requiring no additional training for staff. - Improved performance for hospitals and others submitting data is stated, although not in great detail.	- The narrative provides no indication of the scalability of the solution nor is security addressed. - Describe the technical elements of the project, including hardware, software, and communications requirements. What changes in technology are required. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution? Is the system customizable? - "Using a modem" to submit data implies lower network speed but does not indicate whether data must then be entered manually. Statement that data would be input directly implies that manual data entry currently exists, but this is not stated.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The narrative provides a satisfactory overview of intent with some indication of how training will be provided. - Phasing the project with standalone deliverables is a good strategy.	- The narrative provides no indication of how the intent to change will be disseminated in advance of the implementation date. Given the importance of buy-in by end users this would seem to be a significant oversight. - Apparently the solution has already been chosen, in order to meet the January 1, 2005 implementation date for Phase I. What is the solution? - Not clear how 1/1/05 milestone will be met, although it seems to be driven by federal mandate. Very difficult to assess how reasonable other time frames are with little technical information. Would appear to be very challenging.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The narrative clearly indicates the basic mission critical task that must be performed and the need to limit the scope of the implementation given the timelines. - Accurately describes the greatest risk, since the project not only involves technical upgrades but also a vast amount of training.	- No contingency plans are listed or suggested. - A project with this many aspects and stakeholders probably has a much longer list of risks. It is essential to identify risks and develop mitigation strategies. For example, what steps will be taken to insure cooperation of all of the stakeholders listed in Phases II, III, and IV? Are there any technical barriers to connecting these entities to the system?
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The provision of figures is satisfactory.	- The cost of the "system" is high based on the relative specificity of its scope. Without some indication of the alternatives such a cost is not easily justified. For example, are there web-based packages that could provide equal functionality without a premium in the way of Microsoft licensing? - What is the basis for the budget? Other than training, will there be any consulting costs for

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		customization of the system? - Very difficult to assess without details. And, if the federal government provides reimbursement based on performance, wouldn't there be some dollar amount allocated to federal funds?

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan	$ 655,700	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project addresses the Health and Human Services Systems (HHSS) IT Technology Plan goal of maintaining a stable, responsive, dependable and secure Wide Area and Local Area Network Infrastructure. The project includes the acquisition and installation of Routers, Switches and un-interuptable Power Supplies to replace obsolete equipment currently in operation or equipment reaching the end of it's useful life.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through effective health and human services. The replacement of the network equipment across the HHSS supports intra-agency collaboration, communication, cooperation and security. The data network is the common information technology platform upon which staff can depend and one that enables them to securely connect to HHSS information technology resources across the state and with other public and private networks.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of aggregating demand, reducing acquisition and operational costs and creating support networks.

FUNDING SUMMARY

One-time cost to purchase 414 switches	$414,000
Cost to purchase 325 UPS systems	$162,500
Annual cost to lease routers	$ 79,200
	$655,700
	$327,850 State funds
	$327,850 Federal funds

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	14	13	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	22	22	21	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	17	16	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	9	9.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	8	9.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	15	16	16.7	20
			TOTAL	**87**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clear, concise goals are described that can be measured by specific timelines. - Proactive goal of replacing aging equipment, Project is included in the IT Plan. Power protection for those that don't have it.	- More detail on what equipment is projected to be replaced would help. Mean Time Before Failure information is not necessarily a factor in determining if a piece of equipment is obsolete. Actual failure rate information and cost to repair information would be more valuable.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Describes a very critical infrastructure that needs 24x7 support. - Maintaining high availability is a requirement in today's business environment. HHSS listed the number sites that are active.	- Although they indicate that there is not alternative to upgrading the infrastructure components, they do not mention the alternative of leasing these components through a centralized organization. - Assume that there are 95 sites that will be upgraded over 2 years, but information on number of staff members and clients served by these sites would add "value".
V: Technical Impact	- Security is an important area and this project implies improvements in this area.	- There is no description of what types of reliability issues they are attempting to resolve. - Proposal could use more definition on what equipment is being proposed. There is not real definition of what the new equipment will be nor does it identify what is being replaced. Without this information, it is difficult to determine if proposed solution is feasible. What security features are being added?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Have a strong, realistic timeframe for replacement. - Preliminary timeline should be workable. All work performed by current staff (and possibly telephone company staff - leased router).	
VII: Risk Assessment	- Good list of barriers and risks.	- Importance of barriers and risks not identified. For the most part, the barriers and risks are the same.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Very realistic costs in budget. - Federal/State funding split is great.	- Without more detail on what specific equipment is being acquired, it is impossible to determine if the funding is appropriate. This includes the purchased hardware as well as leased hardware. No discussion concerning annual maintenance on switches and UPS products.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)	$ 50,000	$ 50,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR) is an Intranet web-based Geographic Information Systems (GIS) decision-support tool developed by the NDOR Information Systems Division using web-mapping technology. It allows the user to query multiple databases containing road, bridge, railroad, average daily traffic (ADT) location, and a variety of other transportation data and map the results. Reports may also be generated using the data.

FUNDING SUMMARY

No financial information provided.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	7	14	10.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	12	24	17.0	25
V: Technical Impact	12	5	19	12.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	2	10	6.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	0	9	5.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	13	4.3	20
			TOTAL	**55**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives are valid - This project will greatly expand and broaden access to and the usability of the agency's GIS and associated data. By moving this system to a web-based application, it will greatly enhance individual (non-GIS expert) users access to and query of the agency's data. This is particularly important in terms of providing access to remote sites, such as the agency's District Offices. There is also growing interest within local governments to build on this proposed system to input and maintain local data related to local transportation systems and related infrastructure, which would in turn potentially make this local data available to state agencies and programs, such as Homeland Security and emergency response. Moving these systems to the web is an industry trend and a cost-effective technology trend that takes these applications out of a centralized office, with limited access, and makes them available to a much broader user community.	- No description of project other than the executive summary. No real answers to questions 2 and 3. Answer to question 9 implies this project is already complete. - The major weakness on this project proposal is will how the Project Proposal Form was completed, instead of the project itself. It would have been nice to have had a little more narrative information on how this project integrates with NDOR's comprehensive technology plan, however because I have set in on some of those discussions, I am comfortable with the level of coordination that is occurring.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- A major justification for this project is the degree to which it will greatly leverage the existing investments that NDOR has made in developing its GIS system. Moving it to a web-based application will allow many more users to access	- No other solutions were evaluated. Justification is weak considering the application is already complete, based on the answer to question 9.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	the data and with the potential for local government use, it has the potential to provide a cost-effective means for local governments to collect and access this type of data, which will also make this local data available at the state level. Relative to exploring other solutions, I concur with the agency's assessment that since they are an Integraph-based system, it makes sense to follow through with those integrated product applications. It is important to note that the data can be easily translated to other GIS systems.	
V: Technical Impact	- The software approach of this project is one that is mainstream and based on open-system technology. While the Intergraph GIS software used by NDOR is not a system that is widely used in Nebraska, it is a system that is well suited to NDOR engineering/GIS applications, and it is designed to provide easy, reliable import and export of data to open-GIS standards.	- No answer to question 8. Answer to 7 implies project is already implemented. Does not discuss hardware needs.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project is already implemented. - As noted in the project proposal, much work has already occurred in implementing this basic project. Now that the results of this pilot effort are available to be seen, there is growing interest in building on additional applications, both within the agency and with local governments. I believe there is adequate support available both from within the agency and from developers for this general approach and product.	- Project is already implemented. Why submit project proposal for a project that is already complete. If it is for enhancements, then no enhancements were identified.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The software upon which this project is based has a considerable longevity, reliability, and support both within the agency and external to NDOR. While the movement to the web is relatively new, there is a considerable level of expertise with NDOR related to the software upon with this project is based.	- No evaluation completed. - There are two potential area of risk with this project that occur to me. One area is how they will move this system from an internal agency-only access to the system to allow external access. The other potential risk is the fact that NDOR is an Intergraph shop and most other users in Nebraska are ESRI-based, including local governments. However, even those these concerns were not mentioned in the project proposal, I believe that the agency is aware of them and is proceeding at a deliberate pace to work through these potential areas of concern.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No answers to these questions. - Apparently no budget or financial analysis information provided

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Document Management System	$ 150,000	$ 200,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

NDOR creates and receives thousands of documents from multiple sources every day. Currently our users and/or application system managers are responsible for filing and maintaining those documents in individual files. There is not central repository for them. That creates obvious difficulties in providing uniform rules for version and audit control and creates extra work for employees when they have to go through a sometimes lengthy process to locate a document they need and facilitate point-to-point or point-to-many dissemination of copies.

With a Document Management System (DMS) we will be able to centralize our business approach and business rules for document control, security, version control, access and dissemination. A DMS will provide one-stop-shop capability for our internal and external customers and allow us greater flexibility in improving our document business process.

FUNDING SUMMARY

No financial information provided.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	13	15	13.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	16	16	15.7	25
V: Technical Impact	0	0	0	0.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	0	0	0	0.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	0	0	0	0.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	0	0.0	20
			TOTAL	**29**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are clear. - Good description of goals.	- Metrics are too generally stated to allow a judgment about the project's success. Consider a sampling approach to determine the impact on productivity. You might also try to quantify the impact of lost or misplaced documents -- have there been legal or financial consequences with the current paper system?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Intangible benefits provided.	- Not much information is provided to justify the project. - The proposal does not describe tangible benefits. The intangible benefits are simply stated and are not well developed. "Doing nothing" is not discussed.
V: Technical Impact		- The project proposal provides no information.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- The project proposal provides no information.
VII: Risk		- The project proposal provides no information.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Assessment		
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- The project proposal provides no information.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System	$ 750,000	$ 750,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Enterprise Asset Management System (EAMS) will provide a predictive maintenance process and work order management capability for three critical areas of NDOR operation—facilities, equipment and linear assets (road). The system will help forecast material, labor and equipment requirements for warranty and post-warranty repair or service in all three areas.

Deployed statewide in over 200 locations, EAMS will leverage a thin (web) client configuration and internet/intranet connectivity.

FUNDING SUMMARY

No financial information provided.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	15	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	16	25	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	20	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	5	7	6.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	9	10	10	9.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	0	0.0	20
			TOTAL	**68**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Migration from manual to automated processes. - Executive summary includes description of project. Goals appear legitimate.	- No details on what sort of systems might be purchased (hardware, software, consultation, integration)
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Specific, reasonable benefits. - Strong justification	- Solution has not been selected, so project proposal is weak in many answers.
V: Technical Impact		- Technical impact of project is hard to define when solution has not been selected. Most answers indicate that the selected solution will take in to account the issues mentioned in this section, but in reality, it is hard to prove that.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Sponsors identified.	- Information listed as dependent on final selection. Should have stated what will be required of a successful bidder. - Most questions can not be answered at this time. No project solution has been selected. - Many requirements not yet available.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Good list of risks identified.	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No budget of any kind was supplied. How much is requested and how will it be spent?

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Financial System Update	$ 150,000	$ 150,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This is an umbrella project for upgrades to the DOR Finance system to allow exporting financial data to the Nebraska Information System (NIS). The project requires some modification and upgrading of NDOR's mainframe finance system.

FUNDING SUMMARY

"Technology options for this project are still being researched. Until we understand exactly what combinations of software and hardware will be used we will not be able to adequately estimate either infrastructure or resource expenditures."

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	11	10	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	12	15	15.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	10	16	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	9	9.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	8	7	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	5	5	3.3	20
			TOTAL	**63**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Well written and fully explained	- Outcomes and metrics are somewhat general - It is hard to evaluate this section, since the magnitude of the project is not known.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- Could have described the custom application characteristics better - No discussion of tangible benefits such as cost avoidance or expected productivity gains. Intangible benefits are general. Analysis of "do nothing" alternative is not included. Could NIS be an alternative? - What are the specific benefits stemming from this project? Can NIS provide some of the functionality? It is hard to evaluate this section, since the magnitude of the project is not known.
V: Technical Impact	- Seem confident the upgrade will work and meet their technical requirements	- Don't know yet what platform the FSU would be running on - Technical elements are not stated.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Well done - There appears to be a good project management structure in place.	- The timeline has not yet been established.
VII: Risk Assessment	- OK	- Only mainframe technology risks are addressed.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No budget is supplied.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface	$ 75,000	$ 75,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The NDOR NIS procurement Interface Project is a two way interface between the NDOR Financial Systems and the NIS Procurement application. Transactions must flow both directions as these systems share information.

FUNDING SUMMARY

The Contract for People Soft work is approximately $150,000
DOR staff expenses will probably exceed $750,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	12	13.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	10	10	14.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	15	13	15.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	8	9.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	6	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	17	13	13.3	20
			TOTAL	**74**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Well done, although there seems to be an undercurrent of distrust between DOR and NIS - Specific goals are well identified.	- Does not describe assessments or measures of success
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Well done, although there seems to be an undercurrent of distrust between DOR and NIS	- No justification is provided. Is using the NIS system to feed the NDOR cost accounting system a viable alternative? - This section should summarize other potential solutions, including why NIS apparently cannot provide the functionality that DOR requires.
V: Technical Impact	- Interface format is proven and stable, as are the two applications.	- Turf war - does some discussion regarding philosophies need to happen between these agencies? NDOR and NIS team communication improvement?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Hopefully Peoplesoft does deliver as promised! - All areas are addressed - A good project management structure appears to be in place.	- The timeline indicates the project will be complete by March 31, 2005, which is in the current fiscal year. If this is correct, should the project be included in the biennial budget request?
VII: Risk Assessment	- $150,000 charge by Peoplesoft seems reasonable to risk - PeopleSoft has provided design information to reduce the risk.	- Some discussion about the challenges of keeping data in synch between the two systems would be helpful. - What are the resource requirements for NIS, and has NIS included this project in their schedule?
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The implementation costs are specified.	- It is likely that ongoing support costs will be incurred as PeopleSoft issues new releases of their software. - Some documentation to support the estimated costs would improve the financial analysis.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	PioneerNET	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,500,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In order to realize the full benefits of Nebraska's Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), an integrated software that actively monitors current (and future) field devices is required. The PioneerNET system software will meet those needs unlike commercial, off-the-shelf systems that offer only limited integration and do not provide the necessary flexibility for future changes. Our current systems are not integrated and the software provided by the manufacturers forces redundant entry and multiple programs to manage the system. ITS devices save time, money and lives by reducing delay on the freeway system, improving response and clearance of incidents, as well as reduction in secondary crashes. PioneerNET will be the software package managing the various components which provide functionality to each of the District Operation Centers (DOC).

PioneerNET will be consistent with National Transportation Communication for ITS Protocol (NTCIP) and NITC guidelines and is expected to have positive Benefit/Cost (B/C) Ratios. The system will include video servers, software servers, databases, and archive management servers located in each District. Without PioneerNET, NDOR will struggle to actively manage the freeway system which will result in additional delay and safety issues to the motoring public.

The financial budget is outlined in the Highway Program and the STIP and consists of three projects:
1. Functional Design of the Software
2. System Manager/Integrator
3. Software Development and Implementation

FUNDING SUMMARY

The financial budget is outlined in the Highway Program and the STIP and consists of three projects:
1. Functional Design of the Software
2. System Manager/Integrator
3. Software Development and Implementation

ITSN(2) - 2	**ITSN(2) - 001**	**Statewide & FMS Final Design**		
ITSN(2) - 3a		FMS Planning / Preliminary Engineering Study	$	250,000
ITSN(2) - 3b		Omaha FMS Design	$	400,000
ITSN(2) - 2d		Statewide ITS Element Design / PS & E	$	500,000
ITSN(2) - 2a		Statewide (DOC) Design/Software Functional Design (2000-E1: RFP)	$	900,000
ITSN(2) - 3c		Omaha FMS Software Functional Design	$	250,000
	ITSN(2) - 003	**System Manager**		
ITSN(2) - 2c		Statewide Software System Manager	$	600,000
ITSN(2) - 3e		Omaha FMS Software / Systems Manager	$	350,000
	ITSN(2) - 004	**Software Development/Implementation**		
ITSN(2) - 2b		Statewide Software Development/Implementation	$	1,250,000
ITSN(2) - 3d		Omaha/D-2 Software Development and Implementation	$	750,000
ITSN(2) - 3f		Hardware / Video Design	$	200,000

The Hardware and software will be determined during the first project listed above. New FTE's are not required to develop the software, but ultimately are needed to operate the ITS system. Initial discussions have considered contract staff to operate the system.

Currently, TTG is programming $500,000 annually for system maintenance and enhancements.

State Funds are used to match (50/50) the Federal Dollars of an ITS Deployment Grant.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	15	13	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	22	22	19.7	25
V: Technical Impact	13	19	19	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	9	8.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	5	10	9	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	19	14	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**82**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clearly defined benefits and integration. - Examples good for understanding scope.	
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- B/C ratios useful (if undocumented or explained).	- Another option that should be evaluated is whether it is more cost effective to have a central operations center rather than creating duplicative capabilities in each district office. What are the advantages and disadvantages of locating "video servers, software servers, databases and archive management servers" in each district office? How will data, information and decisions be integrated among district offices? - COTS solutions described as inadequate. The system proposed will be largely a custom system (i.e. one of a kind and proprietary). This means long-time operational costs will be higher and warranty help is more likely to be problematic.
V: Technical Impact		- No explanation of why COTS systems are not appropriate.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The project proposal identifies stakeholders and provides an overall timeframe. - Builds on an existing/ongoing project and requirement development.	- The project team is not identified, and there is no detail regarding the type of training that will be needed.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The barriers/risks stated were those typical of a custom application. There was good thought as to how to minimize the impact of those issues.	- This is a $5.5 million project that has a significant chance for scope creep and cost overruns, based on experience in other states. An additional strategy for mitigating this risk is to implement rigorous project management methods. - The barriers/risks stated were those typical of a custom application. These risks would be lessened by a less custom system, though other risks are then introduced.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- 50% federal match. - Project broken into phases.	- The financial analysis does not provide much detail about on-going operational costs, including the additional positions necessary to support the

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		system. - The budget seems large, though probably correct for development of a system. - Unclear on how amounts were reached (hourly, etc). Unclear on what will be state and/or federally funded. Very difficult to estimate development costs before requirements are completed.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System	$ 750,000	$ 50,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

To replace the existing 30 year old mainframe Project Scheduling System with new windows based Project Scheduling and Project Management System and to improve communication and overall time management, efficiency and timeliness of roadway projects to better serve the public.

FUNDING SUMMARY

"Cannot accurately determine, very early in the process we have not developed an RFI or RFP yet."

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	13	13	13.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	25	25	24	24.7	25
V: Technical Impact	10	18	16	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	8	8	8.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	8	8	8.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	0	13	7.7	20
			TOTAL	**78**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Well done. Good job in describing the issue and their goal to fix the aging systems	
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Well done, explained nicely to make their case - Shifting from mainframe environment to server/web environment.	
V: Technical Impact		- Not to the point yet to make a good assessment of this impact - Would be helpful to know what sorts of general questions/requirements would be included in the RFI/RFP to better understand what the finished product will provide.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Seem to have thought this through and have a good plan	
VII: Risk Assessment	- Seems like they need to do something as anything is better than the current situation	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No budget estimates provided - No budget provided. States "cannot be accurately determined," but at leased a list of probable expense categories would have been helpful. I have no idea how much they intend to ask for.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	$ 55,900	$ 56,290

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Vocational Rehabilitation section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources. This project will also provide the court with programming specific contract programmer(s) to work during development phases.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.2 Programming	$ 50,000.00	$ 52,500.00	$ 55,125.00	$ 57,881.25	$ 60,775.31	$ 276,281.56
2.4 Other	$ 2,900.00	$ 3,190.00	$ 3,349.50	$ 3,516.98	$ 3,692.82	$ 16,649.30
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.2 Software	$ 3,000.00	$ 600.00	$ 690.00	$ 793.50	$ 912.53	$ 5,996.03
TOTAL COSTS	$ 55,900.00	$ 56,290.00	$ 59,164.50	$ 62,191.73	$ 65,380.66	$ 298,926.88
Cash Funds	$ 55,900.00	$ 56,290.00	$ 59,164.50	$ 62,191.73	$ 65,380.66	$ 298,926.88
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 55,900.00	$ 56,290.00	$ 59,164.50	$ 62,191.73	$ 65,380.66	$ 298,926.88

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	11	12	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	16	18	17.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	18	16.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	8	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	6	7	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	18	12	17	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**74**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - This proposal describes technologies to be adopted in support of the Worker's Compensation Court's strategic plan. The specific project seeks to implement document creation, storage, retrieval within the court, and the subsequent transfer of documents to participants in the case.	- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good statement of benefits - The two components of the project, enhanced e-files and message management, are necessary to meet the court's strategic plan of a paperless court.	- Assume final statement on page 4 should be "will NOT achieve" - As described in the commentary, prior requests for document management were turned down by the legislature. The proposal makes no mention of any hardware requirements necessary to support the storage of the documents created within the system. The proposal is for a system that will stand alone within the IT systems of the Worker's Compensation Court. Since alternatives exist for both storage and messaging systems, the benefit analysis should include a comparison of the cost for an internal system when compared to IMS alternatives for both storage and message management.
V: Technical Impact	- The key technologies have been tested within the operational environment of the Worker's Compensation Court. These "proof-of-concept" tests greatly reduce the possibility of failure.	- Third party word processing solution seems to be moving to more "closed" rather than open architecture. - From the dialog, the reviewer must assume that existing hardware and operating software are sufficient to meet the needs of the expanded capabilities contemplated in the proposal.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project staff and key components of the project are listed.	- IT staffing on project may be too light. Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - The proposal contemplates an in-house developed solution, but the narrative only addresses implementation of message management, and message management deliver. Key milestones leading to implementation are not discussed.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Project narrative indicates that "proof-of-concept" testing has been completed. This will substantially reduce the risk associated with the project. If the technology is secure, the management of business implementation is correctly identified as the risk.	- Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful…either would impact this project. - Electronic document creation is listed as the first year project, while delivery of these documents is scheduled for the second year. This means that the court will continue to rely on the delivery of paper documents in the first year. Since messaging technology is available, perhaps the court should include electronic messaging in the first year of implementation.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Acquisition, custom programming, and hosting fees are listed in the budget. Reviewers must assume that software licensing fees are correctly stated, and that programming fees are within the range of services necessary to achieve the project.	- I would expect hardware requirements in a project of this nature. This project probably needs at least part-time project management resources assigned. - This reviewer believes that electronic storage, enhanced backup procedures and hardware, and messaging components may add additional costs not reflected in the budget form.

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

37-01 -- Court Re-enginnering - Vocational Rehabilitation

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.
WCC Response:
The goals are : Enhanced E-Files (document management) and Message Management (letter and document). Further elaboration was provided in Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case of the document. These objectives were set from analysis that has been completed and will be further explored by an outside consultant. This re-engineering initiative has been in process for several years. There are over two dozen documents that are available for review. Two major documents are Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Certification Notification and Assignment and Vocational Rehabilitation Case Management System.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Assume final statement on page 4 should be "will NOT achieve"
WCC Response:
Correct**.** The sentence should read "By doing nothing the court will **NOT** achieve its goal of being paperless." The CIO will correct before submission to the NITC.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- As described in the commentary, prior requests for document management were turned down by the legislature. The proposal makes no mention of any hardware requirements necessary to support the storage of the documents created within the system. The proposal is for a system that will stand alone within the IT systems of the Worker's Compensation Court. Since alternatives exist for both storage and messaging systems, the benefit analysis should include a comparison of the cost for an internal system when compared to
IMS alternatives for both storage and message management.
WCC Response:
The court had only submitted on project request for a document management system. The court currently has excess storage capacity in its current hardware to accommodate the increase in storage needs to store the digital objects for several years into the future. The court has an equipment replacement cycle in place in its continuation budget and assumes that there will be the normal increase in capacity at current levels of cost.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Third party word processing solution seems to be moving to more "closed" rather than open architecture.
WCC Response:
The statement is correct. The third party word processing components are specific to the Borland Delphi development environment. There is a continual debate as to whether closed or opened architectures is the best. Each has its pros and cons. Our current testing shows that this is the appropriate solution for our development environment.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- From the dialog, the reviewer must assume that existing hardware and operating software are sufficient to meet the needs of the expanded capabilities contemplated in the proposal.
WCC Response:
That is correct and is why they are not included in the request.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- IT staffing on project may be too light.
WCC Response:
This section should have included a resource line for contract programming. The Funding Summary does include dollars for such. In addition, a reading of our Comprehensive IT Plan does explain that the majority of our IT Staff is development resource. We plan and schedule our projects within the constraints of those existing resources.

Reviewer(s) Comments
-Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. Key milestones leading to implementation are not discussed.
WCC Response:
The two major milestones are defined. Any further project detail is speculative at this point and only definable as the project progresses.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- The proposal contemplates an in-house developed solution, but the narrative only addresses implementation of message management, and message management deliver.
WCC Response:
Do not fully understand this comment. The court has structured its technology environment as such that it normally builds custom solutions that meet its needs and purchases those items that meet can be integrated into those custom solutions. There are specific times where purchased solutions make sense.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful…either would impact this project.
WCC Response:
The consultant is being funding out of existing continuation dollars. The court has tentatively identified several candidate consultants who already have a proven track record in the work that is being requested.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Electronic document creation is listed as the first year project, while delivery of these documents is scheduled for the second year. This means that the court will continue to rely on the delivery of paper documents in the first year. Since messaging technology is available, perhaps the court should include electronic messaging in the first year of implementation.
WCC Response:
Paper delivery will always need to be an option and it incurs the least risk for the initial deliverable. When the project begins, all current assumptions and preliminary plans will be re-evaluated based upon the changes in the environment.
After the proposal was completed and submitted, technology available through IMServices has come on-line. The court is currently working with IMServices to define and implement the first phase of a concept called MyFiles.From.NE.GOV through the Enterprise Directory / State Portal. Phase One of MyFiles.From.NE.GOV will allow for manual upload and delivery of digital objects in secured way. Phase Two will include electronic acknowledgement of receipt and integration with other computer systems through web services to such systems as the courts planned message management system. The court is already into eFax delivery and plans to incorporate that into system.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- I would expect hardware requirements in a project of this nature. This reviewer believes that electronic storage, enhanced backup procedures and hardware, and

messaging components may add additional costs not reflected in the budget form.

WCC Response:

As stated earlier in this response, the court has adequate capacity for the next several years. The court has built into system replacement dollars for backup replacement systems. The court has already begun discussions with Department of Communications - Server Support on the possible use of the centralized "gator" backup system if enhancements can be made to the system that will accommodate our needs, specifically in the area of records management.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims	$ 58,250	$ 6,508

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Coverage and Claims section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first hardware / software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
7. Other Operating Costs	$4,250	$ 4,462.50	$ 4,685.63	$ 5,165.90	$ 5,424.20	$ 23,988.22
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	$51,500	$ 1,545.00	$ 1,622.25	$ 1,703.36	$ 59,617.69	$ 115,988.30
8.2 Software	$2,500	$ 500.00	$ 525.00	$ 578.81	$ 607.75	$ 4,711.56
TOTAL COSTS	$ 58,250.00	$ 6,507.50	$ 6,832.88	$ 7,448.07	$ 65,649.64	$ 144,688.08
Cash Funds	$ 58,250.00	$ 6,507.50	$ 6,832.88	$ 7,448.07	$ 65,649.64	$ 144,688.08
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 58,250.00	$ 6,507.50	$ 6,832.88	$ 7,448.07	$ 65,649.64	$ 144,688.08

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	11	11	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	18	15	18.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	13	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	5	6.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	6	6	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	13	13	14.3	20
			TOTAL	**72**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very strong outline of goals, beneficiaries, and method to verify that the project outcomes have been achieved. - Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - Project describes two additional components of the Worker's Compensation Court strategic plan.	- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear. - The project contemplates an in-house solution that may duplicate services already provided within DAS. The court should consider outsourcing print management to the DAS print shop. Message management should be developed in conjunction with the messaging systems contemplated in the Vocational Rehabilitation proposal.
IV: Project	- Good case as to why things are not working as	- Not clear if consideration has been given to

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Justification / Business Case	they are. Not sure there is a strong business case on what direction this is headed. No return on investment analysis. - This project contemplates automating paper correspondence. A reviewer must assume that this correspondence is currently being handled by staff. Justification, then, would be to allow staff to process either additional paper, or reduce staff time devoted to paper processing.	using centralized (Print Shop) printing/inserting service alternative - The Worker's Compensation Court plans to implement electronic messaging as a primary component of the court's business. While the court produces paper today, one must assume that the use of paper will decline over time as electronic messaging is accepted by filers. Since paper cannot be totally eliminated, improving staff ability to process paper communications is a proper goal. However, this request has the court purchasing equipment and operating that equipment within the court. As electronic messaging becomes accepted, the demand for this equipment should diminish. The court should contemplate outsourcing this service rather than purchasing equipment to provide it.
V: Technical Impact	- Good to hear the desire to work with IMS and DOC on compatibility. Also need to include other agencies that may have opportunities to partner in this venture. - Both telephonic response and enhanced print and mail management can function to make staff more efficient.	- Unclear how this interfaces with existing technology - Future costs of this technology is not clear. Staff resources are devoted to care and maintenance of print and mail management. Descriptions of telephonic response technology is vague. There is insufficient cost/benefit detail to allow this reviewer to make a recommendation on the technology.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- Would have like specific information on where and how the staff will be training on the Telephonic Response. Voice is a specialized technology that the agency may need some assistance with. - Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - Milestone and deliverables are not defined beyond the technology to be implemented. Given the priority of contact management in 2006, with print management in 2007, one must conclude that telephonic response represents the greatest benefit to court. The current mail functions would continue. By 2007, the court may find electronic filing may negate the need for mail management equipment.
VII: Risk Assessment	- The proposal identifies potential risks for the projects.	- Other risks include items such as complexity of system outpaces staff knowledge, technology changes, and costs of systems not being able to be sustained. - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful…either would impact this project. - Given known volumes of paper production, one would assume that the demands on the system are predictable. The risk assessment leaves open the possibility of future costs to support or modify the system.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Costs associated with the project are reasonable.	- Costs seem low, project likely would require interfaces or, at minimum, changes to legacy systems. - Hardware costs are listed one year before project is scheduled. No personnel or programming costs are associated with the project. This would presume that the solution is turnkey. Hardware purchase may duplicate services already available.

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

37-02 -- Court Re-enginnering - Coverage and Claims

Reviewer(s) Comments
- (Strength) Very strong outline of goals, beneficiaries, and method to verify that the project outcomes have been achieved. - Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - Project describes two additional components of the Worker's Compensation Court strategic plan.
- (Weakness) Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

WCC Response:
One reviewer draws one conclusion and second draws another conclusion.
Nine Analysis documents are available that contain detailed problem and objective definitions. They are titled: Coverage and Claims Re-engineering - IME (Stage 1); Automation of LSS Monitoring; Compliance Case System; Insurance Coverage Enforcement System; Automated Feed of Information from the Department of Insurance system; IME (Stage 2); Automation of Awards Monitoring; Self Insurance; and Managed Care System. These documents are available for review.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- The project contemplates an in-house solution that may duplicate services already provided within DAS. The court should consider outsourcing print management to the DAS print shop.

WCC Response:
At the point of the proposal preparation and submission, DAS services were not reviewed as an option. This was because the Proposal Preparer was not aware of the services that the DAS Print Shop currently provides, so the suggestion is appreciated. The current cost projections are based upon the scenario of an housing the hardware within the agency and represents a worst cost scenario. At the time the project commences and requirements are finalized, the court will consider DAS as an option. The appropriation is still needed if the in-house alternative is the best solution based upon the needs.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Message management should be developed in conjunction with the messaging systems contemplated in the Vocational Rehabilitation proposal.

WCC Response:
Each of the courts "key technologies" will be introduced in one project and then leveraged in other projects. Message Management is part of the Vocational Rehabilitation proposal and will applied to other business areas. Likewise, Enhanced Print and Mail Management and Contact Management (Telephonic Response) will be initiated in Coverage and Claims and then applied to other business areas when deemed beneficial.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- The Worker's Compensation Court plans to implement electronic messaging as a primary component of the court's business. While the court produces paper today, one must assume that the use of paper will decline over time as electronic messaging is accepted by filers. Since paper cannot be totally eliminated, improving staff ability to process paper communications is a proper goal. However, this request has the court purchasing equipment and operating that equipment within the court. As electronic messaging becomes accepted, the demand for this equipment should diminish. The court should contemplate outsourcing this service rather than purchasing equipment to provide it.
- Given the priority of contact management in 2006, with print management in 2007, one must conclude that telephonic response represents the greatest benefit to court. The current mail functions would

continue. By 2007, the court may find electronic filing may negate the need for mail management equipment.
WCC Response:
The reviewer is drawing the same conclusions for out-going and incoming communications. The Proof of Coverage system will always be heavily dependant on using paper for initial out-going communications about a coverage problem because the primary contact is the employer and matching information will not contain the necessary "electronic addresses". The court hopes to facilitate next-step incoming and outgoing communications by offering the employers the use of telephonic and other electronic means of communications as the court brings them on-line.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Unclear how this interfaces with existing technology
WCC Response:
Both printer and telephonic technology will be integrated into new applications developed by the court using the Borland Delphi development environment.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Future costs of this technology is not clear.
WCC Response:
The Financial Analysis and Budget Report lays out on-going costs estimates to support the systems in a maintenance mode and to place the systems on an equipment replacement cycle.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Descriptions of telephonic response technology is vague.
WCC Response:
Telephonic response technology will conceptually function as follows. An employer receiving a communications from the court will receive a phone number and unique key code to call into an automated response system. If the question in the communications is something like "Do you currently have Workers' Compensation Insurance?" and the answer is "Yes", then the employer will be able to using in the key code make a selection to answer "Yes".

Reviewer(s) Comments
- There is insufficient cost/benefit detail to allow this reviewer to make a recommendation on the technology.
WCC Response:
As stated in Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case, "The goal is to improve service as workload increases without increasing staff." Financial projects are outlined in Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget. The Preparer is unsure what level of detail is required for the Reviewer to make a recommendation.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Costs associated with the project are reasonable. - Costs seem low.
WCC Response:
Two separate conclusions by different reviewers.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Hardware costs are listed one year before project is scheduled.
WCC Response:
Fiscal Year 2006 is the projected year to procure hardware/software, development and implement Telephonic Response. It is also the goal to procure enhanced print and mail management hardware/software at the end of that fiscal year so that testing, developing, and implementation can occur in the next Fiscal Year.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- No personnel or programming costs are associated with the project.

WCC Response:
A reading of our Comprehensive IT Plan does explain that the majority of our IT Staff is development resource. We plan and schedule our projects within the constraints of those existing resources.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication		$ 534,066

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Adjudication section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.4 Other		$ 100,000.00				$ 100,000.00
5. Training		$ 36,382.50				$ 36,382.50
6. Travel		$ 12,127.50				$ 12,127.50
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware		$ 30,000.00			$ 20,000.00	$ 50,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 355,556.25	$ 103,607.44	$ 108,787.81	$ 109,790.00	$ 677,741.50
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 534,066.25	$ 103,607.44	$ 108,787.81	$ 129,790.00	$ 876,251.50
Cash Funds		$ 534,066.25	$ 103,607.44	$ 108,787.81	$ 129,790.00	$ 876,251.50
TOTAL FUNDS		$ 534,066.25	$ 103,607.44	$ 108,787.81	$ 129,790.00	$ 876,251.50

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	10	10.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	15	17	16.0	25
V: Technical Impact	17	14	14	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	7	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	5	6	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	12	15	14.0	20
			TOTAL	**69**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The primary outcome of the project appears to be a strategic plan for improving the workflow of the Court and its external stakeholders. The Agency Comprehensive IT Plan has an excellent discussion of the Court's overall strategy. - Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - Workflow is one method used to make	- Some of the outcomes should address business process improvements, with corresponding metrics. - Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	computing systems more efficient. This proposal contemplates the adoption of workflow technology into the adjudication system of the Worker's Compensation court.	- This reviewer is having a difficult time finding enough specificity in the proposal to make a recommendation on the merits of the proposal. The goals are listed as Process Management OR Adjudication System Replacement.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Workflow is a key technology that can improve a computing system's ability to perform. To be effective, it should be used to support the business objectives of the court. The presumption is that the backend systems will remain in place.	- The business case would be much stronger if Section IV included specific information about existing problems that would be improved. The information for question 5 cites increased staffing, data quality, and a backlog. An explanation of these or other problems with supporting data would be helpful. In other words, what is wrong with doing things as they are today? - No other potential solutions identified - The lack of specificity of the project hinders this reviewer's ability to make a evaluation or recommendation.
V: Technical Impact	- Workflow would maintain the existing back-end systems.	- There should be more discussion of web-based options, especially given the implied objective of serving external stakeholders (question 1). Although the project proposal makes a good case that the functions of the Workers' Compensation Court are unique, there should be some discussion of how the underlying technology, especially workflow, and electronic filing relate to other systems purchased or developed by the state. - Specificity limits this reviewer's ability to comment on the impact of the project. Integration of workflow within the existing business process will have a different impact than integrating workflow AND replacing the adjudication system.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The project proposal identifies the project team. - The workflow design team is well qualified to examine the business processes to be incorporated into the workflow product.	- I don't understand the information in the table in question 9. The recommendations of the consultant should be added to the list of milestones in question 10. - Timeline seems overly optimistic. IT staffing on project may be too light. Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - The implementation plan calls for the procurement of a workflow product in the first year, with business engineering following. A better implementation plan might be to evaluate the workflow, the role of web-services, and the evaluation of new business processes developed as a result of the analysis before the workflow product is purchased. This approach might allow the court the opportunity to evaluate or replace the adjudication system without incurring workflow software costs.
VII: Risk Assessment	- A good start to listing potential risks. - The introduction of workflow will have both intended and unintended consequences on the court's computing systems. These risks are identified.	- Some other possible risks might include: rejection by external stakeholders and dependence on the software provider for support, functionality and future licensing costs, if a third party Adjudication Replacement System is chosen. (Are there any lessons learned from implementing NIS that are relevant here?) - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful…either would impact this project. - Unintended risk could be better managed by completing workflow analysis independent of the software purchased to support the workflow. This

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		could result in a wiser purchasing decision. It may also result in a recommendation to use existing workflow products rather than the purchase of additional workflow products specifically for the courts.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- This reviewer presumes that the hardware/software costs are accurate.	- Some explanation of how the estimated costs were determined would be helpful. How does one know that $355,556 is even the correct order of magnitude for either a workflow application or an Adjudication Application? Is $100,000 adequate for assistance with implementation? Also, the cost of the consultant's study in FY2006 should be reflected in the analysis. - This is a large project - probably needs project management resources. Budget seems to be built on an assumption of software purchase, but narrative suggests that COTS software is likely not a viable solution. Software maintenance costs seem high. - The possibility of replacing the adjudication system is not reflected in the cost of the project. Project costs are listed as hardware/software/training for the workflow product. The court should review the possibility of using existing workflow software products rather than developing their own.

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

37-03 -- Court Re-enginnering - Adjudication

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Some of the outcomes should address business process improvements, with corresponding metrics.
- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.
- The business case would be much stronger if Section IV included specific information about existing problems that would be improved. The information for question 5 cites increased staffing, data quality, and a backlog. An explanation of these or other problems with supporting data would be helpful. In other words, what is wrong with doing things as they are today?

WCC Response:
Seven Analysis documents are available that contain detailed problem and objective definitions. They are titled: Adjudication Re-engineering - Clerk's Office; Clerk's Office to Other Court Sections/Adj Assistants/Judges; e-Filing; Judges Section; Miscellaneous; Public Access; and Motion Practice Automation. These documents are available for review.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- There should be more discussion of web-based options, especially given the implied objective of serving external stakeholders (question 1).

WCC Response:
The following statements were included about Web Services: "Web Services may have a place if they can integrate effectively and efficiently with our current technology. Web Services may allow us in the future to extend from Client / Server to an Internet-based application.." In addition, Microsoft is evolving to a ".NET" platform. If the selected solution is the implementation of a base workflow application, then court developed applets that will integrate into workflow will be developed in Borland Delphi which supports both Win32 and .NET.

Reviewer(s) Comments
Although the project proposal makes a good case that the functions of the Workers' Compensation Court are unique, there should be some discussion of how the underlying technology, especially workflow, and electronic filing relate to other systems purchased or developed by the state.

WCC Response:
At the point of when the project defines requirements and issues Requests For Information and/or Requests for Proposals, IMServices (and possibly other state agencies) will be given the opportunity to reply so that the court can evaluate what currently is in use in the state. Just because such systems exist do not mean that there are enterprise licenses available that would cost the court nothing. These existing "in-state" options will be evaluated at the same level as other options.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- The lack of specificity of the project hinders this reviewer's ability to make a evaluation or recommendation.
- Specificity limits this reviewer's ability to comment on the impact of the project. Integration of workflow within the existing business process will have a different impact than integrating workflow AND replacing the adjudication system.

WCC Response:
This preparer is unsure what the reviewer is expecting in quantify and detail that would satisfy his/her needs.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- I don't understand the information in the table in question 9 (VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation).
WCC Response:
The tables intent is to "Describe the project team, including their roles, responsibilities, and experience."

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Timeline seems overly optimistic. IT staffing on project may be too light.
WCC Response:
The milestone "Installation, training, planning for deployment, design of initial re-engineered workflow and development of functions associated with workflow" was intended to communicate that this "initial re-engineered workflow" would be the first of several re-engineered work processes. Additional processes would be re-engineered into the work flow in subsequent fiscal years and should have been included as milestone. A reading of our Comprehensive IT Plan does explain that the majority of our IT Staff is development resource. We plan and schedule our projects within the constraints of those existing resources. $100,000 is also requested for Professional Contract Services during the first Fiscal Year.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- The implementation plan calls for the procurement of a workflow product in the first year, with business engineering following. A better implementation plan might be to evaluate
the workflow, the role of web-services, and the evaluation of new business processes developed as a result of the analysis before the workflow product is purchased. This approach might allow the court the opportunity to evaluate or replace the adjudication system without incurring workflow software costs.
- Unintended risk could be better managed by completing workflow analysis independent of the software purchased to support the workflow. This could result in a wiser purchasing decision. It may also result in a recommendation to use existing workflow products rather than the purchase of additional workflow products specifically for the courts.
WCC Response:
Approximately nine years ago the court completed an extensive process analysis project of Adjudication. Not much has changed in the nine years. These process flow diagrams are still available for use. The court is already in discussions with IMServices about web services with respect to other projects and plans to have an understanding of these services and .NET technology before Fiscal Year 2006. In addition, the courts application development environment, Borland Delphi, can generate web services and .NET applications in addition to Win32. While this application development environment can deliver web services and .NET, there is major piece that it cannot, the intelligent process diagramming tools and workflow engine that will integrate with development and production implementation. The court is watching closely for such a toolset and if available at the time the project begins will evaluate as an additional alternative. The IT Manager attended this years Borland Conference looking for such a toolset.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Some other possible risks might include: rejection by external stakeholders and dependence on the software provider for support, functionality and future licensing costs, if a third
party Adjudication Replacement System is chosen. (Are there any lessons learned from implementing NIS that are relevant here?)
WCC Response:
In Section 4.C. Future IT Projects of the courts Comprehensive Information Technology Plan, the court has the following project listed for completion in Fiscal Year 2005: "Adjudication Re-enginneering Focus Study with External Stakeholders - The Court realizes that to be successful, its external stakeholders must be engaged in the re-engineering effort. Focus sessions are planned." Dependence upon outside vendors is always a risk whether with purchased turnkey systems or application development systems. This is one of the reasons that the court has focused much of its IT resources on custom development and have such a high concentration of development resources in the IT section.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful…either would impact this project.

WCC Response:
The consultant is being funding out of existing continuation dollars. The court has tentatively identified several candidate consultants who already have a proven track record in the work that is being requested.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Some explanation of how the estimated costs were determined would be helpful. How does one know that $355,556 is even the correct order of magnitude for either a workflow application or an Adjudication Application?
- The possibility of replacing the adjudication system is not reflected in the cost of the project.

WCC Response:
Three of the leading workflow software vendors that would incorporate whose technical matches our environment were contacted. Each vendor provided an initial cost estimate based upon information provided by the court. Their estimates ranged from $150,000 to the $355,556. The only known turnkey "court" software vendor that complies with our technical environment was also contacted. Their pricing model is currently based upon large scale implementation and their cost estimate was over $1,000,000. There current price model is out of line for the court. This vendor did leave the door open that over the next two years their pricing model may change to allow for smaller implementations.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- Also, the cost of the consultant's study in FY2006 should be reflected in the analysis.

WCC Response:
The consultant is being funding out of existing continuation dollars.

Reviewer(s) Comments
- This is a large project - probably needs project management resources.

WCC Response:
Project management is handled by the Lead Application Developer assigned to the project with close assistance from the IT Manager.

Reviewer(s) Comments
-Budget seems to be built on an assumption of software purchase, but narrative suggests that COTS software is likely not a viable solution.
Project costs are listed as hardware/software/training for the workflow product. The court should review the possibility of using existing workflow software products rather
than developing their own.

WCC Response:
(COTS - commercial off-the-shelf, adjective that describes software or hardware products that are ready-made and available for sale to the general public. For example, Microsoft Office is a COTS product that is a packaged software solution for businesses. COTS products are designed to be implemented easily into existing systems without the need for customization.)
Based upon the definition above, the comment is correct. A purchased software package will need integration and customization into our current data/application environment. A bedrock of workflow is intelligent process/workflow diagrams. The intelligence of this software is the workflow engine with user queues that manage the events based upon processing rules associated with event. The court is looking to purchase a either generic Workflow system that integrates with court-developed applets or a court management replacement system that includes the above critical elements of workflow.

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade	$ 925,000	$ 925,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The University of Nebraska operates an IBM S/390 enterprise server to support our primary administrative business applications. The Enterprise Server supports applications including the Student Information System (SIS+) for UN-L and UNO, Enterprise Resource Planning (SAP), and the PSL/Budget (PSL) systems. Tivoli Storage Manager (TSM) uses an Automatic Tape Library for desktop and server backups and restores. Each of these products/services is continuing to grow as new features and end-users are added to these systems.

The current system is an IBM Z800 with two general purpose engines and two Linux engines. The two general purpose engines are used to support the administrative applications. They provide approximately 350 million instructions per second (mips) or 60 million service units (msu's). The system frequently runs at 100% capacity on this processor and there are times when the daily work load is not completed.

The purpose of this project is to add a new enterprise server to increase the number of processor cycles available in order to complete the ever increasing work load from SIS, SAP, and TSM. Along with the new processor, there will be an increase in software licensing costs.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	$ 350,000.00	$ 325,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 275,000.00		$ 1,250,000.00
8.2 Software	$ 575,000.00	$ 600,000.00	$ 625,000.00	$ 650,000.00		$ 2,450,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ -	$ 3,700,000.00
General Funds	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00		$ 3,700,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ 925,000.00	$ -	$ 3,700,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	15	13	14.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	23	19	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	19	20	19	19.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	9	9.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	9	9.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	19	14	17.7	20
			TOTAL	**92**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and	- The narrative provides a comprehensive overview of the need for the project to move	- The narrative does not provide any indication of the likely life-cycle of this upgrade. That is,

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Projected Outcomes	forward.	growth is expected but at what rate and how quickly is additional hardware likely to be required?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- The narrative provides a good overview of the process whereby need was assessed and some of the alternatives.	- The narrative does not provide a very thorough overview of the options that were considered beyond doing nothing. For example, what alternative platforms were considered? - The justification would be strengthened by providing more detail. What types of transactions are impacted, and what are the consequences?
V: Technical Impact	- The narrative provides complete information to support the acquisition of the proposed hardware/software.	- The narrative raises the question of why processor upgrades are available for this model while not being an option for the current hardware.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The narrative is clear and concise in this section and the proposed timelines are reasonable.	
VII: Risk Assessment	- The listed risks and management of them is clear and reasonable.	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Costs are broken out and consistent with the scope of the project.	- The timeframe (question 9, Section VI) indicates that the project will be completed by December 2005 (FY06). The budget shows 25% of the costs in FY06 and the balance spread out over the following 3 fiscal years. Are these the most current prices quoted by reputable vendors, and are they subject to much variability?

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

III. We expect a great deal of changes over the next three years that will affect our growth rate. We will be re-evaluating a student information system and continuing to add features to our ERP environment. In light of these unknowns at this time, it is impossible to accurately predict what the growth rate will be. However, over the past 20-25 years, our life cycle has averaged approximately 3-4 years before we need to upgrade again. Other than a major change in platform support for our major applications, we expect that trend to continue. Based on that typical life cycle, we will need to add processor resources in the 2008-2010 timeframe.

IV. a) The University has looked at several different options/alternatives to this proposal. There are 5 different enterprise server alternatives; however, only one of them meets all of the requirements. The 5 alternatives are:

1) Upgrade the Z800 to a Z890 (low cost and very small increase in resources for initial upgrade, high cost for additional resources)
2) Upgrade the Z800 to a Z900 (high cost and good future expandability)
3) Upgrade the Z800 to a Z990 (high cost and good future expandability, including expandable support for ZLinux on S/390)
4) Remove one of our Z800 Linux processors and replace it with a general purpose processor (medium cost, medium increase in resources)
5) Add an additional Zxxx system (high cost, good expandability, limited expandability for zlinux on S/390)

Of the 5 alternatives listed above, only the 5th one will support the goal of "providing an increased level of disaster recovery".

In addition to evaluating the above upgrade options, we are continually looking at other platforms for our applications. At this time, a platform change would not be cost efficient for our environment. It would require a process of retraining staff to support the new platforms, while at the same time continuing the support for our current systems. A project to change platforms for major operating applications, such as ERP and Student Information, should not be taken lightly. The process would be a multi-year and would not provide support for our current upgrade requirements. As we move forward, we will continue to evaluate other platforms.
Other platforms that have been considered, include moving our ERP to other platforms including:

1) Microsoft Operating System running on Intel processors
2) Unix/Linux Operating System running Intel or Power processors

b) There are numerous transactions that are impacted by the restriction in processor resources. This includes:

1) Student Information Systems: There are too many different processes and features in the Student Information systems to list them all, but the primary ones impacted are:
   a. Student Registration and drop and add: Every semester we go through a process of registering or changing classes for approximately half of the 35,000 students. Delays in accomplishing this registration can delay the start of classes, students missing classes and under the right circumstances; it could even cause us to cancel some classes.
   b. Student requests. We frequently receive requests for transcripts or other pieces of student information. Some of these cases include a student applying for work and

needing their degree verification papers. In extreme cases, a delay could actually affect whether a student would be hired.

c. Perception. If the University is perceived to be having problems supporting its major applications, it could affect the whether students would choose to attend the University.

2) Enterprise Resource Planning: Again, there are too many processes to list all of them, but a sample would be:
   a. Processing payments. A delay in processing payments to vendors can cause the loss of discounts for products purchased. Although we do not have exact numbers, this could be significant.
   b. Payroll processing. All University staff expect to be paid on specific dates throughout the year. Delays in processing the payroll would require alternative methods of paying our employees.
   c. Product Upgrades. We are in the process of upgrading our ERP system. Many of the processes are taking much longer (double or more) than they did the last time we upgraded. This will severely impact the length of time to complete the whole upgrade and extends the cost of the upgrade project.

V. There really are not any processor upgrades for our current Z800. The upgrade path is to upgrade this box to a Z890, which is a model change and processor change. This upgrade path is one of the options we have evaluated. Our initial evaluation of this upgrade (the cheapest), showed a 16% increase in processor power. This small increase would be nice right now, but would not solve our problems for the future. We would require another upgrade almost immediately. To upgrade to the larger Z890 processors will include a high cost and at that point all alternatives (the 5 above) need to be included in the evaluation. This upgrade will not provide any support for improving our disaster recovery capabilities.

VIII. These costs were based on number obtained in April-June of 2004 and came from our IBM business partner and/or used equipment vendors. The University often receives additional “educational discounts” that others do not receive.

This upgrade process will need to follow all University purchasing policies, including the issuance of an RFP. In addition to the potential reduction in cost through the RFP process, we will also explore other options. This includes the possibility of purchasing used equipment (as long as it is eligible for maintenance).

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
DAS - CIO	Security Audits	$ 50,000	$ 50,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of this project is to engage a qualified firm to conduct annual security audits / assessments of the information technology infrastructure for state government. Topics of interest include network security, wireless security, application security, and security policies and procedures. The exact scope of each security assessment will focus on one or more of these areas. The Security Work Group will help set priorities and define the scope of work for each assessment.

The NITC security policies (Information Security Management Policy) provide guidance for establishing effective security programs. One requirement is to conduct regular security audits. The Network Security Policy states, "An audit of network security should be conducted annually."

The HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) proposed rule for Security and Electronic Signature Standards (45 CFR Part 142) imposes a comprehensive set of security requirements for "covered entities" that "electronically maintain or transmit any health information relating to an individual." The regulations pertaining to "Administrative Procedures to Guard Data Integrity, Confidentiality, and Availability" includes a requirement for "Security Testing." Given the breadth of HIPAA requirements and the potential penalties for violators, state government requires an independent evaluation of compliance efforts.

Guidelines pertaining to federal Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response grants require "regular independent validataion and verification of Internet security, vulnerability assessment, and security and continuity of operations…" (Critical Capacity #13, Focus Area E – Health Alert Network / Communications and Information Technology).

The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace recommends that state and local governments "establish IT security programs … including awareness, audits, and standards."

In 2003, the Office of the CIO engaged Omnitech Corporation to conduct an external perimeter security sweep of the state's network. The initial evaluation took place during April to June of 2003. This included an automated vulnerability scan and testing of devices exposed to the Internet. In March 2004, Omnitect conducted a second vulnerability scan of the state's network.

FUNDING SUMMARY

The budget request is for $50,000 per year in cash fund authority. The source of cash fund will be the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund. Effort will be made to identify additional funding sources.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	14	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	24	24	23.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	19	19	18.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	10	9	8.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	9	9	8.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	19	20	18.7	20
			TOTAL	**92**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very good list of goals, objectives, etc. I recommend this be expanded to include a risk-assessment of any identified vulnerabilities. We'd then not only know what might happen if something is not fixed but we'd also know the odds of it happening at all. - Clear and concise.	- While this contains a clear statement of benefit to the state agencies, isn't there also a case to be made for the "protection" and confidence of the "citizenry" who also directly and indirectly benefit?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- We just need to make sure that we get what we pay for in this area (i.e. security assessments)	- Item 5 - might it build a better case if you noted that this a foundation step toward building a security program? What's proposed would be more efficient than individual activities, more comprehensive and objective, and provide a better roadmap for the state.
V: Technical Impact	- This project can, conceivably, have a major technical impact on other projects if installed features and functionality prove to contain major security flaws. Accordingly, this project can have a very long arm into all aspects of information technology.	- In Item 8 - "Project will help with implementing security policies" should be "will provide strategic and tactical inputs for inclusion in framing security policies"?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- I appreciate the thoroughness of the Preliminary Implementation Plan although I personally would like to see a more aggressive schedule.	- Item 10. Given the urgency, importance and statute issues with this project, why wait until Nov 2005 to start?
VII: Risk Assessment		- Item 14 - to get "buy-in" should some form on educational awareness and implication to the stakeholders (business and I/T) be part of risk mitigation? Point is to get them to become the partners in the process.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		