Report to the Governor and Legislature

Recommendations on Technology Investments for the FY2007-2009 Biennium

November 15, 2006
(Update: November 27, 2006)

NEBRASKA INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
www.nitc.state.ne.us
501 S. 14th Street
P.O. Box 95045
Lincoln, NE 68509-5045
(402) 471-3560

Contents

Introduction

This document contains the Nebraska Information Technology Commission's ("NITC") recommendations on technology investments for the FY 2007-2009 biennium. It is submitted pursuant to the NITC's statutory responsibility to "make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel, for which new or additional funding is requested…" NEB. REV. STAT. §86-516(8).

This biennium, the NITC received 17 project proposals from agencies to be reviewed as part of the budget review process.[*] Each project was reviewed and scored by three individual reviewers assigned by the Technical Panel. Submitting agencies were then given the opportunity to submit a response to the reviewer comments or other clarifying information.

Next, the projects were reviewed by either the State Government Council or Education Council, and the Technical Panel. These groups provided additional comments and recommendations on the projects.

Finally, the NITC met on November 1, 2006 to review these projects and make the final recommendations included in this report.

This report contains the following three sections:

- **Section 1** includes a table with the list of projects divided into categories as recommended by the NITC.
- **Section 2** includes specific comments and recommendations by the NITC for some projects.
- **Section 3** includes the summary sheets for all of the projects, including comments and recommendations from the councils and Technical Panel, as well as the agency response to reviewer comments.

A copy of this report and the full text of the project proposals are posted on the NITC website at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/reports/

---

[*] Two projects from the Health and Human Services System (25-01 and 25-02) were received after the initial review and scoring process was completed. The summary sheets for these projects will be updated with additional information after the reviews have been completed by the Technical Panel on November 22, 2006. A revised version of this document will be posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/reports/.
(NOTE: This document was updated on November 27, 2006 to include this additional information.)

SECTION 1: NITC Recommendations - Project Prioritization

Category	Description
Mandate	Required by law, regulation, or other authority.
Tier 1	Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency and/or the state.
Tier 2	Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.
Tier 3	Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.
Tier 4	Insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation for funding.

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2007-08	FY2008-09	Total Project Costs
Mandate					
25-01	HHSS	New Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS)			$50,000,000
47-04	NET	Final DTV Transmitter Conversion Project	$ 147,650	$ 1,415,000	$ 2,641,450
Tier 1					
50-01	State College System	Student Information Administrative System	$ 6,000,000	$ 4,000,000	$10,000,000
51-01	University of Nebraska	Student Information System	$18,461,106	$ 3,707,701	$32,649,418
85-01	Retirement	Migration of PIONEER to the jClarity Platform	$ 6,523,000		$ 6,523,000
Tier 2					
05-01 *	Supreme Court	E-Filing in JUSTICE	$ 150,000	$ 150,000	$ 605,000
13-01	Department of Education	Nebraska Transcript Project	$ 128,070	$ 121,930	$ 250,000
37-02	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication	$ 164,200	$ 78,750	$ 970,520
37-03	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	$ 94,400	$ 43,450	$ 204,177
Tier 3					
05-02 *	Supreme Court	Digital Audio Recorders	$ 100,375	$ 210,375	$ 495,440
25-02	HHSS	Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)	$ 179,000	$ 169,000	$ 393,000
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	WCC Internet Enhancement and Security	$ 63,750	$ 6,458	$ 103,083
47-01	NET	Satellite Reconfiguration Project	$ 247,500	$ 222,500	$ 1,259,500
47-02	NET	Public Media Archive and Distribution Project	$ 249,700	$ 305,205	$ 1,219,895
47-03	NET	Public Media at the Capitol	$ 1,111,800	$ 337,500	$ 2,139,815
Tier 4					
27-01	Department of Roads	Expansion of Falcon DMS to Agencywide Use	$ 494,250	$ 253,733	$ 1,509,182
27-03	Department of Roads	Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) Enhancement			

---

* Staff Note: The submitting agency's internal prioritization of their projects had project 05-02 ranked higher than 05-01. This information is normally considered as part of the recommendation process, but inadvertently was not considered in this case.

SECTION 2: NITC Recommendations - Project Specific Comments

25-01	Health and Human Services System	New Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS)

Regarding Project 25-01, New Medicaid Management Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
- To leave Project 25-01 in the recommended "Mandate" list.
- To note that the project was not submitted on time for an evaluation and Technical Panel review.
- That the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for review of the project as needed.

Commissioner Aerni seconded. Motion passed.

25-02	Health and Human Services System	Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)

Regarding Project 25-02, Laboratory Information Management System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
- To leave Project 25-02 in the recommended Tier 3 list.
- To note that the project was not submitted on time for an evaluation and Technical Panel review.
- That the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for review of the project as needed.

Commissioner Flanagan seconded. Motion passed.

27-01	Department of Roads	Expansion of Falcon DMS to Agencywide Use

Commissioner Flanagan moved that Project 27-01 be moved to Tier 4 due to insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation. Commissioner Huggenberger second. Motion passed.

27-03	Department of Roads	Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) Enhancement

Commissioner Hedquist moved that Project 27-03, Department of Roads-Highway Condition Reporting Systems (HCRS) Enhancement, be moved to Tier 4 due to insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation. Commissioner Peterson seconded. Motion passed.

50-01	Nebraska State College System	Student Information Administrative System

Regarding Projects 50-01, State College System-Student Information Administrative System, and the collaboration with Project 51-01, UN-Student Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
- To leave the project in Tier 1.
- That the NITC strongly recommends that the University of Nebraska and the State College System collaborate on these projects in the areas of data element definitions, data warehouse design, data sharing, networking, hardware, and implementation.
- That the systems should be interoperable.
- That the University of Nebraska and the State College System work closely with the Technical Panel and provide periodic project reports to the NITC.

Commissioner Hedquist seconded. Motion passed.

51-01	University of Nebraska	Student Information System

Regarding Projects 50-01, State College System-Student Information Administrative System, and the collaboration with Project 51-01, UN-Student Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:

- To leave the project in Tier 1.
- That the NITC strongly recommends that the University of Nebraska and the State College System collaborate on these projects in the areas of data element definitions, data warehouse design, data sharing, networking, hardware, and implementation.
- That the systems should be interoperable.
- That the University of Nebraska and the State College System work closely with the Technical Panel and provide periodic project reports to the NITC.

Commissioner Hedquist seconded. Motion passed.

| 85-01 | Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems | Migration of PIONEER to the jClarity Platform |

Commissioner Peterson moved to leave Project 85-01, Retirement- Migration of Pioneer to the jClarity Platform, in Tier 1 and recommended that the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for oversight of the project. Commissioner Hoesing seconded. Motion passed.

SECTION 3: Project Summary Sheets

Each summary sheet contains the following information:
- Summary of the Request
- Funding Summary
- Project Score
- Reviewer Comments
- Technical Panel Comments
- State Government Council or Education Council Comments
- NITC Comments
- Appendix: Agency Response to Reviewer Comments (if any)

Project #	Agency	Project Title
05-01	Nebraska Supreme Court	E-Filing in JUSTICE

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

The E-Filing in JUSTICE project will be the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) attempt to introduce Electronic Filing or E-Filing into Nebraska's Trial Court system. JUSTICE is the case and financial management system used for District and County Courts in Nebraska. Currently 185 trial courts utilize JUSTICE. By adding the E-Filing application for the trial courts we are able to provide 24x7 services to citizens of Nebraska.

Electronic filing works by replacing the traditional method of filing, serving, storing, and retrieving court documents with a more efficient electronic process. Instead of duplicating, packaging, and manually delivering copies of documents to the court and service parties, you send them electronically over the Internet.

Documents are then stored electronically. Any time a judge, attorney, or other party on the case needs a copy of the document; they conveniently retrieve the document from a web site. The service is always available; although cases filed after court work hours are time-stamped the following business day. The court can now move documents around in a matter of minutes as opposed to hours in the conventional mode.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Section 8: Financial Analysis and Budget

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs	$ 27,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00		$ 127,000.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming	$ 25,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00		$ 45,000.00
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00		$ 50,000.00
6. Travel	$ 2,500.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00		$ 22,500.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware	$ 10,500.00	$ 105,000.00	$ 105,000.00	$ 70,000.00	$ 70,000.00		$ 360,500.00
8.2 Software							$ -
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 75,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ -	$ 605,000.00
General Funds		$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00	$ 90,000.00	$ 90,000.00		$ 430,000.00
Cash Funds	$ 75,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00		$ 175,000.00
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 75,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ -	$ 605,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	13	12.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	17	17	23	19.0	25
5: Technical Impact	15	15	19	16.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	9	10	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	7	10	9.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	15	20	18.3	20
			TOTAL	**84**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Three objectives are clearly stated.	- Expected outcome is not measurable. What does "successful implementation" mean and who is the judge of that? How can I measure that success in what time frame? How much of a decrease in staff time will result from working with e-file vs. paper and what is the value of that time? - Measurement and assessment should be strengthened. How will productivity improvements be measured? Perhaps "hours saved" could be tracked. The reduction in physical storage should be quantified. A satisfaction survey could be used to measure "better experience for attorneys". Measurable targets should be established that will define the criteria for success of the pilot sites. The criteria should be achieved before expanding the system.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Intangible service benefits (convenience, concurrent use, speed) are important. - good depiction of benefits - both tangible and intangible	- How do they know 24x7 filing is a need and has an economic return on investment? What is that ROI? The case states this will result in a "more productive court staff", but how much more productive? Will this result in a ____% increase in filings processed with same staff? What are the benefits of using ACH besides lost or stolen money and what are the costs of ACH transactions? Reasons for not using US Bankruptcy E-Filing system--training, payment, and proprietary software (the ESP's software will be proprietary also) are weak and need to be developed. - Tangible benefits include staff savings, space savings and less money lost or stolen. Each of these can be expressed in dollars but are not included in the justification.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		There is no description of solutions that were considered and rejected. The Federal system that was described is proprietary, not an alternative to what has been proposed. - project is valuable, but not mandated
5: Technical Impact	- The outsourcing approach offloads training to the ESP and avoids the expense of building our own custom code. The proposed system conforms to a credible subject-relevant XML standard recommended by the National Center for State Courts.	- Need to develop the security, document integrity, and business continuity areas besides reliance on ESP. What is the Court going to do if there is a problem (i.e., ESP is not available, network interruption, etc.) How will the system validate user identity—am I really who I say I am? How will non-repudiation of filing be handled—did I really file something? How will document integrity be handled—is this really what I filed? Need a long-term technical strategy if the pilot is successful (will it stay at ESP or move in-house) and if the pilot is not successful (return to old system?) - Little information is presented about the software interfaces. What are the "great security features" offered by the ESP? Specifics would allow for an evaluation of their adequacy. How does the ESP propose to conform to State standards for accessibility and authentication/authorization?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Pilot, learn, adjust then deploy is a sound strategy as is installing in both courts for a county at the same time. Team membership seems appropriate except that judges do not appear to be represented.	- Are they using the same business processes they use now or will new processes be developed or current ones changed? Using a new technology the same way as the old process? - Judges have considerable power and influence -- they appear to be left out. Stakeholder acceptance in general is an area of weakness. What technologists perceive as "good" may well conflict with how attorneys and court personnel view the system. Please pay more attention to building support among those who will use the system most! Many would rather live with problems they understand and have been coping with than use a system they don't understand. Ongoing support should include provisions for maintaining the new scanners and the PCs they presumably attach to. Training for newly hired court staff should also be included.
7: Risk Assessment	- The ESP that has been selected has been successful in other jurisdictions. The subcommittee that has drafted rules for the Court's consideration appears to include the key stakeholders.	- Funding is explicitly identified as a risk that is highly important yet no mitigation strategy is proposed. The mitigation of the staff training risk appears to be that people have been

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		assigned. No information about how those people will address the risk is included.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- What is the financial plan if this project is a huge success and the need to escalate deployment arises?	- Ongoing maintenance and support costs for the new scanners are missing. It's likely that scanner models and features will change over the five year purchasing cycle. It is unclear how long it will be before the court must replace the scanners with new models. It's unclear if the $3,600 of AS/400 disk storage is required for one or for 93 AS/400s. Scanned images require more storage than native documents. Detailed personnel costs are not included. It is unclear if the costs that are listed are net of expected personnel cost savings. It's difficult to evaluate the adequacy of the programming cost estimate without more detailed information. $25,000 implies a seven to ten week effort -- is that enough? I can find no reference to how the ESP is to be compensated.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a [Tier 2] project.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 2 (Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Three objectives are clearly stated.	- Expected outcome is not measurable. What does "successful implementation" mean and who is the judge of that? How can I measure that success in what time frame? How much of a decrease in staff time will result from working with e-file vs. paper and what is the value of that time? - Measurement and assessment should be strengthened. **Once the pilot courts are complete we will have a better idea as to how to go about and create benchmarks for success.** How will productivity improvements be measured? Perhaps "hours saved" could be tracked. The reduction in physical storage should be quantified. A satisfaction survey could be used to measure "better experience for attorneys". Measurable targets should be established that will define the criteria for success of the pilot sites. The criteria should be achieved before expanding the system.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Intangible service benefits (convenience, concurrent use, speed) are important. - good depiction of benefits - both tangible and intangible	- How do they know 24x7 filing is a need and has an economic return on investment? What is that ROI? The case states this will result in a "more productive court staff", but how much more productive? Will this result in a ____% increase in filings processed with same staff? **Again that is the purpose for using a pilot based approach; once we have gained experience with the pilot courts we will be in a better position to gauge these valid concerns.** What are the benefits of using ACH besides lost or stolen money and what are the costs of ACH transactions? **The benefits for using ACH are convenience, security, accuracy.** Reasons for not using US Bankruptcy E-Filing system--training, payment, and proprietary software (the ESP's software will be proprietary also) are weak and need to be developed. - Tangible benefits include staff savings, space savings and less money lost or stolen. Each of these can be expressed in dollars but are not included in the justification. **To go to the time and trouble to predict these types of savings in 185 courts without knowing the results from a pilot**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		is a hollow and pointless exercise. There is no description of solutions that were considered and rejected. **There are not a lot of alternatives for this type of system in Nebraska, you either build your own, buy an off the shelf product or outsource the results from the pilot project will help us in making that decision.** The Federal system that was described is proprietary, not an alternative to what has been proposed. - project is valuable, but not mandated
5: Technical Impact	- The outsourcing approach offloads training to the ESP and avoids the expense of building our own custom code. The proposed system conforms to a credible subject-relevant XML standard recommended by the National Center for State Courts.	- Need to develop the security, document integrity, and business continuity areas besides reliance on ESP. What is the Court going to do if there is a problem (i.e., ESP is not available, network interruption, etc.) **The ESP is doing very well in other state court systems.** How will the system validate user identity— am I really who I say I am? How will non-repudiation of filing be handled—did I really file something? How will document integrity be handled—is this really what I filed? **The Nebraska Supreme Court has developed Interim Rules for E-Filing cases that address most of these concerns.** Need a long-term technical strategy if the pilot is successful (will it stay at ESP or move in-house) and if the pilot is not successful (return to old system?) - Little information is presented about the software interfaces. What are the "great security features" offered by the ESP? Specifics would allow for an evaluation of their adequacy. How does the ESP propose to conform to State standards for accessibility and authentication/authorization?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Pilot, learn, adjust then deploy is a sound strategy as is installing in both courts for a county at the same time. Team membership seems appropriate except that judges do not appear to be represented.	- Are they using the same business processes they use now or will new processes be developed or current ones changed? Using a new technology the same way as the old process? **Workflows have been developed in the District and County Courts that are a combination of both new and existing processes.** - Judges have considerable power and influence -- they appear to be left out. Stakeholder acceptance in general is an area of weakness. What technologists perceive as "good" may well conflict with how attorneys and court personnel view the system. Please pay more attention to

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		building support among those who will use the system most! Many would rather live with problems they understand and have been coping with than use a system they don't understand. **The Court has an E-Filing subcommittee that is made up of Judges, District Court Clerks, Clerk Magistrates and private sector Attorneys. This group developed the recommended rules for E-Filing and is very involved in getting the pilot project up and running.** Ongoing support should include provisions for maintaining the new scanners and the PCs they presumably attach to. Training for newly hired court staff should also be included. **The PC's being used are leased from the Office of the CIO and include the support discussed here. Training is part of the pilot project. Operation of a scanner is not all that different from a copier or other office business device.**
7: Risk Assessment	- The ESP that has been selected has been successful in other jurisdictions. The subcommittee that has drafted rules for the Court's consideration appears to include the key stakeholders.	- Funding is explicitly identified as a risk that is highly important yet no mitigation strategy is proposed. The mitigation of the staff training risk appears to be that people have been assigned. No information about how those people will address the risk is included.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- What is the financial plan if this project is a huge success and the need to escalate deployment arises?	- Ongoing maintenance and support costs for the new scanners are missing. It's likely that scanner models and features will change over the five year purchasing cycle. It is unclear how long it will be before the court must replace the scanners with new models. **The scanners would be looked at as a four year refresh cycle.** It's unclear if the $3,600 of AS/400 disk storage is required for one or for 93 AS/400s. Scanned images require more storage than native documents. **The images are stored centrally as they currently are for 14 District Courts that use imaging. The cost is for one centralized AS-400.** Detailed personnel costs are not included. It is unclear if the costs that are listed are net of expected personnel cost savings. It's difficult to evaluate the adequacy of the programming cost estimate without more detailed information. $25,000 implies a seven to ten week effort -- is that enough? **This estimate was based on the project**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		estimate from the Office of the CIO. I can find no reference to how the ESP is to be compensated. **The ESP has a separate contract with each attorney or firm registering to use their product. The cost to file a case is still being developed.**

Project #	Agency	Project Title
05-02	Nebraska Supreme Court	Digital Audio Recorders

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This project is intended to replace aging analog tape recorders in Nebraska County Courtrooms with digital audio recorders. This is a multi-year project that was started in FY 2007. All courtroom proceedings are recorded on analog tape recorders. The tapes are either stored or transcribed depending upon the requirements of the case or proceeding. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was notified in June 2006 by Lanier Corporation that Lanier will no longer produce the analog recorders after 2007 and all remaining support will cease approximately five years later.

The AOC tested three digital audio recorders in April –June 2006. The tests proved very successful and the audio quality was superior to that of the analog recording devices. The AOC then worked with State Purchasing to bid the digital audio recorders. The bid was awarded in August 2006. The AOC is presently replacing 21 analog recorders in FY 2007 using a deficit appropriation of $29,000 and shifting some $55,315.00 in existing internal funds (the reason there are some internal funds available was due to an error in NIS which did not show receipt of funds received from Nebraska.gov for several months in FY 2006, going forward those monies will be used to provide additional personal computers to trial court staff.) to cover the cost. Going forward the AOC intends to replace all of the analog recorders over the next three years at a total cost of $495,440.00.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Digital Audio Recorders		
FY2007 Existing Dollars		
Costs for DAR's	**Each**	**21 Units**
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$ 37,695.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$ 13,545.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$ 210.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$ 525.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$ 1,575.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$ 5,565.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$ 59,115.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$ 25,200.00
Total	$4,015.00	$ 84,315.00

Deficit Appropriation	$29,000.00
AOC Internal Funds	$55,315.00
	$84,315.00

FY2008 New Funding

Costs for DAR's	Each		25 Units
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$	44,875.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$	16,125.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$	250.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$	625.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$	1,875.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$	6,625.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$	70,375.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$	30,000.00
FY 2008 Total	$4,015.00	$	100,375.00

FY2009 New Funding

Costs for DAR's	Each		25 Units
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$	44,875.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$	16,125.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$	250.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$	625.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$	1,875.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$	6,625.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$	70,375.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$	30,000.00
Total	$4,015.00	$	100,375.00

Douglas County Court System (centralized)		12 Units
Budget estimate	$	100,000.00
Annual Maintenance	$	10,000.00
	$	110,000.00
FY2009 Total	$	210,375.00

FY2010 New Funding

Costs for DAR's	Each		25 Units
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$	44,875.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$	16,125.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$	250.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$	625.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$	1,875.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$	6,625.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$	70,375.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$	30,000.00

FY 2010 Total	$4,015.00	$ 100,375.00

Total County Courtrooms for DAR Units   **108 Units**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	14	13.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	24	22	23	23.0	25
5: Technical Impact	19	14	19	17.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	8	8.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	7	10	9.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	15	17	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**86**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The objectives and outcome are clearly defined. Appears to be a replacement system.	- Assessments methods were not clear
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Tangible benefits were very clear.	- Manufacture and model number for 6-Port Mixer not listed - Central location of equipment and bandwidth requirements are not addressed. Do not give an estimated cost for training transcribers.
5: Technical Impact	- Project described well.	- Weakness not stated is computer reliability and durability - The bandwidth requirements of an MP3 format being transferred was not addressed. Backup procedures were not addressed regarding off site, etc.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The implementation plan is well defined.	- Experience of Project Team not listed.
7: Risk Assessment		- No contingency plan outlined if the new system goes down. New security risks that come with digital media are not addressed in risk assessment.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget		- In FY 2009 the Douglas County Court System (centralized) cost are more than twice as expensive per unit as the others with no explanation. Ongoing Laptop lease and Annual Software Maintenance costs are not explained. - Initial support is addressed but on-going cost and support is not addressed. Cost of technology refresh is not addressed. Cost allocation of lease program is totaled by year instead of the cost being spread out for the life of the lease. No estimated expense for training. Annual maintenance shows 21 units the first year but those 21 units are not

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		accruing into FY08. FY08 shows annual maintenance charges just on 25 units and does not include the 21 from FY07.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The objectives and outcome are clearly defined. Appears to be a replacement system.	- Assessments methods were not clear
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Tangible benefits were very clear.	- Manufacture and model number for 6-Port Mixer not listed **BIS – MX.2/4-6.USB** Central location of equipment and bandwidth requirements are not addressed **Only the Douglas County system will be a centralized system. The other are all standalone.** Do not give an estimated cost for training transcribers. **Initial transcriber training is included in the cost of the digital recorders.** **Future transcriber training will most likely be a train the trainer approach.**
5: Technical Impact	- Project described well.	- Weakness not stated is computer reliability and durability **Not sure what the reviewer is actually stating in this section as most pc's are considered to be reliable at this point in time.** The bandwidth requirements of an MP3 format being transferred was not addressed. Backup procedures were not addressed regarding off site, etc. **Backup procedures are to a hard drive and to a CD stored off site. Future possibilities are for a centralized server to be used for the purpose of backing up the recordings.**
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The implementation plan is well defined.	- Experience of Project Team not listed. **The Project Team has over 40 years of experience in technical projects.**
7: Risk Assessment		No contingency plan outlined if the new system goes down. **The recorders are on maintenance and the pc's are on maintenance plans. The current contingency is to backup the digital recorders with a floating analog recorder until we can fund a digital backup recorder per District.** New security risks that come with digital media are not addressed in risk assessment. **We believe the security risk for this system to be at a minimum as they are only being used to record court proceedings.**
8: Financial Analysis and		- In FY 2009 the Douglas County Court

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Budget		System (centralized) cost are more than twice as expensive per unit as the others with no explanation. **This cost estimate comes from an RFP estimate provided to the courts for a centralized system**. Ongoing Laptop lease and Annual Software Maintenance costs are not explained. **The laptops are being leased from the Office of the CIO. The annual recorder software maintenance costs are $265.00 per license.** Initial support is addressed but on-going cost and support is not addressed. Cost of technology refresh is not addressed. Cost allocation of lease program is totaled by year instead of the cost being spread out for the life of the lease. No estimated expense for training. Annual maintenance shows 21 units the first year but those 21 units are not accruing into FY08. FY08 shows annual maintenance charges just on 25 units and does not include the 21 from FY07. **The 21 units in 07 and going forward are being paid for with existing fees and are not included in the new monies being requested**.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
13-01	Nebraska Department of Education	Nebraska Transcript Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

The Nebraska Transcript Project – a coalition including the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE), the University of Nebraska P-16 Project, and representatives from the Postsecondary Coordinating Commission, public high schools, the community colleges, and private colleges – requests $250,000 over two years in Nebraska Information Technology Commission funding to lay the necessary groundwork for an electronic transcript system. This system, which is starting to gain momentum nationally, will be contracted with a private company to allow a transcript to be sent to a postsecondary institution, track the request from the high school to the institution, and receive confirmation of it's receipt – all electronically. For students, who are increasingly demanding technology-based access to information it will be a convenient, immediate, and secure way to facilitate their college application process. For high schools, the system will save time and money while providing data about students' college applications and admissions. Also, postsecondary institutions will benefit from a simpler transfer of information and a secure, accountable system.

In order to move toward this electronic system, the Nebraska Transcript Project believes it is critical to address two areas: 1) develop common course descriptors; and 2) design a common electronic transcript for Nebraska high schools. By creating common course descriptors, colleges can more accurately assess, from a transcript, the scope and rigor of the coursework undertaken by an applicant. The descriptors will be based on the national course standards released this year by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). A Project Coordinator with steering committee oversight will educate teachers and administrators through a series of workshops about the new standards and lead a process to involve these entities in the design of a "roadmap" between local courses and the national standards. A common electronic transcript creates a uniform data set for Nebraska students, allowing NDE to track, and when appropriate, report where Nebraska students are applying to colleges, their admission rates, and where they actually attend. This data will help NDE, legislators and the public evaluate how well high schools prepare students for college as well as how successfully Nebraska postsecondary institutions recruit and admit Nebraska students. A committee with representatives from the University of Nebraska P-16 Initiative, the Nebraska Department of Education, the state and private colleges, Nebraska high schools, the community colleges, the Postsecondary Coordinating Commission and registrars from both the high school and postsecondary institutions will meet to review national standards, the formats used on electronic transcript software, and successful models from Iowa and Indiana. From this information, the group will create a Nebraska transcript prototype and promote its voluntary adoption in the state's high schools. NITC funds will support hiring and equipping a full-time coordinator and half-time office support as well as costs to providing four statewide informational workshops.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs		$ 96,996.00	$ 99,264.00				$ 196,260.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials		$ 1,000.00	$ 500.00				$ 1,500.00
4. Telecommunications		$ 1,343.00	$ 1,341.00				$ 2,684.00
5. Training		$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00				$ 4,000.00
6. Travel		$ 16,716.00	$ 15,000.00				$ 31,716.00
7. Other Operating Costs		$ 3,825.00	$ 3,825.00				$ 7,650.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$ 2,800.00					$ 2,800.00
8.2 Software							$ -
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other		$ 3,390.00					$ 3,390.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 128,070.00	$ 121,930.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00
General Funds		$ 128,070.00	$ 121,930.00				$ 250,000.00
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 128,070.00	$ 121,930.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 250,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	12	13	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	16	20	23	19.7	25
5: Technical Impact	15	13	20	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	10	8.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	6	7	7	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	13	20	17.7	20
			TOTAL	**80**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The project goal of standardizing course descriptors and creating a common electronic transcript will ultimately provide high school students with an efficient means to submit college applications while also providing policy makers and instructional practitioners with data to better understand this process. Identifying and assembling a representative group of key stakeholders is critical to this process. - The concept of a statewide digital transcript is commendable. - Project integrates well with the State technology plan as well as utilizing work from our peer states through MHEC	- Obtaining a representative group of stakeholders will be a challenge. Obtaining agreement on course descriptors will be a difficult process, but the idea that this will translate to a verifiable and reliable measure of academic rigor does not necessarily follow. -The transcript approach should be mandated and not optional. One of the outcomes of the project should be a scope and sequence and timeline for total participation; not a roadmap. It is difficult to discern the exact outcomes or objectives from the Section 3 text. - While the document indicates that there will be involvement from other postsecondary institutions that involvement is not detailed in terms of representation and this reviewer was unable to find any documentation on the web that detailed the membership of the coalition. One could infer from this that postsecondary outside of the University system have not been involved in the planning process.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Answering the need to streamline the submission process for high school seniors and higher education institutions. Providing the opportunity to achieve a broad base of support for this process - Many benefits of the statewide transcript project were described. - The benefits of the program are well established	- The primary rationale provided is that there is a growing expectation that such a system will be available and citing students' use of electronic devices as evidence. The goals and objectives of this project are important, however, greater emphasis must be given to a true business case for this undertaking including cost savings and obtaining data that can be used to assist and guide students through the process of selecting and applying to colleges. - No alternative solutions were evaluated other than 'doing nothing'. It appears that participation in electronic transcripts thrusts Nebraska to the forefront of other states. Is this true? Can an overview of other state-

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		level electronic transcript efforts be included? - The analysis of alternatives is weak. Doing nothing is not the only alternative. What are other MHEC states doing if they aren't participating in the MHEC program - how about states outside MHEC?
5: Technical Impact	- The intended outcome of this project is clear and is a necessary step toward the adoption of technology that will streamline the college submission process. - Description of electronic versus paper transcripts was adequate.	- While the funding being sought does not impact technology directly the expected outcome will pave the way for a process that will be technology based. Practically no information was provided on the eventual technology that will used beyond the fact that it will be contracted and is Web-based with hooks to email. This is very scant evidence upon which a reviewer can base her/his evaluation. If the system that will be adopted is good than it will be embraced, however, this reviewer believes that more information on the eventual system that will be used should have been provided. - No technical descriptions were given and said to not be necessary. Is this just an I.T. planning project? How can an electronic transcript be an outcome of the project without hardware and software to maintain it?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	-Clear and concise timeline -Clearly articulated goals aligned to project activities and expenditures - Multi-sector involvement is described and is necessary for a project of this scope.	- The project lays the foundation for broad acceptance; however, it does not provide the on-going support that will be required to help smaller rural districts comply with the requirements. There is significant work that will need to be done in the way of communication as well as assisting districts in a process that will impact their current data systems. This expense will all be pushed back on the schools and ESUs with no additional funding. -The project points to the leadership of Joe Rowson, when he is no longer with the P-16 Initiative, who will be replaced by another P-16 Coordinator.
7: Risk Assessment	- Recognition of the financial and logistical barriers associated with obtaining project outcomes and ensuring that a system will be available beyond the scope of this project. -Alignment with the NCES standards is identified as important.	- Beyond the recognition of the barriers very little was communicated about addressing them beyond suggesting that they are not insurmountable. This is tantamount to saying there are risks but everything should be okay. -Again, a "roadmap" is referred to as helping guide schools toward an electronic transcript. NO mitigation of non-compliance is identified. - While the plan is well laid out the difficulty of the task is substantial and I have doubts that the number of sessions and classes planned will be adequate to facilitate the degree of change required.
8: Financial	- Costs are low relative to the benefits of the	- The salary for the project leader seems

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Analysis and Budget	expected outcomes	very low based on what will be required to ensure the success of the project. -It's not clear how the new FTE personnel relate to the project or how their salaries will be assumed in the long term.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Education Council recommends this project be categorized as a highly recommended project.
- The Education Council disregarded the technical review scores due to the apparent inconsistencies in scoring.
- The Education Council recognizes that the Department of Education project is working cooperatively with MHEC (Midwest Higher Education Compact), an 11-state purchasing consortium, to achieve transcript standardization.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 2 (Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	*NDE Response to Reviewers Comments*
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	-We do not anticipate problems in assembling a representative group of stakeholders. The steering committee that helped to develop the proposal contained folks from all stakeh9older groups. All groups have expressed an interest in participating in the implementation of this project. We agree that the development of the new course descriptors will be a difficult process but we do not see this as a weakness of the project. The new NCES standards have already been developed; the only agreement required is whether or not to adopt the new standards. If adopted, new standard course descriptors will be a more reliable measure because each course has a detailed and comparable definition, which was lacking in the past. -The Department of Education is mandated by rule to collect data on the courses taught in Nebraska schools. There is no such mandate for a common transcript. We believe that a common transcript will benefit both secondary and postsecondary education and therefore the incentive to participate will be great. The project team is looking for sponsorship that would make the electronic transfer of transcripts free to students. -The focus of this project is all of PK-16 education. The Nebraska P-16 Initiative is located at the University of Nebraska and the U of N will play a central role in it's implementation. All of postsecondary education, including private postsecondary was involved in the planning process. This fact was reiterated during the presentation before the NITC Education Committee.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	-The primary focus of this project is to perform the detailed planning necessary to implement the common transcript and the common course descriptors. We are confident that a more than adequate business case will be established as we proceed through this project. -While this project will place Nebraska at the forefront of transferring transcripts electronically, it is difficult to obtain much information from other states. We have talked extensively with folks in Indiana, where a full-blown electronic transcript project is being implemented. We have also visited with our colleagues in Iowa, where they are working on defining data elements for a common transcript. These are the only two states that are currently working on this type of project. -We really do not believe that doing nothing is an alternative since school districts and postsecondary institutions will be adopting electronic transcript products in the very near future. The only question is whether there will be a logical, statewide implementation.
5: Technical Impact	-Without directing the reviewers to specific companies that are selling this service, it is difficult to adequately describe the details of this process. In truth, this is a fairly simple web-based application which requires only a few hours of training. We believe that a key strength to this project is that very little new technology will be required to implement this project and that its web-based nature will be very familiar to students and educators at all levels. -We believe that one strength of this project is that it leverages the investments that school districts and postsecondary institutions have already made in their local student information systems and their hardware networks. Westside High School in Omaha has already demonstrated that drawing transcript data from their current SIS and sending it to a vendor is possible. In addition, SIS vendors with multiple Nebraska customers will be able to design a single extract program to serve all of their customers.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	-The cost of sending transcripts is now borne by high schools and colleges. In the new world of electronic transcripts, this cost will be reduced. In the case of the common course descriptors, NDE is already required to collect this information. The reviewer is correct that the cost of mapping local data to the state standard is not included in this project. -Joe Rowson will continue to serve half time with the P-16 Initiative. In addition, the U of N intends to hire a full time P-16 Coordinator. This project will continue to be supported by the P-16 Initiative.
7: Risk Assessment	-We are aware of the risks that exist with a project like this; however we are also familiar with

	the audience that we will be working with. We have been working with school districts in implementing the new Nebraska Student and Staff Record System and the data model has already been developed for this project. We are familiar with our audience nad comfortable with our approach. -The transcript portion of this project is voluntary. Non-compliance is not an issue. -We believe the n umber fs session is adequate.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	-The salary is typical of a senior consultant in the Department of Education -We expect that the cost of incorporating the new course descriptors into the student and staff record system will be absorbed by the NDE since this is currently a critical activity of NDE. School districts and postsecondary institutions will assume long-term support of the electronic transcript unless outside funding can be secured.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-01	Health and Human Services System	New Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

In 1965, Title XIX of the Social Security Act initiated a jointly funded medical assistance program for certain individuals and families with low incomes and resources. The program, called Medicaid, is a cooperative venture between the Federal and State governments to assist States in providing medical care to eligible needy persons.

The Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) is the claims processing system for Nebraska's Medicaid Program. In addition to processing claims, the MMIS also supports coordination of benefits, surveillance and utilization review, federal and management reporting, and case management.

Last fiscal year the Nebraska MMIS was used to process nearly 9.5 million Medicaid claims, and issued over $1.3 billion in payments to providers. Over the past ten years, the number of Medicaid claims processed has nearly doubled, and the average monthly number of Medicaid eligibles has increased from 135,159 in fiscal year 1994 to 197,152 in 2004.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) requires a certified and continuously operational MMIS to fully fund administrative functions. CMS funds the MMIS at 75% for operations and 90% for MMIS enhancement and replacement. The federal fiscal year 2005 budget proposal released on February 5, 2005, proposed to cut the federal matching rate for MMIS enhancements from 90% to 75%. Although this proposal was not adopted, the potential elimination of federal funding exists.

Three significant problem areas of the current system are:

1) **Outdated Technology:** Nebraska's MMIS was developed 27 years ago and has outlived most other states; Medicaid Management Information Systems. The current MMIS uses outdated technology and an older, inflexible technical design. Staff have worked hard to maintain the functionality of the MMIS, however, it is an extremely tenuous system often requiring "band aid" solutions. Several experts have concluded that the current MMIS in incapable of meeting expectations and future needs.

2) **Needs Outgrew System:** The Medicaid program has become increasingly complex, with service changes (e.g. hospice, behavioral health), eligibility changes, and new regulations (e.g. HIPAA). New program needs are difficult to address with the existing system. Labor-intensive "workarounds" are used to address these changes in the short-term, but do not represent a long-term solution.

3) **Costly to Maintain:** Because the MMIS is based on outdated technology and older, inflexible programming, it is costly to maintain, operate and enhance.

A Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) procurement will replace the current MMIS with a state-of-the-art MMIS. It will provide the Department with enhanced claims processing functions to increase claims productivity and accuracy. It will also provide tools to manage and distribute work, track and report all customer contracts and provide a portal for providers and clients to obtain and share needed information within the Department as well as to external agencies.

The new MMIS will be more closely aligned to the Medicaid Information Technology Architecture (MITA), which was developed and supported by Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). CMS is

using MITA as a tool for communicating a common vision for the Medicaid program and for providing guidance on achieving that vision. CMS will use an updated advance planning document (APD) review process and criteria to ensure that state IT planning meets MITA goals and objectives.

Some of the key technical architecture features include:
- Service-oriented architecture (SOA)
- Common interoperability and access services
- Adaptability and extensibility
- Hub architecture
- Performance measurement

The State of Nebraska released a RFP for a MMIS on December 15, 2005. Four bids were received. The bids were opened and reviewed by State Purchasing on April 26, 2006. After evaluation, all four bids were rejected on June 20, 2006. The bids were rejected for price, failing to meet the requirement that the bidder transfer ownership of some key portions to the State, and qualifications of the bidder. It is the State's intent to continue with procurement of a new MMIS.

The Department is submitting an Advance Planning Document (APDP to notify the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) of plans to procure a new MMIS and to request Federal Financial Participation (FFP) for the activities required for planning, procurement, design, development, implementation and certification.

FUNDING SUMMARY

The total cost for this project is estimated at $50 million. Based on previously submitted RFP's the federal match for this project will average 87%. A break out of individual expenses is not available at this time but will be included in the RFP responses.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	12	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	22	24	19	21.7	25
5: Technical Impact	15	18	18	17.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	9	6	7.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	8	9	7	8.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	15	13	13.7	20
			TOTAL	**80**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives are described adequately - Very strong goals/objectives/beneficiaries and outcomes description - Goals, objectives, benefits, and expected outcomes well thought out and presented. Using comprehensive project management process and procedure will benefit the implementation process.	- This project will be very similar in size and scope to the installation of a typical ERP system. It will also be a system that is probably quite similar to 50 other state systems doing the same thing. I would have liked to see some reference to that fact. - Could improve measures of success by relating them specifically to outcomes (i.e. one expected outcome is increased number of electronic claims, an appropriate measure of achievement would be change in e-claim numbers)

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- Page 5, the first bullet item appears to be incomplete; not sure if everything is mentioned. There is no measurement criteria defined to determine the quality and effectiveness of the resultant software application.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Appears to be well thought out - Explanation of other solutions evaluated is particularly strong - Good analysis of the four solutions presented pertaining to time frame and risk factors. State and federal mandates are clearly defined.	- It seems to me that if 50 states are all doing similar types of activities in this area the option of MMIS replacement with /Fiscal agent should possibly be given more consideration, I would have liked to see more data on this approach as well as the MMIS procurement approach. What are the real differences? - Tangible benefits are not fully explained. There is no projected economic return on investment (ROI) for any of the four solutions identified.
5: Technical Impact	- The SOA approach is a good one as it enables you to connect just about all of your computing assets into a cohesive whole, making it possible to get your systems speaking the same language together, regardless of their technology and what you may have been told in the past were 'incompatible' systems. - Technical elements are defined at the standards level, rather than software/hardware level, which is appropriate at this stage of project. Standards identified are appropriate for project. - Most of the technical issues are well developed and supported.	- A Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) is a very good approach to this proposal. SOA is supported by standards-based technologies like XML, web services, and SOAP, it is quickly moving from pilot projects to mainstream applications critical to business operations. One of the key standards accelerating the adoption of SOA is Business Process Execution Language for web services (BPEL). BPEL was created to address the requirements of composition of web services in a service-oriented environment. I would have liked to see a discussion on the use of BPEL as part of the architectural design that is associated with this project, since BPEL is a really good approach to model and map the business processes to the system design. - No clear discussion of reliability and security, beyond statement of adherence to common standards. - Security measures are not defined.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good discussion from an IT perspective - Good breakdown on teams that will be involved. The support requirements are clear and well defined.	- The business modeling process was really not discussed. If the agency does not look at this aspect then we are paving the cow paths. Implementing an SOA environment should include a review of all the business processes. - Stakeholder acceptance not addressed - I could not find where the Project sponsor(s) were identified. No information was given that indicated stakeholder acceptance was examined. Deliverables are loosely defined. Not clear which groups the "train the trainers" will train and which the contractor will train.
7: Risk Assessment	- Agree that this will not be a simple project. Going in with eyes wide open is positive. Coordination with other states will be necessary. - A number of valid risks and mitigation plans are identified. I do believe this project carries significant risk simply as a result of its size and scope. - The IT risks are well defined.	- Not much discussion regarding the risks associated with the business process design. This is going from the as-is to the to-be model. Will the architecture match the business process? What is that risk? - End-user computer proficiency could be a factor in the acceptance of new technology and the time needed to train the end-users.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Not much information, however the project is in an initial planning stage. - Financial information is sparse due to initial planning stage. There was no response to item #16.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	

- Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a "mandate".

NITC COMMENTS

- Mandate (Required by law, regulation, or other authority.)
- Regarding Project 25-01, New Medicaid Management Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
  - To leave Project 25-01 in the recommended "Mandate" list.
  - To note that the project was not submitted on time for an evaluation and Technical Panel review.
  - That the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for review of the project as needed.
  Commissioner Aerni seconded. Motion passed.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-02	Health and Human Services System	Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

The NHHS R&L Laboratory is in the process of identifying a new Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) to replace their current system, LabVantage SeedPak (version 3.98.1). The current system is outdated (Oracle 7.4.3). The new system will improve the efficiency for sample tracking, quality assurance documentation, record-keeping, document archival, data management, and data reporting. All of these enhancements will help the HHS Lab achieve and maintain accreditation under the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) and/or the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimated costs for the HHSS Laboratory LIMS

Expenditures for new hardware, software and services.

Also includes expenditures for ongoing support and maintenance

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Implementation Services							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training		$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00				$ 4,000.00
6. Travel		$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00				$ 4,000.00
7. Ongoing support and maintenance Costs		$ -	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 60,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$ 20,000.00					$ 20,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00				$ 300,000.00
8.3 Network		$ 3,000.00					$ 3,000.00
8.4 Other		$ 2,000.00					$ 2,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 179,000.00	$ 169,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 393,000.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds (22082)		$ 179,000.00	$ 169,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 393,000.00
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 179,000.00	$ 169,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 393,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	13	13.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	22	22	23	22.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	17	15	15.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	10	5	7.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	6	9	5	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	18	12	14.7	20
			TOTAL	79	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Good description of goals/objectives - Complete project definition with reasonable measurement criteria. - The goals and objectives are strong, but it does read like a sales brochure…. A little more detail instead of the generalized statements would have been better.	- Minimal info about linkage to agency technology plan - found it as a reviewer, without assistance within the project proposal - Would like to see some quantity assigned to 'more testing', 'shorter time period', 'reduce data entry'. - Expected outcomes - could have been stronger. If there were that many goals and objectives, at a minimum, there should have been a reference to the goals and objectives. Question 2 - measurement and assessment methods - instructions ask for the methods that will be used. The statement of staff will determine when each phase is complete is not an answer. Of course staff will be used, but what criteria are they going to use. The methods are either not listed or are in vague terms. I would expect a project of this complexity to provide more of a methodology to the acceptance of each of the components of work. While I see this as a weakness, I also believe it is a detail that can be corrected and documented in the RFP and contract for the acquisition of the software. Question 3 - I don't understand how a project of this magnitude is not part of the agency technology plan.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good description of justification, although almost entirely in terms of intangible benefits, with little or no mention of tangible benefits. - Good business case. - Reading the entire proposal, the benefits of the new system will be very valuable, just not completely stated in this section.	- Only the "do nothing" option was mentioned - this may be because a RFP will be used to identify the solution, and thus comparative options weren't really known - Only considering a 'do nothing' alternative may have been too narrow of a focus. - Question 4 - it would seem the goals and objectives would again be tangible benefits to the project, not referenced in this question. Question 5 - While it is briefly mentioned, it should have been more clearly stated here that one option considered was the upgrading of the existing system, while it is not a viable option, it would seem it was thought about. If going to a manual system, as a result of the current system not functioning, will only increase the lab operation by 2 FTEs and maybe require a little more time for samples. I think the result would have a much larger impact that is noted for doing nothing. Question 6 - is not accreditation for the federal programs an important aspect of this process, it may not be a mandate, but should have been mentioned again....
5: Technical Impact	- Reasonably good comments regarding enhancements - although similar or duplicative of the comments offered in the business justification. - Question 7 - the enhancements are clearly covered and discussed. Some technical discussion. (see weaknesses)	- Very little technical detail provided in project proposal. - I would like to know how the system will provide for future enhancements and migration to avoid a total reimplementation in the future. - Question 7 - The technical discussion was weak and confusing. The answer states this system will function on an independent network, yet in question 8, it states the system will use present network and internet protocol. The answers seem to conflict each other. Also, there was no discussion of strengths and weaknesses in this question.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Pretty good overview of general schedule and milestones or phases that will be monitored and	- Doesn't speak much at all to the experience and qualifications of the team from HHSS that will be

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	managed as the project progresses	managing this project. - Question 9 - Did not think the answers came close to the information requested in the question. The answer was referencing the RFP will require. This question asked for detail now, we don't get to see the RFP on this document. Question 10 - was the same schedule listed before which could have used more narrative in the expectation for the deliverables. The deliverables are the gauge of project completion. Question 12 states a system administrator will be required to manage the system, but this position is not listed in the budget section. It would appear to be existing staff, but it is unclear.
7: Risk Assessment	- All risks seem to be understood and manageable.	- Not much detail in addressing how any potential risks would be mitigated. - Question 13- setting up the network - again seems to conflict with previous statements. Also, I would suspect there are other risks, such as the risk of the current system conflicting with the new system during dual operation. Question 14 - does not address strategies to address the risks listed in question 13, but talks about a specification list that will be in the RFP, and this list will minimize all of the risks. I do not understand the connection.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The budget seems reasonable.	- The budgeted software amount is entered in two years - not quite sure how this payment structure is envisioned. Maintenance at 10% could easily be over-optimistic, at least based on common software contracting practices. - Final expenditure will be related to the cost of the LIMS software which is controlled by the vendor. (76% of the total budget) - Question 16 - itemized list of hardware and software - 2 servers (possibly 3) this is inconsistent with the rest of the proposal, most of the time only 2 servers are listed. Also, no software is listed here, yet the entire proposal is for information system (software?). No FTEs - should address what is meant by a system administrator listed previously. On-going or replacement costs - nothing is listed, yet it appears there might be a risk of some laboratory equipment not working with a new system. It is also possible that not all current equipment will be able to function with the new system. Should be included as a risk and a possibility of additional expenditures. The last item listed states the funding is coming from the cash fund. Will there be an increase in fees to the customers listed earlier in the proposal or is there an expectation that fees for lab work will remain the same... This could have a significant impact on the customers of this project, yet nothing is mentioned...

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✔			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✔	
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✔	

- Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)
- Regarding Project 25-02, Laboratory Information Management System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
  - o To leave Project 25-02 in the recommended Tier 3 list.
  - o To note that the project was not submitted on time for an evaluation and Technical Panel review.
  - o That the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for review of the project as needed.
  Commissioner Flanagan seconded. Motion passed.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-01	Department of Roads	Expansion of Falcon DMS to Agencywide Use

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

To expand the Falcon Document Management System license to cover all agency (NDOR) employees and acquire the Automate Program Interfaces (APIs) to allow interfacing to in-house developed applications.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							$ -
8.2 Software							$ -
8.3 Network		$ 494,250.00					$ 494,250.00
8.4 Other			$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,014,932.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 494,250.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,509,182.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds		$ 494,250.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,509,182.00
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 494,250.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,509,182.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	9	14	10	11.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	15	20	20	18.3	25
5: Technical Impact	10	17	16	14.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	6	8	6.3	10
7: Risk Assessment	5	8	7	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	12	16	15	14.3	20
			TOTAL	71	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Identifies specific objectives - It is clear at a basic level what the desired outcome is expected to be. The product is already in use within the agency.	- Think they confused Automate Program Interface with Application Program Interface. Not sure if they have to increase the number of licenses they need. Not very clear on how important this system

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		really is from the information provided. The writer assumes we already understand what the system is all about. - Objective 3 (expand to all agency documents) doesn't identify specific additional business areas for implementation - Weakness may be in the cost to expand this solution and the technical requirements to implement and maintain this software.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Goals of reducing storage space for documents and eliminating multiple copies are valid. The fact that the software is already in use and this would be an expansion of current use is a strength. Other solutions were evaluated in 2000 when this product was selected is mentioned.	- Justification is based on the fact that they already spent a lot of money on this and retraining costs would be too high. However they do not provide any evidence of that. - Does not address implications of doing nothing ...
5: Technical Impact	- Enhancement of current capabilities seems straightforward - Strength is that this is an expansion of existing technology.	- Comments like - "I would hazard a guess..." and "To the best of my knowledge..." do not give this reviewer the confidence to say that the author has met the requirement of this part. What is the existing infrastructure? I have no knowledge of that the "in-house" applications are that will interface with this system. That being the case one can't say if this will continue to work they way they want it to. Very limited detail provided. - Implementation of new API's could present technical challenges that aren't addressed. I wonder if an imaging solution such as this also presents scalability issues - if so they aren't addressed. - Weakness is that the impact of expanding this software in terms of technical impact and is not well defined. An example of technical impact would be any issues related to all documents being stored centrally and making them available to office locations across the state. Will the current network and hardware configuration support this change?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- At least one new area (ARMS) appears to be ready to utilize the new capability planned in this proposal. - The strength is the expanded use of current software.	- Once the API's are provided a lot of programming work still has to take place. The author does not provide any detail on how that will progress and to what time schedule. Training requirements are glossed over. Not even a little detail. - Doesn't identify sponsor, timelines, or roles required to implement. - The plan to implement does not provide much detail on how this software will be implemented. It appears to be a minor upgrade, but the goals of agency wide use are not clearly addressed.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
7: Risk Assessment	- Strength is that software is already installed; this project only expands current use.	- Again very little detail. One could assume this is a very easy thing to do and yet it could be rather complicated. In that they have had this project for at least six years there must be some positive things to say about it in terms of cost savings already experienced. What has been the training experience been already? How many hours? Is there on-line help built in the system? What about accessibility standards? - The possibility of impact to current technical environment is not described. If scope of project is to retrieve existing stored documents into existing applications, risk should be minimal. The expansion of this solution to other document types and multiple locations could add addition risk. If these issues have not been considered, then stated goals of project may not be achieved without additional costs.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Expansion of existing software.	- Sketchy at best. Are there hardware costs with this upgrade? Training costs? Costs to modify existing applications?? - The numbers seem reasonable, but I'm having difficulty matching the Financial Analysis and Budget form with the detailed costs listed in item 16. - Software is offered with multiple options, if the requirements have not been correctly identified the cost to implement may be greater than budgeted.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.			✓	
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	

- Unknown. Not enough information provided to make a determination.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 4 (Insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation for funding.)
- Commissioner Flanagan moved that Project 27-01 be moved to Tier 4 due to insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation. Commissioner Huggenberger second. Motion passed.

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section 3: Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Specific goals and objectives;
This system is how everyone at NDOR can access engineering documents. It may be someone directly involved in the Design process (Engineers, Appraisers, and Traffic Analysts) to District personnel such as District Engineers, Project Managers and Maintenance workers who need to know what they are going to have to build in order to coordinate their people and activities. This system is one of two that handle reference (background) files with CADD documents. This system will automatically copy out all of the reference files when you check out or copy out a CADD document so that you see all of the information without having to go copy out or check out all of the reference files one at a time.

With the success we have had on the Engineering side, it is now time for us to expand this into a full document management system for NDOR. The acquisition of the APIs will allow us to create interfaces to various systems for different applications based on user need and security. There are also several add-on products that we can utilize to transfer information to customers within and outside of NDOR as well as receive information from customers outside of NDOR.

Section 4: Project Justification / Business Case
Tangible Benefits;
1) APIs would allow us to create hook functions into our Automated Right-of-Way Management System (ARMS) so our appraisers and negotiators can copy out files to review them or they would be able to make a PDF out of a plan sheet and store it inside of ARMS so they can eliminate the need for carrying a set of plans when they go to negotiate with landowners.
2) API's would allow us to create hook functions with our GIS applications such as NECTAR so District personnel can look up as-built plans on old projects by clicking on a map interface and finding TIF images or a PDF of a plan set on a project. Currently they have to go to the District office to look at microfilm images of the plan sheets. Here is the scenario we would eliminate in one of our Construction offices in the Panhandle (District 5).
   a. Project Manager in Chadron must drive to the District Office in Gering (100 miles and 2 hours time) in order to view the as-builts for a project.
   b. Project Manger finds what they need and then calls the archives office in Lincoln to print the sheets for them
   c. Project Manager drives back to Chadron
   d. Archives office prints off the sheets. The next day (if we catch the mail truck) they are driven out to Chadron. Since the delivery truck goes around to all District offices, this could take two or three days.
   e. Project Manager receives the sheets after two to four days from viewing the plan sheets.
   f. Project Manager drives back to the District Office in Gering to review the as-builts because a miscommunication between them and the archives office led to the wrong sheets being printed.
   g. Go through steps b through e again – Worst case scenario
3) APIs would allow us to create a number of front ends for users who store documents into Falcon and have specific security needs. An example is the Human Resources Division who could store all their documentation in Falcon and we could create a front end for them using VB, C#, Java or the web so they can have others access only the information they need to on individuals.
4) APIs would allow us to create hook functions into our plotting software so we can automatically send PDF or TIFF images of plans into Falcon and also create CADD files for District personnel to do as-built plans for keeping track of changes made in the field on projects.

41

5) Falcon SVP will allow us to setup a web page for consultants to post files into our system and also to get files out of our system on projects they are designing for us. Current workflow is the consultant has to put the files on a CD or DVD and then NDOR employees have to put the files into the system along with the metadata describing each file.

6) Falcon SVP will allow us to setup a storefront for contractors so they find the project they want to bid on and purchase the PDF of the project or specific pages they want or purchase printed copies from NDOR.

7) Falcon Transmittal will allow us to track electronic documents and make sure that people have reviewed them in a timely matter. Currently on documents that are routed they sometimes are lost in an inbox and no one knows where they are at. This causes delays in moving forward with projects since decisions cannot be made or documented.

Other evaluated solutions;

As stated earlier there is only one other solution that could possibly handle the needs of NDOR. When we were looking for a solution in 2000, this same solution was available at that time. The reason we could not and still cannot use that solution is because they do not have the APIs to allow us to develop our own applications and they also allow for more than one person to modify a file at the same time. NDOR wants only one person to be modifying a file at a time and if someone else needs to make changes to the file, that person must communicate with the person who has the file. Before we went to Falcon, we had no way to secure these files from having more than two people modifying them at a time. This caused loss of data on a number of occasions which resulted in NDOR employees having to redo work.

The other solution is also more expensive than what we currently have and if we were to change, you would also need to include the cost of migrating the data from the old to the new system as well as the time it will take to run tests to make sure all of the files and database information has been moved and is functioning properly. Also the cost of training on a new system would need to be included.

There are other solutions for document management systems (McClaren, FileNet, IBM DB2 Document Manager) but I could find no evidence that they handle the reference file support that we require so users don't have to find each file they need for a specific drawing. McClaren's Enterprise Engineer comes close but that sits on top of FileNet so you would have to purchase two products in order to handle your document management needs.

Section 5: Technical Impact

Enhances, changes or replaces present technology

1) The current process in regard to ARMS is to print off a set of plans and take them with you into the field. This would allow us to let the appraisers save the files into ARMS (PDF, TIFF or CADD file) so they can review the document along with the landowner information on their laptop.

2) Connection into NDOR's NECTAR application will allow NDOR personnel and customers to access project information via the web instead of the current situation which is to look at microfilm or come into the office in Lincoln.

3) Currently we have to burn CDs' or DVDs' to get information out to the field. A website utilizing Falcon SVP will allow us to give contractors access to the information they need when they need it and not have to wait on getting the information in the mail.

4) The creation of a store front to allow contractors to get plan sets or sheets printed without having to make calls into the office or come into Lincoln will eliminate the amount of time contractors will need to wait on getting the information they need to place bids on projects. The ability to get the electronic file will also allow them to redline the drawings so they can determine project phasing and give NDOR the best price for the project.

Training will be required for all of our development staff on utilizing the APIs. Training will also be required for the new users into the system. NDOR currently has a training program setup. We are currently looking to not only have the classroom training but put it on-line as well for people to review

when they have the time. We will need to develop training for using the website and store front applications.

The increase in document storage may require us to purchase an additional server or upgrade the current server. Since our District offices already utilize the system to access engineering drawings, there should be minimal additional impact on the network. We may need to make changes to our network based on the study being completed by our Operations Division in relation to District Operation Centers with the State Patrol. Any modifications made will improve our existing network.

Section 6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation
1) Familiarize IT staff with the APIs and other add-on application in the Falcon Suite
2) Provide training to development staff in utilizing the APIs
3) Meet with project stakeholders and describe to them the various projects we have planned and get their buy-in.
4) Finalize training documentation to include the add-on applications in the Falcon Suite.
5) Train new users to the system and familiarize them with the add-on applications.
6) Setup teams for each project, identify the sponsors and begin developing the business processes that existing and those that may need to be changed
7) Once the business processes have been finalized, determine the schedule for the project including development, testing, documentation and training. Set milestones for the project development including a defined end project date.

Steps 6 & 7 would be done for each project described in Section 4 of the Tangible Benefits part of the document.

Support will be required from the vendor as far as the APIs and any malfunctions in the software. We may also utilize the vendor to either develop or assist us in developing applications or hook functions into various software products.

Section 7: Risk Assessment
If we are not able to obtain the APIs and additional add-on applications, NDOR will not be able to improve some of our workflows which would allow us to save time. Things such as burning DVDs, printing plans sheets, routing paper documents, etc. will still be standard practice for NDOR if we cannot obtain these things. We will have some of this still within NDOR but it would decrease the amount of this significantly in my opinion with this purchase.

This system has provided many benefits to NDOR.
1) It allows us to find CADD drawings easily without having to look in different locations since our folder structure is now a standard.
2) It eliminated the loss of data since only one person may modify a file at a single time.
3) It has made it possible for District personnel to review files without having to copy the files since the system has a built-in viewer.
4) It provides us a mechanism (utilizing Crystal Reports) to track who and when someone has made modifications to a file as well as when the file was added into the system and who deleted a file.

Section 8: Financial Analysis and Budget
We may need to purchase a new server or upgrade the existing server since more documents will be placed into the system.

Training documentation is completed for everything but the add-on applications. That needs to be written and it will be taught by our existing Falcon Administrator or his staff. We will contract with the vendor on how to utilize the APIs for developer training.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-03	Department of Roads	Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) Enhancement

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

Enhance the existing Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) application to automate the exchange of road condition and incident/event information with the new Nebraska State Patrol (NSP) Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System and with other State Departments of Transportation Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS). Build a training version of HCRS to provide a system for training internal users without impacting the live data which feeds to the public 511 Advanced Traveler Information System. Provide 511 data to handheld device users and at Interstate rest area kiosks in a streamlined format. Improve the appearance of the existing HCRS/TIP public website map. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Earmark funds have already been approved by the Federal Highway Administration, allocated and obligated to NDOR with the intent of offsetting half of the enhancement costs.

FUNDING SUMMARY

$200,000 has been contributed by the FHWA as an element of the FY-02 approved Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Earmark work plan, $200,000 is the State's required match to the ITS Earmark and $200,000 has been set aside for system administration, operation and maintenance throughout the five-year contract.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	15	10	13.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	23	24	23	23.3	25
5: Technical Impact	13	19	10	14.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	7	8.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	7	0	5.3	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	8	10	12	10.0	20
			TOTAL	74	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The outlined goals and objectives related to enabling the updating, enhancing and sharing data between multiple users of street/highway centerline data are laudable and if done correctly has the potential to benefit a wide range of users of this data and therefore should be aggressively pursued.	- A major concern with this proposal is the relative absence of any significant discussion of the geospatial base map upon which this system will be based (see Section 5). While not discussed in this proposal, is my understanding that at the present time the planned NSP CAD system will be based on a different roads centerline base map than that currently used by the Nebraska NCRS system. It is also my understanding that neither the current NCRS geospatial base map, nor the proposed NSP base map is comprehensive (local roads?) or, in the case of the NSP data, complete statewide. Is movement to a common base map anticipated or planned? Is such a change in base map reflected in NDOR's

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		comprehensive information technology plan? Has the NDOR GIS division/section been involved in any discussion related to a possible change of centerline base maps? If there is not currently a plan to move to a common road centerline database, it is likely that these factors will introduce significant hurdles in arranging for data exchange, translation, and maintenance between these systems. These hurdles would appear to be significant enough to merit an explicit delineation of objectives related to resolving these issues. The absence of any objective related to these issues raises questions about how well this aspect of the project has been explored.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- There are a wide range of benefits to be gained from enhancing the ability to harvest and integrate information on the highway, road and street conditions and increasing the ability to provide this enhanced data to a broad range of users in a broad range of formats. Based on the potential benefits, this reviewer rates this aspect of the proposal highly.	- Other solutions are vague. - Appears to be an enhancement to a current system. Other solutions were not considered, but it's possible this project could be replaced following upcoming District Operations Center software selection. It's unclear when the DOC selection is planned, if it's very soon, it might make sense to delay implementation until it's determined if DOC software will replace the HCRS, and how quickly that might happen. - It would appear to this reviewer, that a key to efficient and reliable harvesting, integrating and disseminating road condition data, from multiple sources, would be the development of either a common base map and/or common data translation standards. Unless this project incorporates significant coordination efforts in this area, instead of helping to achieve the potential data sharing benefits outlined in this project justification section, this proposal may actually result in the development and/or perpetuation of yet another non-compatible system that would place hurdles in the way of efficient data exchange that could benefit us all (see Section 5 for additional comments).
5: Technical Impact	- Enhancement to an existing, reliable system. - The proposed enhanced system is to be built on a hardware, software, and communications system that has proven reliability track record.	- No technical elements and no weaknesses. - Access for visually impaired (although the current system has a NITC exemption on this point). - The major thrust and benefits of this proposed project are directly related to developing systems to efficiently facilitate data exchange, integration and sharing. However, as noted before in this review, a major concern with this proposal is the relative absence of any significant discussion of the geospatial base map upon which this system will be based. While it is possible that issues related to base map incompatibility have been considered, it is

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		not at all apparent in this proposal, as submitted.

While not discussed in this NDOR proposal, is my understanding that at the present time the planned NSP CAD system will be based on a different roads centerline base map than that currently used by the Nebraska NCRS system. It is also my understanding that neither the current NCRS geospatial base map, nor the proposed NSP base map is comprehensive (local roads?) or, in the case of the NSP data, complete statewide.

Is movement to a common base map between the NCRS system and the NSP CAD system anticipated or planned? Is such a change in base map reflected in NDOR's comprehensive information technology plan? Has the NDOR GIS division/section been involved in any discussion related to a possible change of centerline base maps or if not the translation and integration of data between these two base map systems? The proposal also refers to this project as being a possible transition to a new District Operations Center (DOC) software solution. What will be the roads centerline base map for this new system? If there is to ultimately be a base map change, will this proposal facilitate that change? Have communications related to this base map issue been initiated with either the Nebraska Public Service Commission (the primary developer of NSP data) and/or the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee. If there is not currently a plan to move to a common road centerline database, it is likely that these factors will introduce significant hurdles in arranging for data exchange, translation, and maintenance between these systems. The absence of any significant discussion related to these data issues raises questions about how well this core aspect of the project has been explored.

Also not discussed in this proposal is the scope of this proposed project, specifically relative to local road systems. Is it the plan to ultimately integrate local roads into this NCRS system? It is my understanding that the current NCRS system includes only a limited subset of local roads. If local roads are to be integrated into the system, how will location of an incident or road condition be referenced? Unlike state highways, most local roads do not have mile marker post for |

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		locational reference. The most readily available locational reference for local road incidents are street addresses. It is my understanding that current the NDOR NCRS roads base map system does not currently have any street address information. How would an incident reported by the NSP CAD system (which will have street address information reference) be translated into the NDOR NCRS system? A central component of this proposal is the exchange of data with the NSP new CAD system. However, there is also no information in the proposal as to whether the new NSP CAD system has a built-in data exchange system or whether the NSP will need to contract for the development of a data exchange subsystem for their CAD in order to facilitate this data exchange.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- No Project Team experiences listed - Project Sponsors should be identified by name. - Question # 10 makes reference to three (3) and possibly four (4) GIS Map Updates, but there is no milestone reference to adoption of geospatial base map standards or data transfer standards.
7: Risk Assessment	- SLA agreement with consultant seems strong, and includes financial penalties for non performance	- Barriers and risks listed are vague. Upgrades always have risks. - A project that includes multiple agencies, and multiple state partners, likely involves communication and coordination of activities risks that are not recognized here. - As has been outlined before (Section 5), this reviewer sees the greatest potential risk to this proposed data exchange and integration project to be that of data incompatibility. Data incompatibility between the NSP CAD and current NCRS system could create major hurdles to the efficient exchange and integration of street centerline condition data between these two systems. While the project planners may have made provisions to address these potential data incompatibility problems, there is little reference to that in the proposal as submitted. The proposal also refers to this project as being a possible transition to a new District Operations Center (DOC) software solution. If these potential data incompatibility/data exchange problems are not addressed as a part of the current proposed project, they will likely become even more difficult to resolve in later projects as various agencies and

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		agency subsections become increasingly invested in overlapping, incompatible data structures and processes.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No financial information, No hardware information, No on-going and replacement cost information, No non-stated funding sources and funds information. - Section 6, question 12 identifies 700 hours of project management requirements annually, but doesn't seem to be included in the responses to question 16. - While the answers to two of the questions in this section of the Project Proposal Form refer to "Included in the attached spreadsheet", there appears to be no attached spreadsheet. Therefore it is difficult for this reviewer to comment on or assess the appropriateness of the budget.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	

- The project document indicates that "…this application currently meets all of the NITC standards except the access for the visually impared [sic], which we were granted an exemption." It is unclear who granted the "exemption," but it was not the Technical Panel of the NITC.
- The agency should carefully review and address the GIS issues raised by the reviewers.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 4 (Insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation for funding.)
- Commissioner Hedquist moved that Project 27-03, Department of Roads-Highway Condition Reporting Systems (HCRS) Enhancement, be moved to Tier 4 due to insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation. Commissioner Peterson seconded. Motion passed.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	WCC Internet Enhancement and Security

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This project is a multi-year project that will procure, develop, install, and support Court enhancements in base technical infrastructure in preparation for an expanded Internet presence and provide enhanced levels of security.

In this phase of the project, the court will address:
- Internet Server Redundancy and Load Balancing
- Application Security Assessments

FUNDING SUMMARY

WCC Internet Enhancement and Security

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total		
1. Personnel Costs							$ -		
2. Contractual Services									
2.1 Design							$ -		
2.2 Programming							$ -		
2.3 Project Management							$ -		
2.4 Other		$ 46,000.00					$ 46,000.00	$ 46,000	2.4 Other
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -	$6,000	Load Balancing equipment setup and configuration
4. Telecommunications							$ -	$40,000	Application Security Assessment
5. Training							$ -		
6. Travel							$ -		
7. Other Operating Costs	$ 4,600.00	$ 4,600.00	$ 4,830.00	$ 5,071.50	$ 5,325.08	$ 24,426.58	$ 4,600	7 Other
8. Capital Expenditures								$2,500	Load Balancing Lease
8.1a Hardware - One Time		$ 10,000.00			$11,500		$ 21,500.00	$2,100	2nd Internet Server Footprint
8.1b Hardware - Cont			$ 1,700.00	$ 1,785.00	$ 1,874.25	$ 1,967.96	$ 5,359.25		
8.2a Software - One Time		$ 3,000.00					$ 3,000.00		
8.2b Software - Cont		$ 150.00	$ 157.50	$ 165.38	$ 173.64	$ 182.33	$ 828.84		
8.3 Network							$ -	$10,000	8.1a Hardware - One Time
8.4 Other							$ -	$10,000	2nd Internet Server
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 63,750.00	$ 6,457.50	$ 6,780.38	$ 18,619.39	$ 7,475.36	$ 103,082.63		8.1b Hardware - Cont
General Funds							$ -		Maintenance and Support
Cash Funds		$ 63,750.00	$ 6,457.50	$ 6,780.38	$ 18,619.39	$ 7,475.36	$ 103,082.63		
Federal Funds							$ -	$ 3,000	8.2a Software - One Time
Revolving Funds							$ -	$3,000	Internet Server Software
Other Funds							$ -		8.2b Software - Cont
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 63,750.00	$ 6,457.50	$ 6,780.38	$ 18,619.39	$ 7,475.36	$ 103,082.63		Upgrade and Support

Biennium Total $ 70,207.50

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	13	14	12.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	20	22	23	21.7	25
5: Technical Impact	15	18	20	17.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	9	10	8.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	8	9	9	8.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	18	20	20	19.3	20
			TOTAL	**89**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clearly linked to agency technology plan. Stakeholders clearly identified. Measurements reasonably articulated. - Clear objectives are identified for the Court's Internet applications: availability (98% plus), security (no "holes"), responsiveness (<5 sec, 95% of transactions). A technical approach has been selected to achieve the goals. - The inclusion of application assessments are a positive step in determining the gaps in data flows, and processes pre-production.	- Goals and Objectives are still, by this reviewer's opinion, stated too generally. - Measurement methods for availability and responsiveness are not identified. It is unclear if the availability and responsiveness measures meet the business needs of the beneficiaries. For example, 98% availability implies over three hours of downtime per week. - More detail on how the Internet servers will be redundant. Will they be clustered? Mirrored? I understand that all these questions and more will need to be answered and will be as the project moves along.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- The need for a stable and secure infrastructure is reasonably well articulated. - Intangible customer service benefits are described. Since this is an infrastructure project, it is indirectly related to the ultimate business benefits that will be associated with the application it supports. Contextual information about related projects is also included. - The court has done many things to improve their security posture and should be commended for such.	- Justification is presented essentially as a technical explanation, without a great deal of documented business impact. - Descriptions of several related efforts are included however they do not include descriptions of other solutions for this project. Alternatives for a second server are discussed; however a decision is premature at this time. - Section 4 asks for other solution that were evaluated and rejected and I could not find any solution that fit that description. I read about many items that are moving forward either under the courts purview or at an enterprise level, and I agree that doing nothing is not an option. I was looking for solutions that either didn't fit or were found to be prohibitively expensive.
5: Technical Impact	- General statement of desired outcomes is clearly articulated. Technical approach is reasonably well documented. - The proposed technical approach appears to be reasonable for an infrastructure project. The project is directed at improving reliability and security. - Again, I commend the courts for looking at performing application security testing.	- Information remains very general and seems to lack details. This may be due to the project still being in a proposed, or very early, status. - Strengths and weaknesses are not addressed, nor is scalability. Consideration should be given to the Court's disaster recovery plan when selecting a location for the second Internet server.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project Team appears to have ample experience. - The project has a modest scope that appears to be adequately addressed pending the outcome of the prerequisite server re-engineering design.	- Milestone and/or deliverable descriptions are very general and lack specific details. - No milestones are presented other than the completion of the activities.
7: Risk Assessment	- Risks appear to be relatively minimal, and are adequately addressed. - Testing is a reasonable risk mitigation strategy before implementing new	- Please examine the risks associated with specification error (i.e. the availability and responsiveness goals may not be stringent enough to meet the business need).

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	technology. Offloading tasks to more specialized resources in the Office of the CIO is also an appropriate strategy. -Relatively low risk in implementing a proven technology.	
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Budgetary estimates seem reasonable, and seem to be conservatively (that is, overstated) presented. - Costs appear to be reasonable for this project scope.	

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)

Project #	Agency	Project Title
37-02	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering – Adjudication

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This is a multi-year project that will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Adjudication section of the court. These enhancements will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendations from a consultant engaged in Fiscal Year 2006-07.

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 projects key technology is Computer Managed Workflow.

Project Update
An RFP was issued and awarded for a workflow consultant. With the assistance of the consultant, court will issue an RFI and RFP for the purpose of selecting and procuring workflow software by the end of the biennium. The court will have also started the initial installation and training on this software with the goal of having completed a pilot implementation.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Adjudication Re-engineering

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-11 (Year 4)	Future	Total	
1. Personnel Costs							$ -	
2. Contractual Services								
2.1 Design							$ -	
2.2 Programming							$ -	
2.3 Project Management							$ -	
2.4 Other	$ 25,000.00	$ 75,000.00					$ 100,000.00	**2.4 Other** Professional Contract Services to assist in the completion of the installation, configuration, etc. of purchased software
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -	
4. Telecommunications							$ -	
5. Training	$ 16,000.00	$ 10,000.00					$ 26,000.00	**8.1a Hardware - One Time** Servers & Server Replacements (Prod & Test) $30,000 / $30,000
6. Travel	$ 8,000.00	$ 4,000.00					$ 12,000.00	
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -	***
8. Capital Expenditures								
8.1a Hardware - One Time	$ 30,000.00			$ 30,000.00			$ 60,000.00	**8.1b Hardware - Cont** CIO Data Center Footprint $4,200 / $4,200
8.1b Hardware - Cont	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 25,200.00	
8.2a Software - One Time	$ 355,000.00						$ 355,000.00	***
8.2b Software - Cont		$ 71,000.00	$ 74,550.00	$ 78,277.50	$ 82,191.38	$ 86,300.94	$ 392,319.82	**8.2a Software - One Time** Workflow Software $355,000 / $355,000
8.3 Network							$ -	
8.4 Other							$ -	***
TOTAL COSTS	$ 438,200.00	$ 164,200.00	$ 78,750.00	$ 82,477.50	$ 116,391.38	$ 90,500.94	$ 970,519.82	
General Funds							$ -	**8.2b Software - Cont** Annual License Renewals, Subscriptions, Maintenance Agreements $71,000 / $71,000
Cash Funds	$ 438,200.00	$ 164,200.00	$ 78,750.00	$ 82,477.50	$ 116,391.38	$ 90,500.94	$ 970,519.82	
Federal Funds							$ -	
Revolving Funds							$ -	
Other Funds							$ -	
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 438,200.00	$ 164,200.00	$ 78,750.00	$ 82,477.50	$ 116,391.38	$ 90,500.94	$ 970,519.82	***

Biennium Total $ 242,950.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	11	11	11.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	21	21	18	20.0	25
5: Technical Impact	18	16	16	16.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	5	6	6.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	8	7	8.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	15	18	16.0	20
			TOTAL	78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Good description of workflow benefits. Good description of metrics. Clearly tied to agency technology plan. - Application of workflow management on activities of court. Properly applied, activity should result in productivity gains. Continuation of long term improvements to overall system.	- Still a bit unclear as to what the specific goals of this specific project proposal are... - Desired outcomes not expressed in measurable terms. Limits ability to develop cost/benefit analysis. Workflow directed at adjudication. No mention of reusability of workflow manager on other tasks. - Until the consultant completes the work on the RFI and RFP for the workflow software it will be difficult at best to fully answer this section.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good explanation of the reasons to consider moving to some new technology solution. - Identification of weaknesses of current system processes. Workflow manager should improve those processes. Strong narrative description of desired outcomes.	- Limited explanation, at least in any detail, of specific benefits that will be attained from this project - especially given the significant financial investment for this project. Overly general description of options reviewed in the course of formulating this project. - Outcomes described in generic terms. Implied redesign of current system without impact analysis of other processes. No measures for return on investment. - Again, this reviewer feels that without the actual workflow software known, the benefits are very weak or questionable at best.
5: Technical Impact	- Good description of how new technology must fit within existing environment. Evidence of "good faith" efforts to consider and meet all appropriate standards and guidelines. - Describes incorporation of workflow manager into existing environment. Describes benefits within computing environment. - This section part 7 was done very well.	- Not much available detail, since the project is still early - "pre-RFP results".... - Describes desired outcomes, but does not address detailed requirements to achieve outcome. Financial request appears to support hardware/software purchase. This reviewer cannot find estimates, other than training, for the level of programming and business analysis necessary to achieve described outcome. - In this section part 8 was again limited and weak as the actual workflow software is unknown and the statement reads "Computer Managed Workflow must prove to be highly reliable..." . How can one know that when the software has not been

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		selected?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good general description of what needs to occur in the overall project. Appears to be a solid project team. - RFI/RFP process correctly described after analysis and evaluation of architectural requirements. Courts project team identified.	-Still early in project to provide specific and/or detailed project plan information. - This section scored low because budget request and narrative is for purchase of workflow manager, but implementation section appears to address alternative technologies. The reviewer would assume that alternatives would have been evaluation before decision to purchase workflow manager. While court project team has been identified, no estimates for contract resources appear in the document or budget request. - Project Plans are tentative and may be revised based on a consultant's recommendations.
7: Risk Assessment	- Thorough identification of both technical and people-based risks - along with approaches to mitigate those risks. - General risks identified and response appropriate.	- Two general risks are inherent in project. First is risk associated with the selection of product on which to build workflow managed solution. This seems to be addressed. The second is risk associated with the process of reengineering the adjudication process. Since the request seems to document the selection process, the risk associated with development has scant documentation. - This reviewer had a difficult time understanding the format of the barriers/risks and the strategies to minimize the risks. The format used consisted of bullet points and sub-bullet points.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Reasonable financial estimates. - Budget is well documented for software/hardware acquisition and training. Costs over time are identified. - Not requesting General Fund dollars.	- Still early in project - financial estimates could still vary significantly - Budget is for hardware/software and training. Contract services are not identified, and the level of service required is not documented in narrative nor budget. Other than hardware/software, no budget information for cost or impact for development.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a [Tier 2] project.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 2 (Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Good description of workflow benefits. Good description of metrics. Clearly tied to agency technology plan. - Application of workflow management on activities of court. Properly applied, activity should result in productivity gains. Continuation of long term improvements to overall system.	- Still a bit unclear as to what the specific goals of this specific project proposal are... - Desired outcomes not expressed in measurable terms. Limits ability to develop cost/benefit analysis. Workflow directed at adjudication. No mention of reusability of workflow manager on other tasks. **Response: The primary need is in Adjudication and is the business driver for the project. Workflow will be implemented in other sections of the court where workflow management is appropriate.** - Until the consultant completes the work on the RFI and RFP for the workflow software it will be difficult at best to fully answer this section.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good explanation of the reasons to consider moving to some new technology solution. - Identification of weaknesses of current system processes. Workflow manager should improve those processes. Strong narrative description of desired outcomes.	- Limited explanation, at least in any detail, of specific benefits that will be attained from this project - especially given the significant financial investment for this project. Overly general description of options reviewed in the course of formulating this project. - Outcomes described in generic terms. Implied redesign of current system without impact analysis of other processes. No measures for return on investment. - Again, this reviewer feels that without the actual workflow software known, the benefits are very weak or questionable at best.
5: Technical Impact	- Good description of how new technology must fit within existing environment. Evidence of "good faith" efforts to consider and meet all appropriate standards and guidelines. - Describes incorporation of workflow manager into existing environment. Describes benefits within computing environment. - This section part 7 was done very well.	- Not much available detail, since the project is still early - "pre-RFP results".... **Response: Project proposals by nature are "weak" in detail. A project proposal should represent at the most 10% of the total project effort. To have full detail would require having completed full requirements, general design, and possibly some detail design. At that point, up to 60% of the allocated project time would be completed.** - Describes desired outcomes, but does not address detailed requirements to achieve outcome. Financial request appears to support hardware/software purchase. This reviewer cannot find estimates, other than training, for the level of programming and business analysis necessary to achieve described outcome. - In this section part 8 was again limited and

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		weak as the actual workflow software is unknown and the statement reads "Computer Managed Workflow must prove to be highly reliable..." . How can one know that when the software has not been selected?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good general description of what needs to occur in the overall project. Appears to be a solid project team. - RFI/RFP process correctly described after analysis and evaluation of architectural requirements. Courts project team identified.	-Still early in project to provide specific and/or detailed project plan information. - This section scored low because budget request and narrative is for purchase of workflow manager, but implementation section appears to address alternative technologies. The reviewer would assume that alternatives would have been evaluation before decision to purchase workflow manager. **Response: Alternatives were evaluated. The court analyzed the build alternative for workflow. As a change management approach it has implemented "work queues" with no automated rules engine. The users make the decision about what the next task is. In contrast, a complete workflow system has robust rule engines and metric measurement systems. Workflow is a product that is mature.** While court project team has been identified, no estimates for contract resources appear in the document or budget request. **Response: Contract resources for professional implementation services are identified in 2.4 Other under 2 Contractual Services.** - Project Plans are tentative and may be revised based on a consultant's recommendations.
7: Risk Assessment	- Thorough identification of both technical and people-based risks - along with approaches to mitigate those risks. - General risks identified and response appropriate.	- Two general risks are inherent in project. First is risk associated with the selection of product on which to build workflow managed solution. This seems to be addressed. The second is risk associated with the process of reengineering the adjudication process. Since the request seems to document the selection process, the risk associated with development has scant documentation. - This reviewer had a difficult time understanding the format of the barriers/risks and the strategies to minimize the risks. The format used consisted of bullet points and sub-bullet points.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Reasonable financial estimates. - Budget is well documented for software/hardware acquisition and training. Costs over time are identified. - Not requesting General Fund dollars.	- Still early in project - financial estimates could still vary significantly **Response: The final cost could come in considerably less than the budgeted amount. The cost estimates in the original request were developed through**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		information gathered from high-tier, middle-tier, and low-tier workflow manufacturers. A probable cost was calculated. The Workflow Consultant has reviewed the estimates and is comfortable that our budget is adequate. - Budget is for hardware/software and training. Contract services are not identified, and the level of service required is not documented in narrative nor budget. **Response: Contract resources for professional implementation services are identified in 2.4 Other under 2 Contractual Services.** Other than hardware/software, no budget information for cost or impact for development. **Response: The court has existing development staff that will be assigned to the project.**

Project #	Agency	Project Title
37-03	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering – Vocational Rehabilitation

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This project is a continuation of a multi-year project that 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. 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's additional key technologies are:
- Adhoc Message Composition, Secured Message Delivery, and Electronic Message Reception

This project will also provide the court with monies for contract programming during development phases.

Project Update
Phase 1, VRS Counselor Certification Notification & Assignment System, is in the final stages of development, testing, and conversion. This phase introduced electronic document management and the outgoing message management (programmatic communications by email, efax, and letter). This phase was scheduled to be completed in the 1st Qtr of FY2005-06, but because of higher priority projects and introduction of new technologies is now projected to be completed in the 1st Qtr of FY2006-07.

Phase 2, VRS Case Management will focus on VRS Case Management and re-engineer data, programs, and processes associated with managing Workers Compensation Rehabilitation Cases.

This phase will also introduce to the court integrated adhoc outgoing message composition which will allow staff to compose free-form communications that will be programmatically rendered to PDF, saved in the integrated Case/Document management repository, and then delivered by email, electronic fax, or letter. It will also address Secured Message Delivery, and Electronic Message Reception It will also address Secured Message Delivery, and Electronic Message Reception.

FUNDING SUMMARY

VR Re-engineering

Section VIII. Financial Analysis and Budget

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	Request for FY2009-10 (Year 3)	Request for FY2010-11 (Year 4)	Future	Total	
1. Personnel Costs							$ -	
2. Contractual Services								**2.2 Programming** Represents use of contract programming to develop specific applications and interfaces to Office of the CIO systems
2.1 Design							$ -	
2.2 Programming	$ 10,000.00	$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00				$ 70,000.00	
2.3 Project Management							$ -	
2.4 Other							$ -	**7. Operating Costs** $2,400 Secured Email Transaction Fees $2,400
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -	
4. Telecommunications							$ -	
5. Training							$ -	***
6. Travel							$ -	
7. Other Operating Costs		$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$ 12,000.00	**8.1a Hardware One Time** File transfer applicance $20,000
8. Capital Expenditures								
8.1a Hardware - One Time		$ 20,000.00					$ 20,000.00	
8.1b Hardware - Cont			$ 3,000.00	$ 3,450.00	$ 3,967.50	$ 4,562.63		**8.1b Hardware Cont** Maintenance, support, replacement costs
8.2a Software - One Time	$ 5,000.00	$ 35,000.00					$ 40,000.00	
8.2b Software - Cont		$ 7,000.00	$ 8,050.00	$ 9,257.50	$ 10,646.13	$ 12,243.04	$ 47,196.67	
8.3 Network							$ -	
8.4 Other							$ -	
TOTAL COSTS	$ 15,000.00	$ 94,400.00	$ 43,450.00	$ 15,107.50	$ 17,013.63	$ 19,205.67	$ 204,176.79	**8.2a Software One Time** Message Composition Software $35,000
General Funds							$ -	Electronic Message Reception Software $5,000 $30,000
Cash Funds	$ 15,000.00	$ 94,400.00	$ 43,450.00	$ 15,107.50	$ 17,013.63	$ 19,205.67	$ 204,176.79	
Federal Funds							$ -	***
Revolving Funds							$ -	
Other Funds							$ -	**8.2a Software Cont** Support, upgrades, etc.
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 15,000.00	$ 94,400.00	$ 43,450.00	$ 15,107.50	$ 17,013.63	$ 19,205.67	$ 204,176.79	

Biennium Total $ 137,850.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	14	12	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	22	19	19	20.0	25
5: Technical Impact	16	14	17	15.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	8	8	7.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	7	6	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	17	18	17.0	20
			TOTAL	79	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clearly identifies beneficiaries. Measurement and assessment techniques reasonably well documented. - Continuation of VRS information management and re-engineering to include ad hoc message composition, secure message delivery, and message reception.	- In this reviewer's opinion, goals and objectives are lost in extended narrative about other parallel activities. More precise, explicit statement of goals and objectives would have been helpful. - Acquisition is for secured mail and file transfer capabilities and for new software for message composition and attachment of incoming messages to individual cases. Presumption is that out-going and in-coming messages contain machine readable metadata in order to integrate with management systems. For this to occur there must be standards between the sending and receiving systems that understand the metadata. PDF does not provide the metadata. Secured e-mail allows for receipt of unstructured and unsolicited communications. Without metadata standards, the requirement to integrate e-mail messages with the case management system may not be obtainable. Out going message formatting also requires metadata and could probably be developed without a requirement for additional 3rd party software. - Expected outcomes section is lacking in what exactly are the beneficial outcomes? Are they speed to process, ease of use, lower cost per transaction?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Reasonable explanation of additional services/capabilities that will be gained by virtue of implementing this project. Reasonable recounting of solutions under evaluation. - Describes life-cycle data management requirements. Describes intelligent document composition requirements. States requirement for secured message delivery.	- By some elements of the description, parts of this project are still in preliminary phases and cannot be described in precise detail. - Although this reviewer understands the need for life-cycle data management, I fail to understand how the key technologies apply to this requirement. Secured message delivery can be secured as an application instead of requiring secured e-mail. As part of an application, the integration of metadata

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		incorporated into a message as described would make more sense. Assuming e-mail is for ad-hoc messages that are external to electronic filing; this reviewer can understand the initiation of secured e-mail from the court. I'm unsure about the process to receive secured e-mail from outside the court. Electronic scanning of FAX or documents to create the metadata described in the request seems problematic without standards for the content of the document or standards for sending and receiving secured e-mail. - In part 5 of this section the writer fails to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the solution.
5: Technical Impact	- Reasonably good inventory of technical elements that will make up the environment. - Describes a vision for message management, secure mail, file transfer, and electronic filing. - The project is trying to work with the Office of the CIO for the Secure Email component of the project. The project is working with the OCIO on several fronts on this project.	- Reasonably good inventory of technical elements that will make up the environment. - Seeks to enhance current environment by procuring additional software, the general functionality of which is achievable without a requirement for additional software. Unsure as to what this additional software provides, unless required by the Borland Delphi/Oracle/Windows application. Unsure of the duplication of the file transfer appliance/Domino requirement since those requirements exist in current environment. References to ad-hoc message conversion to metadata are suspect without standards to define the data.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project team appears to have ample experience and skills. - Describes process for implementation.	- Descriptions of milestones are very general, without much detail. Significant training requirements are mentioned, but without much detail as to an exact approach or curriculum of courses. - Three key acquisitions and deployments are inherent in process. Implementation of message creation. Secured e-mail for message delivery. Programmatic redirecting of FAX and e-mail into integrated manager. All are to be implemented in a year. Given prior slippage, and other projects, the implementation may slip. In addition, a question about which problem to solve first comes to mind. Should the court address standards, and then acquire technology. Or acquire technology, and then address standards. - Reads like major training activities will be necessary.
7: Risk Assessment	- Both technical and organizational risks are identified. - Describes risks associate with project.	- Mitigation strategies are only generally described. - Risks are defined from an implementation perspective. The greater risk appears to be in the development. The question of receiving secured e-mail from without the

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		agency would require all suppliers of information to agree to a set of standards. Those standards do not exist in the WWW. - Very weak on discussion of barriers/risks and strategies to mitigate the risks.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Elements within budget seem plausible. - Budget has both procurement and cost over time identified. - No General Funds being requested.	- Both in other sections of this project proposal, and specifically here in the documentation of budget information, more information on hardware would have been useful. - Budget document is for hardware and software necessary for message management and e-mail. Training is identified. Document refers to contract program services, but aren't reflected in the budget. If they are, they are not identified to the extent it would seem necessary to implement the life-cycle management system, the message system, the secure e-mail system, and the integration of unstructured data into a structured data management system. Would predict that the project will slip due to lack of resources for development and implementation.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a [Tier 2] project.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 2 (Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clearly identifies beneficiaries. Measurement and assessment techniques reasonably well documented. - Continuation of VRS information management and re-engineering to include ad hoc message composition, secure message delivery, and message reception.	- In this reviewer's opinion, goals and objectives are lost in extended narrative about other parallel activities. More precise, explicit statement of goals and objectives would have been helpful. - Acquisition is for secured mail and file transfer capabilities and for new software for message composition and attachment of incoming messages to individual cases. Presumption is that out-going and in-coming messages contain machine readable metadata in order to integrate with management systems. For this to occur there must be standards between the sending and receiving systems that understand the metadata. PDF does not provide the metadata. Secured e-mail allows for receipt of unstructured and unsolicited communications. Without metadata standards, the requirement to integrate e-mail messages with the case management system may not be obtainable. Out going message formatting also requires metadata and could probably be developed without a requirement for additional 3rd party software. **Response: While we do not disagree with the technical discussion of the need for metadata standards, we disagree with this approach as the solution for secured email and file transfer. The court is a member of the SGC Secured Email Workgroup. The workgroup views the issue of secured email and file transfer as primarily a transmission encryption issue, not a digital object encryption issue whether the object is in transmission or at rest.** - Expected outcomes section is lacking in what exactly are the beneficial outcomes? Are they speed to process, ease of use, lower cost per transaction?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Reasonable explanation of additional services/capabilities that will be gained by virtue of implementing this project. Reasonable recounting of solutions under evaluation. - Describes life-cycle data management requirements. Describes intelligent document composition requirements. States requirement for secured message delivery.	- By some elements of the description, parts of this project are still in preliminary phases and cannot be described in precise detail. - Although this reviewer understands the need for life-cycle data management, I fail to understand how the key technologies apply to this requirement. **Response: Life-cycle data management begins with creation of a data object. Message composition one of several methods of creation.**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		Secured message delivery can be secured as an application instead of requiring secured e-mail. As part of an application, the integration of metadata incorporated into a message as described would make more sense. Assuming e-mail is for ad-hoc messages that are external to electronic filing; this reviewer can understand the initiation of secured e-mail from the court. **Response: See response in 3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes** I'm unsure about the process to receive secured e-mail from outside the court. **Response: The court is faced with the potential of over 100 trading partners requiring us to use their secured email systems because of HIPPA and other privacy issues. Our hope is to put a system of secured email in place by which we can at least require them to use for court initiated communications. We do not have a solution yet, but it is the hope that the Secured Email Workgroup will come up with such a solution. Standards are evolving with major vendors in this area that look promising.** Electronic scanning of FAX or documents to create the metadata described in the request seems problematic without standards for the content of the document or standards for sending and receiving secured e-mail. **Response: Faxes come into the court through the Enterprise Fax server. We will leverage such things as barcodes, identifying incoming phone numbers, etc. to assist with linking these documents to our case data in our relational database. There will always be a necessity for human intervention with scanning.** - In part 5 of this section the writer fails to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the solution.
5: Technical Impact	- Reasonably good inventory of technical elements that will make up the environment. - Describes a vision for message management, secure mail, file transfer, and electronic filing. - The project is trying to work with the Office of the CIO for the Secure Email component of the project. The project is working with the OCIO on several fronts on this project.	- Reasonably good inventory of technical elements that will make up the environment. - Seeks to enhance current environment by procuring additional software, the general functionality of which is achievable without a requirement for additional software. Unsure as to what this additional software provides, unless required by the Borland Delphi/Oracle/Windows application. **Response: The additional software third-party component software will provide word-processing and spell-checking directly embedded or tightly integrated**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		into the courts Borland Delphi/Oracle developed applications. Unsure of the duplication of the file transfer appliance/Domino requirement since those requirements exist in current environment. **Response: This is not duplication. File Transfer is necessary for large file transfers that the court needs to perform securely given that outside email systems usually enforce an attachment size limit. Also, our Message Management system generates letters in electronic format that may be better served through a file transfer product which may provide a pickup receipt.** References to ad-hoc message conversion to metadata are suspect without standards to define the data.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project team appears to have ample experience and skills. - Describes process for implementation.	- Descriptions of milestones are very general, without much detail. Significant training requirements are mentioned, but without much detail as to an exact approach or curriculum of courses. - Three key acquisitions and deployments are inherent in process. Implementation of message creation. Secured e-mail for message delivery. Programmatic redirecting of FAX and e-mail into integrated manager. All are to be implemented in a year. Given prior slippage, and other projects, the implementation may slip. In addition, a question about which problem to solve first comes to mind. Should the court address standards, and then acquire technology. Or acquire technology, and then address standards. - Reads like major training activities will be necessary.
7: Risk Assessment	- Both technical and organizational risks are identified. - Describes risks associate with project.	- Mitigation strategies are only generally described. - Risks are defined from an implementation perspective. The greater risk appears to be in the development. The question of receiving secured e-mail from without the agency would require all suppliers of information to agree to a set of standards. Those standards do not exist in the WWW. - Very weak on discussion of barriers/risks and strategies to mitigate the risks. **Response: The court would like to address the risk of development and mitigating that risk.** **The court has been in discussion with major external partners such as Hartford**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		Insurance through the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions (IAIABC). Insurance companies and Third-Party Administrators are faced with HIPPA and other privacy concerns. These partners have a diverse set of parties that they may communicate with electronically (i.e. email). Some of these parties may have Yahoo or AOL email accounts. Because of this diversity, standards such as Transport Layer Security (TLS) are not being implemented. Instead our partners are putting in place secure email appliance systems that are forcing the court to use their systems and not our own. The lack of Internet standards is driving these specialized solutions and the court and state government must come up with a solution in the same arena before we are overwhelmed. **The development risks are being mitigated through the formation of the SGC Secured Email Workgroup and the court working with the IAIABC to address these issues with these partners.**
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Elements within budget seem plausible. - Budget has both procurement and cost over time identified. - No General Funds being requested.	- Both in other sections of this project proposal, and specifically here in the documentation of budget information, more information on hardware would have been useful. - Budget document is for hardware and software necessary for message management and e-mail. Training is identified. Document refers to contract program services, but aren't reflected in the budget. If they are, they are not identified to the extent it would seem necessary to implement the life-cycle management system, the message system, the secure e-mail system, and the integration of unstructured data into a structured data management system. **Response: Contract programming services are listed in 2.1 Programming with is a sub-item under 2 Contractual Services** Would predict that the project will slip due to lack of resources for development and implementation.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-01	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Satellite Reconfiguration Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

For the past 16 years, satellite systems established by the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) have delivered distance learning across the state. Nebraska, with its large geographic size (77,354 square miles) and low population density (1,747,214 residents) has been well served by this satellite network. From bringing classes to remote corners of the state to making possible a wide range of two-way communication, Networks 1, 2 and 3 have helped transform the educational landscape of Nebraska. While current technology in Networks 2 and 3 efficiently delivers video and audio signals, technology upgrades to these systems would add even greater value to the State's investment.

The proposed satellite reconfiguration would upgrade Networks 2 and 3 from audio/video-based channels to Internet Protocol (IP). This reconfiguration would also provide improved integration with Network Nebraska and would comply with NITC-adopted statewide standards for communications and for video and audio requirements. This will enable NET to directly connect with Education and Telehealth videoconferencing networks and with Network Nebraska, maximizing the State's investment in satellite transponders and relieving traffic in the Network Nebraska system. There are locations in the state where Network Nebraska has difficulty supplying sizable bandwidth cost effectively. Coordinating with the State Division of Communications and the University of Nebraska, specific locations (identified by bandwidth need) will be able to access existing satellite bandwidth passing IP data just as they would through the terrestrial portion of Network Nebraska. State agencies need to move a great deal of non-Internet data files every day that are not immediately time sensitive. IP connectivity through the satellite would allow delivery of these files reducing traffic over the terrestrial connection. This would allow Internet and non-Internet data to move faster where the terrestrial path is insufficient.

NET proposes to upgrade Network 3 (two-way), in FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 (Phase 1), with Network 2 (one-way) undergoing a technology upgrade in FY 2009-2010 and FY 2010-2011 (Phase 2). This project is being done in consultation with the Division of Communications and the partners managing of Network Nebraska.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials		$ 187,500.00	$ 222,500.00	$ 338,500.00	$ 411,000.00		$ 1,159,500.00
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training		$ 10,000.00					$ 10,000.00
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							$ -
8.2 Software		$ 50,000.00		$ 40,000.00			$ 90,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 247,500.00	$ 222,500.00	$ 378,500.00	$ 411,000.00	$ -	$ 1,259,500.00
General Funds							$

	Item	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	Total
Phase 1	Modem (DMD 20 Radyne)	$ 33,000.00	$ 198,000.00			
Phase 1	IP Switch (Cisco 3750)	$ 6,000.00	$ 6,000.00			
Phase 1	Packeer Packet Shaper	$ 5,500.00	$ 5,500.00			
Phase 1	Firewall (Cisco PIX 525)	$ 13,000.00	$ 13,000.00			
Phase 1	Video Conference Bridge Upgrade	$ 95,000.00	$ -			
Phase 1	Multiplexer (TMX 2010 Motorola)	$ 35,000.00	$ -			
Phase 1	Management System (Radyne-ILC)	$ 50,000.00	$ -			
Phase 1	Training	$ 10,000.00				
Phase 2	Encoders SE 4000			$ 120,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	Server DELL 2850			$ 5,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	Multiplexer (TMX 2010 Motorola)			$ 35,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	DVB Modulator Miteq DVM 100			$ 8,500.00	$ 8,500.00	
Phase 2	Software			$ 40,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	Satellite Receive Systems (DOC)			$ 14,000.00	$ 21,000.00	
Phase 2	ATSC Receive Systems (DOC)			$ 6,000.00	$ 6,500.00	
Phase 2	Receivers			$ 150,000.00	$ 375,000.00	

$ 247,500.00 $ 222,500.00 $ 378,500.00 $ 411,000.00 $ 1,259,500.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	9	14	11.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	18	10	24	17.3	25
5: Technical Impact	16	12	19	15.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	5	9	7.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	13	19	16.3	20
			TOTAL	**77**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Move to IP network. Building on past expenditures. Ability to pass traffic other than video/audio, i.e. just data. Common Ticket system - The project, as described, would bring great benefit to Nebraska education as well as other sectors.	- I think there needs to be more testing or a pilot to determine the true usefulness of the technology. I don't think the State Agencies will be able to use this technology. Network Nebraska Design could mean just 3-4 sites across the state for 2 way. - Beneficiaries are somewhat vague "current and future users". No documented need for switching to IP. What does this project solve as there is no identified problem. - The goals and objectives fail to mention the potential usage of delivering rich media content to many locations around the State without incurring terrestrial transport bandwidth.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Greater integration with Network Nebraska. IP network support. Trying to meet the requirements of the NITC for IP video support. Will need to do something to continue supporting video network.	- Probably won't be used in the common State and University data networks. Pilot of the actual usefulness would be helpful Yet to be determined how to integrate in to the Network Nebraska network.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	Could be useful if there were a lot static content to be delivered - Would meet the standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing but other solutions might meet this also. - The business case and project justification is well constructed. The cost/benefit ratio is favorable and would allow Nebraska more integrated options for its IP traffic.	- What are the future bandwidth costs they are defraying? For the amount of money being requested there is not a good economic return on investment outlined. Who are the specific customers that are asking for this. Hard to understand what the definable benefits are to the State of Nebraska.
5: Technical Impact	- Moves NET network to support video standards set by the NITC. Satellite's have been reliable for their video networks - Project is described well. - The technical advantage of IP over satellite needs to happen; it's only a question of when. With satellite transponder leases through 2012, the sooner the conversion, the sooner that this bandwidth can be employed for utilitarian or specialized purposes. The increased interoperability with Network Nebraska is advantageous.	- If purpose is to increase IP bandwidth, number of sites may be able to be reduced to a much lower number, due to design of Network Nebraska. System will have limited IP bandwidth. - Latency delays not addressed. Not much detail given for security or reliability.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Plan can be accomplished as listed. - Implementation plan is reasonable. - With the LB 1208 implementation and upgrade of over 300 education entities by August 2009, this satellite digitization upgrade plan will match the timeline for the terrestrial upgrade.	- Concern over number of sites that need upgraded. - Would it not be possible to accelerate the Phase 2 Net 2 upgrade timeline so that more post-conversion use will be gained before the transponder lease expires?
7: Risk Assessment	- Converting from an RF skill set to IP skill set will assist in the availability of support and maintenance functions for the satellite network.	- Concern over actual use of system in real applications, including one way data. - Does not address any risk specific to this project. These are general technical risks for any project.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The four-year implementation and budget plan is doable.	- Costs listed as "supplies and materials". In actual breakout, it doesn't give quantity, so it is difficult to determine. - Do not see any on-going maintenance costs. Return on investment to the State are not clearly defined. - Funding stretches over 3 biennial budgets.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

NET Response to Weaknesses for Satellite Reconfiguration NITC Project # 47-01

Section 3 - Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

"- I think there needs to be more testing or a pilot to determine the true usefulness of the technology. I don't think the State Agencies will be able to use this technology. Network Nebraska Design could mean just 3-4 sites across the state for 2 way."

We are currently using this technology in NET's Datacasting Project and University of Nebraska at Kearney in the Network 3. We have requested DOC (Heath Hollenbeck) to validate the usefulness and reliability of this technology. To date Heath has not completed his testing.

The Nebraska Department of Roads and Health and Human Services Agency have expressed interest. We have requested NDoR (Kevin Briggs and Jaimie Huber)) to validate the usefulness and reliability of this technology. To date NDoR has not completed their testing.

The assumption regarding 2 way connectivity is correct. However, the 3-4 locations do not have current access to reasonably priced High Speed Connectivity.

"- Beneficiaries are somewhat vague "current and future users". No documented need for switching to IP. What does this project solve as there is no identified problem?"

Current users are the Department of Education and the NETCHE Education Consortium in the Datacasting model. Future users are the Nebraska Department of Roads and Health and Human Services.

The need to switch to IP is explained in the Executive Summary:
The proposed satellite reconfiguration would upgrade Networks 2 and 3 from audio/video-based channels to Internet Protocol (IP). This reconfiguration would also provide improved integration with Network Nebraska and would comply with NITC-adopted statewide standards for communications and for video and audio requirements. This will enable NET to directly connect with Education and Telehealth videoconferencing networks and with Network Nebraska, maximizing the State's investment in satellite transponders and relieving traffic in the Network Nebraska system. There are locations in the state where Network Nebraska has difficulty supplying sizable bandwidth cost effectively. Coordinating with the State Division of Communications and the University of Nebraska, specific locations (identified by bandwidth need) will be able to access existing satellite bandwidth passing IP data just as they would through the terrestrial portion of Network Nebraska. State agencies need to move a great deal of non-Internet data files every day that are not immediately time sensitive. IP connectivity through the satellite would allow delivery of these files reducing traffic over the terrestrial connection. This would allow Internet and non-Internet data to move faster where the terrestrial path is insufficient.

The Division of Communications is having difficulty providing a reasonably priced High Speed Connectivity to South Sioux City, Chadron and Valentine Nebraska.

"- The goals and objectives fail to mention the potential usage of delivering rich media content to many locations around the State without incurring terrestrial transport bandwidth."

Reconfiguring the Satellite encoding scheme will allow IP traffic to be delivered over the satellite. This means the bandwidth could pass traffic that is not specifically video and audio and the potential usage of

delivering rich media content to many locations around the State without incurring terrestrial transport bandwidth.

This would accomplish several things:
- More efficient use of current satellite bandwidth through newer compression algorithms and protocols.
- Traffic would pass through the satellite bandwidth even when classes are not in session so the state will get more use from the expense.
- By better integrating with Network Nebraska, difficult to reach locations may be better served.
- NETC will use technology that is compliant with current state technical standards.

Section 4 - Project Justification / Business Case

"- Probably won't be used in the common State and University data networks.
Pilot of the actual usefulness would be helpful. Yet to be determined how to integrate in to the Network Nebraska network."

Wayne State College has expressed a strong interest in this program.

Currently NET is using this technology to deliver Datacasting to the K-16 system at ESU 10, ESU 6, ESU 13 and to the 14 College / University NETCHE Consortium through Wayne State College.

The integration of this technology will be a combined effort with Division of Communications and NET. With the use of IP Satellite Routers (provided by NET, DMD 20 Radyne) and Enterprise management (provided by DOC) under served areas can be accommodated.

"- What are the future bandwidth costs they are defraying? For the amount of money being requested there is not a good economic return on investment outlined. Who are the specific customers that are asking for this? Hard to understand what the definable benefits are to the State of Nebraska."

Currently DOC is paying about 15% higher then anticipated per month for DS3 connectivity for Chadron. However, implementing Satellite connectivity the service provider would have incentive to maintain reasonable cost structures.

If the current pricing for a DS3 (the effective bandwidth of a Satellite Transponder) in an underserved area is used for comparison the return on investment is good. Current pricing is $ 5,000 per month or $ 60,000 per year then; $ 1,259,500 will be paid for in just over five (5) years.

Division of Communications, State Colleges, Nebraska Department of Roads and Health and Human Services have expressed interest in using this service.

Some of the tangible benefits to the state of Nebraska include:
- Improved integration with Network Nebraska
- Direct connectivity with Education and Telehealth videoconferencing networks
- Compliance with NITC-adopted statewide standards for communications and for video and audio
- Maximizing the State's investment in satellite transponders (passing data even if there are no video conferences going on)

Some of the intangible benefits include:
- Relief of some traffic congestion in the Network Nebraska system
- Defraying future terrestrial bandwidth costs
- Alleviating need for overnight data push by state agencies

- Using the latest encoding equipment to allow for more videoconference sessions to pass in the same amount of bandwidth

Section 5 - Technical Impact

"- If purpose is to increase IP bandwidth, number of sites may be able to be reduced to a much lower number, due to design of Network Nebraska.
System will have limited IP bandwidth."

The purpose is to convert from a Video/Audio only system to an IP based system that accommodates IP based Video/Audio and IP traffic.

Satellite encoding technology is constantly improving allowing for increasing bandwidth. The equipment specified has upgrade capabilities.

"- Latency delays not addressed. Not much detail given for security or reliability."

Satellite technology has about one half of a second of latency.

The security of Satellite encoding technology has built-in security due to the nature of the system. It is requires expensive infrastructure (which already exists), very specialized encryption technology. The highest security risk is within the LAN or WAN. The reliability of Satellite technology is .9999. Two (2) times a year the Satellite system suffers 'Solar Outage', five (5) minutes for five (5) days.

Section 6 - Preliminary Plan for Implementation

"- Concern over number of sites that need upgraded."

The entire system would need to be upgraded. NET currently has 20 Network 3 & 350 Network 2 clients. NET believes all existing clients need to maintain existing services and allow additional services during idle time.

"- Would it not be possible to accelerate the Phase 2 Net 2 upgrade timeline so that more post-conversion use will be gained before the transponder lease expires?"

Phase 2 could be accelerated. However, the financial impact was extended over an entire Bi-Annual Budget.

Section 7 - Risk Assessment

"- Concern over actual use of system in real applications, including one way data."

Currently NET is using this technology to deliver Datacasting to the K-16 system at ESU 10, ESU 6, ESU 13 and 14 College / University NETCHE Consortium through Wayne State College. Datacasting is only one way.

"- Does not address any risk specific to this project. These are general technical risks for any project."

The obvious barrier would be to not receive funding. NETC only has budgetary support of these systems on an annual maintenance basis. Portions of the network might be updated more slowly than with these funds, but there are large portions of the network that have to be upgraded all at once or not at all.
Section 8 - Financial Analysis and Budget

"- Costs listed as "supplies and materials". In actual breakout, it doesn't give quantity, so it is difficult to determine."

Network 3

Equipment Description	Unit Price	Quantity	FY 07-08	Quantity	FY 08-09	Total
Modem (DMD 20 Radyne)	$ 5,500.00	6	$ 33,000.00	36	$198,000.00	$231,000.00
IP Switch (Cisco 3750)	$ 6,000.00	1	$ 6,000.00	1	$ 6,000.00	$ 12,000.00
Packeer Packet Shaper	$ 5,500.00	1	$ 5,500.00	1	$ 5,500.00	$ 11,000.00
Firewall (Cisco PIX 525)	$ 13,000.00	1	$ 13,000.00	1	$ 13,000.00	$ 26,000.00
Video Conference Bridge Upgrade	$ 95,000.00	1	$ 95,000.00		$ -	$ 95,000.00
Multiplexer (2010 Motorola)	$ 35,000.00	1	$ 35,000.00		$ -	$ 35,000.00
Management System (Radyne-ILC)	$ 50,000.00	1	$ 50,000.00		$ -	$ 50,000.00
Training	$ 10,000.00	1	$ 10,000.00	1	$ 10,000.00	$ 20,000.00
						$ -
			$247,500.00		$232,500.00	$480,000.00

Network 2

Equipment Description	Unit Price	Quantity	FY 09-10	Quantity	FY 10-11	Total
Encoders SE 4000	$20,000.00	6	$120,000.00		$ -	$ 120,000.00
Server DELL 2850	$ 5,000.00	1	$ 5,000.00		$ -	$ 5,000.00
Multiplexer TMX 2010	$35,000.00	1	$ 35,000.00		$ -	$ 35,000.00
DVB Modulator Miteq DVM 100	$ 8,500.00	1	$ 8,500.00	1	$ 8,500.00	$ 17,000.00
Software	$40,000.00	1	$ 40,000.00		$ -	$ 40,000.00
Satellite Receive Systems (DOC)	$ 7,000.00	2	$ 14,000.00	3	$ 21,000.00	$ 35,000.00
ATSC Receive Systems (DOC)	$ 500.00	12	$ 6,000.00	13	$ 6,500.00	$ 12,500.00
Receiver	$ 1,500.00	100	$150,000.00	250	$ 375,000.00	$ 525,000.00
Total			$378,500.00		$ 411,000.00	$ 789,500.00

"- Do not see any on-going maintenance costs. Return on investment to the State are not clearly defined."
An annual maintenance budget for Network 2 and Network 3 is in place. The upgrade equipment will use this existing maintenance budget.

If the current pricing for a DS3 (the effective bandwidth of a Satellite Transponder) in an underserved area is used for comparison the return on investment is good. Current pricing is $ 5,000 per month or $ 60,000 per year then; $ 1,259,500 will be paid for in just over five (5) years.

"- Funding stretches over 3 biennial budgets."
The budget is for four (4) years. Two (2) years in two (2) biennial budgets.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-02	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Public Media Archive and Distribution Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

Technologies and trends are fundamentally reshaping the media landscape. Transition from analog to digital technologies presents a great challenge and a momentous opportunity. Consumers are demanding content that can be accessed anytime and anywhere, on a growing variety of platforms and devices at mind-boggling speed. There is tremendous potential to enhance public service through digital media in education, civic engagement, health care and other important public needs. The "push" of scheduled programming is steadily being replaced by the "pull" of more diverse content selected by consumers – media on "my time" that is also segmented and formatted for delivery not only on television and radio, but also on computers, cell phones, PDAs, iPods and other increasingly portable devices.

More and more Nebraskans are expanding their use of new media "spaces" to access information important to them as citizens and as individuals. New media venues such as Cable Video on Demand, Internet Video and Audio on Demand, Podcasting, Vodcasting, and mobile platforms such as cell phones and PDA's are becoming as important to Nebraskans as traditional broadcast and cable.

To reach Nebraskans on all current and emerging media platforms, it is necessary to increase public access to the existing media created not only by NET but by other government, educational, and non-profit organizations across the state. To maximize the content produced currently and in the past by NET, it is also necessary to rethink and retool routine production and distribution tasks including capture, logging, editing, transcoding, asset management, administration and archiving content.

A public media Content Management System will optimize the State's investment in digital technology, creating a more effective repository and distribution system of information important to Nebraska's civically and culturally-engaged individuals and organizations. The enhanced capabilities will allow "mission-similar" partners interested in adapting the best of their content for widespread distribution across NET's multicast and broadband services. NET's broadcast and broadband distribution capacity has the potential to raise the profiles of the presenting organizations and extend the reach of their programs, making them more cost-effective to the presenters and broadening their service to the citizens of Nebraska.

To develop this public media archive and expand its distribution, NET proposes to implement two integrated systems: enterprise content management (ECM), which embraces all the content of an organization, from print documents and images to multimedia and audio and video files; and Web content management (WCM), including all content made available via the Internet, broadband and portable services.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Pulbic Media Archive and Distribution Project

Item	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	Project Total
Archive					
Avid Unity ISIS Storage Chassis		$115,000			
Avid Interplay graphics hardware and software interface		$30,000			
Xiotec Server Storage for AVID Interplay		$30,205			
Xiotech Magnitude 3d 3000 e storage			$78,000		
Storagetek SL-500 LTO tape archive			$89,000		
Catalyst 6500 firewall/switch with blades and supervisor unit			$100,000		
Xiotech SATA Raid expansion for radio storage			$39,000		
Dell Server Poweredge 6850			$14,000		
Cable and Labor			$36,000		
ISIS storage expansion				$239,990	
Cicso License and Maintenance				$14,000	
Broadband Distribution					
Avid Transcode for multiple media hardware and software		$75,000			
Production					
Ikigami tapeless field acquisition	$55,000	$55,000	$55,000		
Radio Traffic Management					
Protrack Software Upgrade	$16,000				
Web Content Management					
VMWare server memory	$6,000				
Consultation regarding product specificiation	$8,000				
OS licenses	$700				
Web Content Management System (CMS) software	$125,000				
Training in use of purchased software	$12,000				
Server licenses	$2,000				
Consultation regarding migration of existing website	$25,000				
FY Totals	$249,700	$305,205	$411,000	$253,990	$1,219,895

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	12	13	13.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	23	21	20	21.3	25
5: Technical Impact	18	15	15	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	6	6.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	5	5	5.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	15	16	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**78**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very good "common language" description of what the project is intended to accomplish. Clear statement of goals. - Good description of NET's needs for content management	- No detail on other providers of content and whether they have agreed to this concept/initiative.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good review of options considered. - Again, good description of NET's needs to digitize NET content and make it available on demand. Good descriptions of content	- Ideally, more tangible benefit would have been documented. - No detail on non-NET content that would be made available.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
5: Technical Impact	- Good explanation of how the technical environment might work. - Good descriptions of "content mgmt". Strong emphasis on standards.	- Not much comment or information on technical requirements or strategies. - Current NET organization has created the need to improve content management. Not sure I see the detailed description of the system.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Relatively good identification of milestones. - Good Team definition	- Relatively little information about ongoing staff requirements for support - Little detail, but ok since this is preliminary
7: Risk Assessment		- Information provided seems slow to acknowledge the possibility of risk from undertaking something of this size. - There are more risks than those identified.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Plenty of information regarding equipment and software.	- Costs for possible external assistance and/or consulting seem quite low.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

NET Response to Weaknesses for Public Media Archive NITC Project # 47-02

Section 3 - Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

Section 4 - Project Justification and Business Case

"- No detail on other providers of content and whether they have agreed to this concept/initiative."

"- No detail on non-NET content that would be made available."

The reviewer is correct; NET has not signed formal agreements with any potential partners, pending funding. However, we have had discussions with the Nebraska Humanities Council, the Institute of Agricultural and Natural Resources at UNL, the NETCHE post-secondary consortium, and the Office of the Clerk of the Legislature about hosting content.

Section 5 - Technical Impact

"- Not much comment or information on technical requirements or strategies."

"- Current NET organization has created the need to improve content management.
Not sure I see the detailed description of the system."

The detailed description of the system and technical requirements was contained in section 4 and should have been repeated in Section 5. The internal NET content will be produced and archived in the enterprise Avid Interplay Content Management system. External content from partners will be digitized to web standards and also housed in the Avid Interplay.

This content will be available to the Web Content Management system from a vendor such as RedDot or Artisia. The web content management system will collect the metadata for each element in the archive, the web ready files and combine them into a dynamically refreshed public website. An example of such a site can be found at http://www.cetconnect.org/

Section 6 - Preliminary Plan for Implementation

"- Relatively little information about ongoing staff requirements for support."

NET anticipates no additional staff will be needed to support the Public Media Archive. Support for the IT equipment and infrastructure will be the responsibility of the existing Information Services staff. Operation of the Avid Interplay system will be the responsibility of the existing Production and Network Operations staff. Creation and maintenance of the Public Media website will be the responsibility of the existing Interactive Media Group staff.

Section 7 - Risk Assessment

"- Information provided seems slow to acknowledge the possibility of risk from undertaking something of this size."

"- There are more risks than those identified."

The Public Media Archive represents a new area of service to the State of Nebraska and its citizens. With any new service, there is the risk that the service will not be used. However, experience with similar Archives in Cincinnati and Wisconsin has shown there are both a need and a desire for this service. NET is committed to providing promotional support through its existing media outlets. In addition, partners providing content on the Archive have a vested interest in also promoting this service.

As the management team in Section 6 indicates, NET has several decades of experience in managing large scale technology, integration, and content delivery projects. The scope of this work is well within the capacity of both the staff and the institution of NET.

Section 8 - Financial Analysis and Budget

"- Costs for possible external assistance and/or consulting seem quite low."

Consultation services represent only 2.5% of the total project cost. The reviewer is correct; consultation services for integration project can run as high as 25%. NET believes, however, that the significant experience of its staff in developing, implementing, and managing large scale projects of this nature alleviates the need to invest significant tax dollars in outside consultants.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-03	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Public Media at the Capitol

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

"The salvation of the state is watchfulness in the citizen." To serve Nebraskans by keeping pace with today's rapidly evolving technology, NET proposes a communications technology redesign that will dramatically increase the public's access to legislative floor debate, committee hearings, Judiciary proceedings, and communications from the Executive branch, bringing the multimedia technology of the Capitol to current standards. Radio and television technologies will be provided that will replace outmoded systems currently in place, which will guarantee many years of public broadcasting coverage and better access by the state's commercial radio and television stations. Nebraska citizens will have simultaneous access to Internet streams from the floor of the senate, Capitol conference and hearing rooms, the Supreme Court, and the Governor's office, and to a searchable on-line archive of all legislative proceedings. This project is being done in consultation with the State CIO, the Legislative Council, the Office of the Capitol Commission, and the State Judiciary branch. It has the support of the Legislative Council, the Office of the Capitol Commission and Supreme Court.

The proposed equipment upgrade would give the people of Nebraska and beyond greater access to both real-time and archival proceedings originating from all branches of state government. This investment will generate far more coverage of the deliberative workings of the state, available through multiple delivery methods, than ever before.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Item	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11
Judicial				
Appellate Court		$ 32,700.00		
Supreme Court	$ 41,400.00			
Legislative				
Legislative Chamber	$ 131,500.00			
Hearing Room 1510		$ 48,900.00		
Hearing Room 1507		$ 48,900.00		
Hearing Room 1524	$ 48,900.00			
Hearing Room 1525	$ 48,900.00			
Hearing Room 1003			$ 41,400.00	
Hearing Room 1113			$ 41,400.00	
Hearing Room 2102			$ 41,400.00	
Executive				
Governor's Hearing RM	$ 47,100.00			
OCC				
Press Room 1224		$ 152,000.00		
Rotunda	$ 15,400.00			
Warner Chamber				$ 120,000.00
Exterior Access			$ 78,000.00	
Wire Installation	$ 35,000.00			
Custom Camera mount	$ 10,000.00			
Exterior horizontal boring		$ 15,000.00		
Control room renovation	$ 105,000.00			
Room 1224 renovation		$ 40,000.00		

NET

Control Room	$ 410,600.00	
Bldg Wire Infrastructure	$ 200,000.00	
NET Radio RM 1504.1	$ 18,000.00	
IT software		$294,000.00
IT Encoding hardware		48,605.00
IT Archive hardware		$25,710.00

FY Totals $1,111,800.00 $ 337,500.00 $202,200.00 $488,315.00

Project Total   2,139,815.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	14	14	14.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	19	23	17	19.7	25
5: Technical Impact	17	15	16	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	8	6	7.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	6	5	6.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	13	16	15.3	20
			TOTAL	78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- High degree of collaboration. Upgrade appears will overdue. - Clearly defined the goals for each branch of government.	
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Most justifications are appropriate. - The benefit to the public would be good. The project is a good one the only concern is would putting in a unified infrastructure be more cost effective than putting in a separate dedicated video infrastructure like is being proposed.	- No intangible benefits listed. Not sure DTV conversion is necessarily tied to this update of the Capitol's video equipment. -Not much detail or justification given for cost of providing temporary technical hardware and labor as opposed to this permanent solution. It would appear no other solutions were evaluated. Not a lot of detail on the overall economic return on investment. No clear understanding on whether the scope of this is larger than it needs to be. Should address the existing infrastructure in the building so we don't end

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		up with separate ones -- need a unified approach.
5: Technical Impact	- Technical impact description is very good	- Detail on equipment technology is lacking, other than what ever it is, it is robust and meets "standards". - Adequate video solution but not a progressive solution -- should be integrated with the existing data infrastructure in the building. Because of the structure of the Capitol and historic integrity, multiple independent infrastructures are not desired. Not much detail on strengths or weaknesses. No alternative solutions or even migration plans using some of the existing equipment in the rooms.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Team well defined - Well defined milestones.	- Details lacking, but this appears to be an initial plan. - Not much detail on roles of the project team.
7: Risk Assessment		- Initiative of this magnitude probably has more risks than those listed. Technology issues, funding issues, building issues. - Not much detail given regarding the historical requirements of the Capitol and how new infrastructure and equipment fits into that building.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Very detailed list of equipment needed. -Good detail and a good project.	- Some items not defined well. - Excellent project for the Capitol if a unified infrastructure was addressed in this proposal. Alternative proposals might have a larger benefit for a lesser cost if other technology needs were combined into this request (voice, data).

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			- The agency should review and address the issue raised by a reviewer that this project "should be integrated with the existing data infrastructure in the building."
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

NET Response to Weaknesses for Public Media at the Capitol NITC Project # 47-03

Section 4 – Project Justification / Business Case

"- No intangible benefits listed."

Intangible benefits were included in the proposal: this project replaces and modernizes the closed circuit, broadcast television and Internet streaming capabilities presently in place in Capitol to serve general public audiences, State Government viewers and Internet viewers throughout Nebraska. In consultation with the Division of Communications, the Judiciary branch and the Clerk of the Legislature's office, the common goal was to provide greater public access and transparency to the State's business and proceedings.

"- Not sure DTV conversion is necessarily tied to this update of the Capitol's video equipment."

The project is not represented as part of NET's DTV conversion. It does envision replacing analog television equipment with more efficient digital systems.

"-Not much detail or justification given for cost of providing temporary technical hardware and labor as opposed to this permanent solution.

As this is a replacement project, implementation schedules would be designed to not require temporary solutions. No service interruption is envisioned.

"- The project is a good one the only concern is would putting in a unified infrastructure be more cost effective than putting in a separate dedicated video infrastructure like is being proposed."

"Should address the existing infrastructure in the building so we don't end up with separate ones -- need a unified approach."

The project is envisioned to be designed and implemented collaborative with the Division of Communications and the other partners. The concept of a shared wiring infrastructure and data environment is acceptable to NET.

Section 7 – Risk Assessment

"- Initiative of this magnitude probably has more risks than those listed. Technology issues, funding issues, building issues."

NET understands the risks associated with this project very well, having dealt with these types of projects and issues on a consultative basis for the agencies and departments who are and were responsible for the implementation of the present systems that now need to be replaced. This project involves much less risk that in the digital conversion of the statewide system. NET believes its project management and risk abatement record over the past few years provides some measure of assurance regarding its ability to manage this project.

"- Not much detail given regarding the historical requirements of the Capitol and how new infrastructure and equipment fits into that building."

Capitol architects and preservation authorities have been involved in every aspect of planning this project.

NET Summary

On the other areas (Technical Impact, Planning for Implementation, and Financial Analysis and Budget) we would note the discrepancy between reviewers' comments: one's strengths are another's weaknesses. NET believes it has developed a detailed and credible plan.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-04	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Final DTV Transmitter Conversion Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

NET has met DTV conversion deadlines established by the FCC and now simulcasts in both legacy analog NTSC and in DTV. Federal regulations demand that analog transmission ceases at the end of the simulcast period in February 2009. This requirement for NET to shut down its analog broadcasts will mean changing or replacing some transmitters, antenna systems, and associated equipment not covered by prior state appropriations.

For each transmission site, NET has selected one of the two current simulcast channels for digital-only broadcast by February of 2009, with the other channel then being abandoned to the FCC. At some sites the final selection will be the present DTV channel, requiring less upfront cost, while most will retain the present analog channel number. Long-term savings will result in the latter cases due to the reduced electrical power needed to broadcast at the lower channel frequencies now associated with analog. In each case, however, capitol costs will be associated with analog shut-down. NET will incur these expenses in FY 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, with the removal of obsolete transmitters and antennas occurring in FY's 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Capitol Expenditure Projects Draft Budgets   Page 1

Analog Shutdown

	Item	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	Project Total
KHNE Hastings	Upgrade chnl 29 transmitter to digital				$120,000		
KLNE Lexington	Remove chnl 3 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
KMNE Bassett	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 7 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 15 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
KPNE North Platte	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 9 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 16 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Culbertson Translator	Translator replacement	$56,100					
	DTV mask filter	$3,500					
Max/Benkelman Translator	Translator replacement		$56,100				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Wauneta Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
KRNE Merriman	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 12 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Detailed tower analysis			$20,000			
	Top-mount chnl 12 antenna			$250,000			
	1100 ft of 4 inch transmission line			$180,000			
	Install antenna & transmission line			$150,000			
	Remove chnl 17 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
KTNE Angora	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 13 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 24 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Chadron Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Crawford Translator	Translator replacement		$15,500				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Harrison Translator	Translator replacement		$15,500				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
KUON Lincoln	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 12 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 40 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Beatrice Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Blair Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Falls City Translator	Translator replacement	$56,100					
	DTV mask filter	$3,500					
Pawnee City Translator	Translator replacement	$56,100					
	DTV mask filter	$3,500					
KXNE Norfolk	Tune chnl 16 exciters to chnl 19			$5,000			
	Chnl 19 DTV filter			$35,000			

Capitol Expenditure Projects Draft Budgets   Page 2

	Item	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	Project Total
	Upgrade chnl 19 transmitter to digital				$60,000		
	Remove chnl 16 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Decatur Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Neligh Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Niobrara Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Vertigre Translator	Translator replacement		$15,050				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
KYNE Omaha	Detailed tower analysis				$20,000		
	Top-mount chnl 17 antenna				$250,000		
	Antenna installation				$100,000		
	FY Totals	$178,800.00	$147,650	$1,415,000	$550,000	$350,000	$2,641,450
	USDA Federal Grant	$178,800.00	$116,150.00				
	FY Totals with grant applied		$31,500.00	$1,415,000.00	$550,000.00	$350,000.00	$2,346,500.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	14	14	14.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	24	24	24.3	25
5: Technical Impact	20	19	16	18.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	9	6	8.3	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	17	16	17.7	20
			TOTAL	92	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Excellent description, all questions answered. Mandated change. - Well defined with specific goals	- A little more detail on the current users of educational services would be useful. How many classrooms/teachers actually use the programs provided by this service. What are the benefits to these users?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- All very appropriate. - Clearly defined mandate for federal compliance. Tangible benefits for a large section of Nebraska. - Federal Mandate is cited.	
5: Technical Impact	- Again well described - Plan leverages existing investment.	- Since they are getting rid of the analog completely, the customers are being forced to either get a digital TV or a digital tuner for their analog TV. Mandated timeline from the feds does not leave NET any flexibility. -Not all technology items have a life of three years, this is broadly misstated. The NITC does have video and audio standards that may apply to some of the systems being discussed here. No mention of the satellite interconnections to this distribution system and that truly is a single point of failure.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Implementation plan is clear and addresses federal mandates. - Appropriate planning is listed for this project.	
7: Risk Assessment	- Great description of risks.	- If FCC would change any mandates or extend them a second time that could affect the project. - No discussion of satellite interconnections and potential risk from that aspect of the project. Finding qualified radio engineering staff will be a risk going forward.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The possibility of getting matching federal funds.	- This reviewer could not tell if all funds being requested were from the General Fund or the NebSat Cash Fund.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS
- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a "mandate".

NITC COMMENTS
- Mandate (Required by law, regulation, or other authority.)

Project #	Agency	Project Title
50-01	Nebraska State College System	Student Information Administrative System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

Nebraska State College System (NSCS) is requesting $6 million in year one of the 07-09 biennium and an additional $4 million in year two of the same biennium for the purpose of purchasing student information administrative software system (referred to in this document as an enterprise resource planning (ERP) solution) and necessary supporting hardware. The existing student information system was purchased and implemented in 1987 and is now dated, lacking necessary function to provide appropriate administrative support to students, faculty, and provide accountability reporting. Year one dollars will provide for planning and vendor selection, software and hardware purchase, training, and initial migration to a modern system. Year two will continue with training and implementation efforts.

The request will allow the Nebraska State College System to maintain its essential administration system. New software and hardware will provide online functions necessary to meeting the needs of students, faculty, and administration. Among the components considered are: recruiting, admissions, registration, student accounts, financial aid, housing, grade reports, transcripts student access to records, faculty advising, class scheduling room assignments, departmental budgeting and accounting, key control, parking, alumni functions, document imaging, and electronic transcript exchange.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							$ -
8.2 Software							$ -
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 6,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00
General Funds (SBF)		$ 6,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00				$ 10,000,000.00
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
	$ -	$ 6,000,000.00	$ 4,000,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,000,000.00

Note: Request is based on information gathered from informal presentations provided to each campus. Detail will be available after completion of he Request for Proposal process.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	12	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	24	24	22	23.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	18	13	15.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	7	6	6.3	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	6	6	6.3	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	13	11	8.0	20
			TOTAL	72	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Given the advances in technology over the last 20 years it is clear that the SCS needs to update to provide modern services and comply with reporting demands. The stated goals are clear and appropriate objectives for an organization that finds itself with a nearly 20 year old system - The goals are clearly defined and identify the systems required of today's ERP system if we are to provide the Nebraska State College System the tools necessary to succeed in the information age we must compete. The concept is "right on" in regard to better serving students and making the tasks of faculty and staff less onerous. - There was a complete list of the areas of affected core business functions.	- The measurement method as outlined is whether or not SCS can successfully migrate their existing data and bring the new system on line. While that is certainly a "bottom line" measure it falls far short of a process to evaluate the implementation of a very complex system and substantial undertaking. - Outcomes and performance measures seem a bit nebulous. Our experience in implementing a new ERP system is that the individuals in charge of each subsystem (Student Information, Financial Aid, etc.) will identify specific areas they want to see improvements in performance and/or reporting of data. - The measurement and assessment methods are not described but will be described in the RFP?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- The primary justification is to minimize the risk associated with maintaining a system that is where increasingly there is a lack of human resources capable of doing the necessary work and industry support is quickly fading. It is clear that migrating to a new system is critical. - One benefit that stands out is the potential a move to a system utilized by over 1,000 peer or similar institutions would provide. The NSCS will benefit from the knowledge base which most peer institutions readily share, especially as you implement a new system. Other solutions were not specifically offered in item 5 but the implication is that doing nothing is no longer an option and that the current system has run its course. Other integrated solutions will become evident as qualified providers respond to the RFP.	- Much depends on the needs assessment, selection process and subsequent gap analysis. It is beyond the scope of the proposal to outline this in any detail; however, more information on the RFP process is needed to fully assess this project. - No particular mandate is listed. Many details belonging in this proposal are described as "...will be defined in the RFP".

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Solid business case and justification is evident.	
5: Technical Impact	- Due to where NSCS is at in the process it is very difficult to assess this proposal based on anything other than the stated objectives. Thus, no real assessment of the technology (hardware/software) can be done. - The timing of migrating "now" rather than later seems reliable advice. A migration to a newer platform would move the NSCS to a technological position many other colleges have already made. Our experience would be that the desire for web access to applications drives many of our business interactions.	- The basis of the RFP appears to be sound and moving away from the existing legacy system is critical. - Would have liked more information reliability, scalability and security. The promise seems to be that it will be there. Addressing some of the improvements over the existing platform would have been helpful. - The project proposal needs more technical detail and explanation. Again, it said that these requirements will be defined by the RFP.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Obtaining appropriate, credible, representation from all groups will be difficult yet critical to obtaining widespread acceptance in a state known for fierce localism. In light of that some mention of the process that will be used to attract these representatives would have been helpful. - I agree that many of the fine points of the implementation process will be refined after system vendor has been selected. The make up of the team from the different offices and systems looks fine.	- There is no way at this point to determine the adequacy of the process that will unfold based on the information provided. - I would have liked to have seen more stated about the climate of acceptance amongst the stakeholders. Do they see the need for the change? Will they be champions of a major implementation? Has the leadership of the NSCS prepared the stakeholders for work that is ahead of them? Placing appropriate training and consulting days into the implementation will be critical to the success of the project. - Overall timeline/milestones lacks specific and detail.
7: Risk Assessment	- The document outlined the need for widespread representation and this is made clear in the recognition that widespread user acceptance is critical. - Funding is always a challenge.	- Integration at this level is very complicated and user buy-in is critical. There is no clear evidence that those who will spend the most time interacting with this system will have much in the way of input. Focus groups that work through existing processes that will be changed should be convened in front of deployment. In essence, one of the major risks is change management and very little is discussed in this proposal that addresses how it will be handled. - There are many barriers and risk to an implementation and should be anticipated in the project plan/proposal. - Risk assessment section definitely needs more detail.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Total dollars for each budget year are identified.	- In one sense it is premature to assess a budget because all of that is to be determined within the context of the RFP. Nevertheless, appropriations totaling 6 million dollars are being requested. Providing a price tag of that magnitude with no substantive rationale suggests that either work has been done and the details weren't provided or, worse, that this number represents a "ballpark" figure that could actually turn out to be much lower than what is needed.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- The detail I would expect was lacking. It tells me the planners do not have a clear concept of where the costs of the project will accrue. A listing of major components and projected costs of the project would have been helpful. I realize the project is in the initial planning stage and the variables are many. - The financial analysis is so incomplete it is hard to gauge whether the $10,000,000 is adequate or inadequate.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.

- The Technical Panel concurs with the Education Council recommendation that encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and State College System's SIS projects.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Education Council recommends this project be categorized as a highly recommended project.
- Both SIS projects are of equal importance for their sectors due to the discontinuation of support of the existing systems.
- The Education Council encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and the State College System's Student Information System projects in the procurement, implementation, and training and other areas that provide efficiency and cost effectiveness.
- The concerns about the financial analysis and budget of the State College System project, by one reviewer, can be attributed to the uncertainties associated with the purchase and implementation of a robust, contemporary collegiate information system.
- The Education Council disregarded the technical review scores due to the apparent inconsistencies in scoring.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 1 (Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency and/or the state.)
- Regarding Projects 50-01, State College System-Student Information Administrative System, and the collaboration with Project 51-01, UN-Student Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
  - o To leave the project in Tier 1.

- o That the NITC strongly recommends that the University of Nebraska and the State College System collaborate on these projects in the areas of data element definitions, data warehouse design, data sharing, networking, hardware, and implementation.
- o That the systems should be interoperable.
- o That the University of Nebraska and the State College System work closely with the Technical Panel and provide periodic project reports to the NITC.

Commissioner Hedquist seconded. Motion passed.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
51-01	University of Nebraska	Student Information System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

The University of Nebraska currently operates separate student information systems for each of our four campuses. A vendor developed student information product, the SunGard SCT SIS PLUS system, is utilized by our UNL, UNO, and UNK campuses. UNMC operates an in-house developed student information system. These SIS systems are running on a variety of database management products, operating platforms, and hardware environments.

The SCT SIS PLUS system was developed in the 1970s and is based on dated design principles and technologies (e.g. terminal access and batch processing) that are becoming technologically obsolete. The SIS PLUS vendor announced 5 years ago they would continue to provide basic system maintenance to comply with federal and other higher education regulatory requirements but would not implement any significant PLUS system enhancements in the future. SCT is no longer actively marketing the PLUS system and the PLUS client base has declined from a peak of approximately 450 schools in 2000 to less than 70 and this number continues to decline. Indications are that SCT will likely terminate maintenance for PLUS in the 2009 – 2010 timeframe.

Additionally, PLUS provides limited support in a number of areas that are becoming increasingly important in the higher education arena – e.g. prospecting and recruiting, 24x7 availability, the ability to offer and administer courses that are not term-based, web-based access to data and services, workflow support, reporting capability, decision-support, and flexibility in registration and billing. These functionality "gaps" are addressed either through the purchase of additional function specific software products that must be integrated with PLUS, a costly process, or through in-house developed applications. Enhancements to PLUS developed in-house often require complex interfaces due to the lack of technical integration in the PLUS system. It is becoming more and more expensive to implement and maintain these "external" applications to provide functionality the base PLUS system does not offer.

As we face increasing competitive pressure to provide any time any place access to information and enhanced services we are finding it more and more difficult, and in some cases virtually impossible, to implement new desirable features and functionality due to the PLUS system architecture and technical limitations.

If the University of Nebraska is to remain competitive in the future we must implement new student information systems which allow us to be more innovative, responsive, and effective in meeting these challenges.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	ADDITIONAL NOTES PROVIDED IN PROPOSAL	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future (Year 5)	Total
1. Personnel Costs		$ 970,000.00	$ 981,100.00	$ 992,533.00	$ 404,309.00	$ 416,438.00	$ 3,764,380.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other		$ 7,395,000.00					$ 7,395,000.00
3. Supplies and Materials		$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00			$ 4,500.00
4. Telecommunications		$ 21,600.00	$ 25,200.00	$ 21,600.00			$ 68,400.00
5. Training			$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 320,000.00
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs		$ 662,150.00	$ 647,150.00	$ 647,150.00	$ 595,150.00	$ 595,150.00	$ 3,146,750.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$ 1,739,386.00	$ 558,486.00	$ 226,785.00	$ 253,999.00	$ 284,479.00	$ 3,063,135.00
8.2 Software		$ 7,491,470.00	$ 1,358,265.00	$ 1,600,952.00	$ 1,887,324.00	$ 2,225,242.00	$ 14,563,253.00
8.3 Network		$ 180,000.00	$ 36,000.00	$ 36,000.00	$ 36,000.00	$ 36,000.00	$ 324,000.00
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 18,461,106.00	$ 3,707,701.00	$ 3,626,520.00	$ 3,276,782.00	$ 3,577,309.00	$ 32,649,418.00
General Funds							$ -

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	14	14	14.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	24	24	24.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	19	14	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	10	9	9.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	20	17	19.0	20
			TOTAL	92	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- A variety of assessment methods are listed and each can realistically be used to understand the effectiveness of the new system. The interrelationships between the measures can also be examined for a more comprehensive understanding. - The goals and objectives clearly reflect the improvement a new administrative computing system would provide. The positive outcomes will impact the beneficiaries of the project in noticeable ways in today's instant access climate and 24/7 expectations of students, faculty, staff and administrators. The growth and impact upon FTE, retention and revenues are measurable and a reasonable expectation of the project. - The described Student Information System would eliminate the aging legacy campus systems and unite all four campuses under one enterprise system.	- The change of a SIS results in changes to many business practices. It would be helpful to see some of those listed; however, the reviewer recognizes that this project is still in the formative stages. - The measurement and assessment instruments were not described in detail but can be inferred from the general methods listed.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- It is clear that the present SIS is outdated and the risk of this system will grow moving forward since the vendor will remove support. There are many tangible benefits listed that are appropriate targets and objectives to be achieved. Risk avoidance is another and moving forward that will be addressed with a new system. - The justifications clearly identify the benefits desired with a new integrated SIS administrative computing system. The project positions those working within the information system to be proactive in regard to serving customers anytime anywhere rather than reacting to customer requests using older technology pieces that are not fully integrated. The section evaluating solutions and options makes clear the cost of maintaining and	- The return on investment was described but not quantified or estimated.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	patching the current system. Maintenance costs, enhancing an old product, skill sets of support staff, and poor service of the existing product were clearly weighed and evaluated. Doing nothing does not seem a viable option. - The existing SIS system is definitely reaching the end of its useful lifespan and must be replaced.	
5: Technical Impact	- The present technology is very dated and a new system like those under consideration will provide many benefits and allow a much greater degree of integration with other systems. There are real savings associated with better system integration so this move has the benefit of impacting the budget in a positive fashion. - The proposed technology addresses the short-coming of the existing systems, with improvement to accessibility, reliability, security, and scalability. Conforms to NITC standards.	- It is difficult to adequately speak to the technical merits of the proposal when the decision process is still unfolding. - The strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution were not evaluated. The technical elements of the project were not described in detail.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Assembling the many groups will be critical to the success of this project so that there is buy-in to the strategic vision and tactical plans to be undertaken. The milestones are well laid out and clearly defined. - The implementation plan has administrative support, realistic timeline, and project teams to support a successful implementation and migration to a new system. Hiring and training of key staff are covered in the proposal. The milestones seem reasonable but do point out the fact that project approval means real benefit realization is 3 to 4 years from approval. - Although a complex and sizable undertaking, the University-wide committees and work groups should help unify the approach.	- A mention of the willingness and commitment of the stakeholders (students, administrators, faculty, and staff) to the project would have been nice, - Support requirements should involve more than just 'programmers on each campus'. How about back up data systems, additional hardware beyond that currently in existence, redundancy, etc..?
7: Risk Assessment	- The document clearly outlines the risks associated with adoption and implementation of a system of this magnitude. Of particular note is the recognition of the critical nature of data migration and the use of vendor toolkits that will ensure the process is done in a systematic fashion that can be successful and timely. - The barriers and risks to a successful implement are mitigated by enhancements to software, flexibility of the system, sharing of knowledge from other large universities who have already made the change, and the experience of the UNL staff who will be relied upon for implementation of the software.	

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	The strategies to minimize risk appear to be thorough and address the many conversion challenges an implementation provides. The tools, processes, and technical support are on target. - Very complete analysis.	
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- All expenses are listed and realistic for an undertaking of this magnitude. - The budget reflects the reality and cost of the project. The detailed description and costs indicate that proper homework and planning have occurred. Very impressive! - Very complete listing of proposed hardware and cost estimates.	- Consulting and travel expense seems high; at almost 25% of the total project cost. An additional 20 new positions is required of the project. Where is the eventual cost savings that was promised earlier in the proposal? Question 17 (where in agency budget request) is not answered.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.

- The Technical Panel concurs with the Education Council recommendation that encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and State College System's SIS projects.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Education Council recommends this project be categorized as a highly recommended project.
- Both SIS projects are of equal importance for their sectors due to the discontinuation of support of the existing systems.
- The Education Council encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and the State College System's Student Information System projects in the procurement, implementation, and training and other areas that provide efficiency and cost effectiveness.
- The Education Council disregarded the technical review scores due to the apparent inconsistencies in scoring.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 1 (Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency and/or the state.)
- Regarding Projects 50-01, State College System-Student Information Administrative System, and the collaboration with Project 51-01, UN-Student Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:

- o To leave the project in Tier 1.
- o That the NITC strongly recommends that the University of Nebraska and the State College System collaborate on these projects in the areas of data element definitions, data warehouse design, data sharing, networking, hardware, and implementation.
- o That the systems should be interoperable.
- o That the University of Nebraska and the State College System work closely with the Technical Panel and provide periodic project reports to the NITC.

Commissioner Hedquist seconded. Motion passed.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
85-01	Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems	Migration of PIONEER to the jClarity Platform

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This project is for the migration of the PIONEER application to the Sabre jClarety framework based on J2EE technology and written in Java. The jClarety framework is a functionally rich solution with very stable and robust architecture specifically developed for public retirement systems. The need for this project to be implemented at this time is due to the fact that Forte (the language PIONEER was written in) was purchased by Sun Microsystems. Sun is a big proponent of Java and has decided to completely stop support of Forte. This leaves NPERS and our software system in a potentially dangerous situation not having software support.

FUNDING SUMMARY

PIONEER Migration to JAVA

Services		5,751,000.00
Hardware/Software		772,000.00
Total		**6,523,000.00**

Month	Service Fees	Delivery	Payment Due at Delivery	HoldBack	Cumulative HoldBack
1					
2				$0.00	$0.00
3	$48,107.12	On-line Application - I: Requirements Documentation	$43,296.40	$4,810.71	$4,810.71
4	$221,292.73	On-line Application - I: Detailed Design	$199,163.46	$22,129.27	$26,939.98
4	$221,292.73	On-line Application - I: Integrated and Tested Code	$199,163.46	$22,129.27	$49,069.26
5	$386,000.00	Hardware/Software for Testing	$386,000.00	$0.00	$49,069.26
5	$471,449.73	On-line Application - I: Acceptance Testing	$424,304.75	$47,144.97	$96,214.23
6	$386,000.00	Hardware/Software for Production	$386,000.00	$0.00	$96,214.23
7	$124,422.89	On-line Application - II: Requirements Documentation	$111,980.60	$12,442.29	$108,656.52
8	$572,345.27	On-line Application - II: Detailed Design	$515,110.74	$57,234.53	$165,891.05
9		Hold back on services: On-line Application I	$96,214.23		$69,676.82
10					$69,676.82
11	$572,345.27	On-line Application - II: Integrated and Tested Code	$515,110.74	$57,234.53	$126,911.34
12	$115,020.00	Batch Application: Requirements Documentation	$103,518.00	$11,502.00	$138,413.34
13	$1,219,344.27	On-line Application - II: Acceptance Testing	$1,097,409.85	$121,934.43	$260,347.77
14	$529,092.00	Batch Application: Detailed Design	$476,182.80	$52,909.20	$313,256.97
15					$313,256.97
16					$313,256.97
17		Hold back on services: On-line Application II	$248,845.77		$64,411.20
17	$529,092.00	Batch Application: Integrated and Tested Code	$476,182.80	$52,909.20	$117,320.40
18	$1,127,196.00	Batch Application: Acceptance Testing	$1,014,476.40	$112,719.60	$230,040.00
19					$230,040.00
20					$230,040.00
21					$230,040.00
22		Hold back on services: Batch Application	$230,040.00		$0.00
	$6,523,000.00		**$6,523,000.00**	**$575,100.00**	**$0.00**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	10	10	11.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	20	16	20.3	25
5: Technical Impact	18	12	13	14.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	6	5	6.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	7	5	7.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	17	12	14.7	20
			TOTAL	74	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Way back at the September 2003 SunNetwork Conference held in San Francisco, Sun Microsystems announced that the Forte/UDS platform will go into maintenance mode starting in 2004. From 2004 to 2008, support for Forte will reduce until it is completely phased out in 2008. During this period, licensing and support costs are expected to rise and minimal new functionality is expected to be added. - Modernization of code is clearly due, and is probably an overriding need. - The steps are described, but very limited information is provided.	- No description of measurement/assessment methods, or of relationship to IT plan. One of the goals seems to be to maintain current vendor relationship ... possibly that's an appropriate goal, but it is a little unusual. - The goal is to migrate to JAVA, because of dropped support for FORTE, using their current vendor. What other options have been considered?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good discussion - Strong description of the criticality of need. - The project is described at a very high level and gives the reader a sense of the impact this system has on the agency and clients.	- No description of other solutions evaluated. Unclear if the architectural benefits mentioned in this section (reduction of support time and effort, use of multi threading batch processes, etc.) have been realized in other implementations of this product. -Because NPERS is working with existing vendor it doesn't appear that many solutions were considered. This recommendation is based on what the current vendor recommended. Has current vendor performed satisfactory to this point?
5: Technical Impact	- Movement to N-tier architecture described. Seems to be an appropriate modernized architecture. - Describes changes when moving from thick client to thin client.	- No discussion about security. Will Explorer be the only browser allowed? What about Firefox or the Mac Safari browser? - No description of specific technology changes included. No description of changed hardware requirements, or of changes to data tier. Reliability, security, scalability, and compliance with NITC standards not addressed. - The impact of moving from client server to web based architecture is not a small undertaking. This change may require rewriting the majority of the application. The

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		impacts to existing interfaces such as NIS are not addressed other than to say it will not change? It is likely that the current hardware used to support PIONEER will not be adequate nor will the skills required to support this environment be similar to the existing solution.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Phased approach with multiple implementations will reduce risk. - Mentions review by CIO staff.	- Did not see any discussion regarding the use of automated migration tools. From what I read it seems we are looking at a total manual re-write of the system. I could not tell if that was the case given the proposal. There are commercially available migration tools that can automate the Forte to Java translation. Has this been explored?? Most Forte projects have taken months and years to develop. If the translation were done manually, then it too would take approximately the same amount of time. A translation tool always generates the same code. This can eliminate programming and typographical errors that may be introduced by manual translation. - No timelines identified. Ongoing support requirements not identified. Technical staffing seems low if goal is to bring any significant portion of the maintenance in-house. Generally, a multiple rollout implementation will require bridging or scaffolding between the new functionality, and the remaining legacy functionality. That is not addressed in this plan. Data migration, or changes to the data tier are not addressed in the project plan. Non functional requirements (usability, security, performance, etc) should be identified early. They don't seem to be addressed in the preliminary plan. Project sponsor and agency project manager not identified. - Project estimates for work without knowing the scope of work to be accomplished seem unrealistic. A demo by Sabre should not be the deciding factor on choosing a vendor or software solution. NPERS current IT staffing seems inadequate based on the size to this project. There is no mention of project management staffing or executive oversight structure or steering group on NPERS side of project. A project of this size requires significant

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		resources from staff to complete. The vendor cannot be relied upon to provide project management alone. There needs to be a check and balance between NPERS and the vendor.
7: Risk Assessment	- The migration of a Forte application to Java, though complex, can be managed successfully with the early adoption of a migration strategy in the lifecycle of a project. - The Iterative development approach proposed should reduce risk and lead to improved quality during the course of the project. - Describes a phased implementation of new solution.	- This is a large project that, by virtue of its size, will bring with it a fair amount of risk. I'm not familiar with the "jClarety Methodology", and can't speak to whether it provides sufficient rigor for a project of this size. I suspect staffing and supportability are risks with this project. It's unclear whether the Agency Business Systems Analyst and IT Staff (6-7 people?) will be assigned full time to this project. If they are not, I suspect there will be a high risk of missed requirements and/or inability to support. The timeline seems very short, introducing schedule risk. The need to scaffold between a legacy and new system in a iterative project also introduces some risks. - Without analysis to existing solution how can we be sure that new solution and old will function along side of each other. This approach requires both old and new applications to be supported at the same time. This approach will add a burden to the development and business staff to maintain and test both solutions as the project moves forward. Moving from client server to web based development and not having current experience in this area is a risk. Not looking at alternate solutions and taking current vendors recommendation is a risk. No evidence of strong project management or oversight by NPERS staff is a risk.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Deliverables based funding, and "holdbacks" are great approaches. - Looks like a price quote.	- Not a lot of detail from my point of view. Does the cost include design and development of the cost by a contractor or does the development actually take place with staff in the IMS department or staff in another state department? Is there funding for migration tools? - As noted earlier, there are a number of items (data migration, non-functional requirements) that should be included in a deliverables based funding plan. It does not appear that this budget includes Agency staff who will be participating in the project.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- Estimates without requirements are dangerous. Is this a fix price quote? What assumptions has the vendor placed on these estimates? If NPERS can not perform to the vendors assumptions are the quotes still valid? The small technical staff at NPERS is not adequate to support an application of this size even with the addition of a developer FTE.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.			✓	
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	

- The agency has legitimate concerns about the current system, and the technical issues need to be addressed.
- The agency should work with the Technical Panel to provide for an ongoing review of the technical elements of this project.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a [Tier 1] project.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 1 (Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency and/or the state.)
- Commissioner Peterson moved to leave Project 85-01, Retirement- Migration of Pioneer to the jClarity Platform, in Tier 1 and recommended that the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for oversight of the project. Commissioner Hoesing seconded. Motion passed.

APPENDIX

AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Pioneer Migration Project Comments

- Project Proposal:
    - At the time the Project Proposal Form was completed, Nebraska Public Employment Retirement System (NPERS) understood something needed to be done, but only had information from the Pioneer vendor (Saber) that could be used in the Proposal. Also at this time, NPERS did not have a full time IT Manager to help provide direction. Consequently, it has generated a number of concerns during the review process.

    - Since this time, Jerry Brown from the Office of the CIO was invited to function as the NPERS IT Manager starting October 10th. We have since had discussions about:
        - RFI
        - RFP
        - Sole Source
        - Forte to Java conversion vendors, for example Softsol Group, who have done this in other locations.
        - Also, a draft technical review has been completed by the Office of the CIO and NPERS. The review was presented to the Nebraska Public Employee Retirement Board on October 16, 2006.

    - Be assured that this project will incorporate best practices in:
        - Project Management
        - Standards
        - Sponsor participation throughout the project
        - Establishment of a Steering Committee

- This is a project that must be completed by 2009 or before. Why?

    - The PIONEER application was developed in a language called Forte, which is a fourth generation language. Forte is owned by Sun Microsystems, who purchased the product suite in late 1999. Sun Microsystems has pledged to support Forte on select platforms until sometime in 2007, after which legacy systems (i.e. PIONEER) will need to look elsewhere for support.

    - PIONEER was written with some dependency on Windows 2000. It is projected that Microsoft will terminate Windows 2000 support by 2010. It is possible to transition to Windows XP, but would involve updating 75+ workstations, updating the software where appropriate, and testing the entire system. It is yet to be determined if this would be justified, based on when the transitioned system would be in production.

- Activities currently in progress or planned:
    - Prepare preliminary timeline for transition, Forte support and Windows 2000 support to determine if Windows XP conversion necessary.
    - Determine Transition Approach (establish requirements):
        - Possible RFI
        - RFP:
            - Totally different application (vendor): this is the least favored

- Use software tool to accomplish transition
- Current vendor would perform transition, so no tool required
- Process RFP through vendor selection
- Establish more precise budget

- Summary:
  - o This project needs to be done, but possibly not exactly as written in the proposal
  - o The project has a "defined" deadline, as discussed above
  - o The project has Sponsor support from the Nebraska Public Employee Retirement Board
  - o The agency has recent experience with a major application implementation, which will reduce the overall risk