Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information			
Project Name			Date
Nebraska Statewide Radio System (SRS)			10-15-2014
Sponsoring Agency			
Office of the Chief Information Officer			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Mike Jeffres	402-471-3719	Mike.jeffres@nebraska.gov	OCIO
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Mike Jeffres	402-471-3719	Mike.jeffres@nebraska.gov	OCIO

Project Start Date	Sept 2009	**Project End Date**	Dec 2012	**Project Close Date**	Oct 2014

Key Questions		**Explanation**
1. Did the scope of the project change?	☐ Yes X No	
2. Did the project meet the expectations of the stakeholders?	X Yes ☐ No	
3. Did the project costs exceed the budget provided?	☐ Yes X No	

Significant Project Milestones
Insert additional lines as necessary.

Milestone	Met	Not Met	Original Date	Actual Date	Impact (if late)
Phase I	X	☐	9-23-2009	9-23-2009	
Phase II	X	☐	3-10-2010	3-10-2010	
Phase III	X	☐	10-19-2010	10-29-2010	
Phase IV	X	☐	1-21-2011	1-21-2011	

Lessons Learned Documentation

What went wrong during the project and recommendations to avoid similar occurrences in the future
Provide a summary of what went wrong during the project, including the problem or issue, the impact and the recommendation to avoid those occurrences in the future.

1) TRANSITIONING: Agencies experienced difficulties in several areas that affected their early success using the system, and in some instances had the potential to put users in jeopardy in the performance of their duties. Recommendations:

    a. TRAINING: Needed to be a greater emphasis on training. Plan and budget for double what you think you will need. Also need to plan on continuing the training after initial implementation.

    b. OPERATIONS: The Systems User Group (SUG) could have been implemented earlier in the process. Also, need to ensure that the representation on the SUG is appropriate to represent users and does not consist of only policy or management individuals.

    c. POLICIES: Agencies were accustomed to operating independently for decades. The new system brought local, state, federal, public utilities and neighboring states into the picture. It is unrealistic to expect rapid changes to agency policies to improve interagency communications. However, persistent change must start early in the project. Successful changes to policies and procedures takes facilitation, it involves maturing in the system functions, knowledge of the system (both technically and operationally) to identify problem areas, plans for improvement with identifying steps to improve, and timelines.

2) INTERNAL CHALLENGES: Procurement, financial, fixed assets, reporting and other processes were frequent challenges and did not support the pace of the project implementation. Recommendations:

    a. OWNERSHIP: Clear ownership of procurement, financial, fixed asset and reporting processes. It would have taken significant effort to work out these changes, but in hindsight it probably would have saved duplicated efforts.

    b. AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES: User agencies had the responsibility to coordinate with the vendor and vendor contractors on equipment installations in their vehicles and their user radio programming. Confirmation from the agencies and the vendor that the installations took place and were acceptable to invoice off the contract took many months. While the user agencies has a responsibility to confirm the installs, the vendor also has a responsibility for correct and timely invoicing.

    c. TROUBLE REPORTING SYSTEM – A trouble reporting system should have implemented earlier in the process as a method for users to report issues/troubles.

3) COVERAGE EXPECTATIONS: Coverage requirements were defined in the RFP and coverage maps were created based on measurements taken from measuring the system coverage statewide over two months. However, users experienced coverage differently based on the various factors that can exist. The team created maps to illustrate different levels of degradation that a user might experience. A coverage map is a tool that provides a picture for where a user should expect their radio to work. It also serves as a useful troubleshooting tool when the user identifies problems where the map shows good coverage. Recommendations:

   a. VEHICLE STANDARDS: Establish vehicle standards early as a guide for installation of equipment.

   b. COVERAGE: Ensure that the agencies understand that factors such as vehicle installation, external interference, the type of antenna, equipment in the vehicle and weather can all impact coverage.

   c. TROUBLESHOOTING: Field troubleshooting practices have to be consistent to isolate problems and document repeating symptoms. When appropriate, joint agency troubleshooting needs to occur. The goal should be to establish common practices for technicians and provide learning opportunities to become more familiar with how the system works.

What went right during the project and how similar projects may benefit from this information

Provide a summary of what went right during the project, including the success or accomplishment, the impact and how future projects may benefit from this information.

1) PROJECT DIVISIONS: Creating divisions of project management and oversight.

   a. PROJECT OWNERS: OCIO, NPPD and Motorola worked out methods to coordinate many different project tasks and timelines owned by the three entities. The project was successful in part because the project was not the sole responsibility of the vendor. There were several project timelines and project managers who continually communicated and made decisions. There were continual streams of communications regarding all aspects of the project – state and NPPD network, tower development, tower builds and acquisitions, purchase order processing, change orders, frequency licensing, federal agreements, agency installations, vendor installations, etc. The timeline was aggressive, but that was openly accepted by the group.

   b. IMPLEMENTATION PHASES: Phasing in the system and taking beneficial use by phase was a positive of the project. Instead of migrating to a new statewide system all at once we migrated in four phases. Agencies were able to deal with challenges at a more manageable pace and recognize the need to modify their radio programming before going statewide by beginning implementation in the western Panhandle. Western Nebraska was also an easier part of the state to license public safety radio frequencies, access local towers to share, and coordinate state tower changes with NSP and NDOR to make room for installing the new equipment. This allowed the team to gain experience with the project issues, anticipate upcoming issues to plan for, adjust our schedules and target our efforts more efficiently in the subsequent phases. As we approached implementing in the eastern end of the state we already had the completed federal spectrum sharing agreement in place to use federal frequencies in the system where we anticipated supplemental frequencies would be needed.

2)	USER GROUP: Creating the System User Group provided a forum to discuss ongoing project challenges with NPPD and the user agencies. This is still a useful forum that is becoming more operationally focused as we close out the project and put the emphasis on users maturing in the system, expanding the user base and developing training materials.
3)	OCIO-NPPD INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT: The interlocal agreement with the Nebraska Public Power District is a model example of many of the right approaches we took in developing the relationship and committing our resources to ensure the project's success. We have routine ongoing discussions concerning the system operation, monitoring, maintenance, user agency support and many other topics.
4)	TROUBLE REPORT SYSTEM: Timely and accurate information is needed to correlate with the system logs and troubleshoot potential causes and effects. We created a web based trouble reporting system that any user or dispatcher could complete AND see what follow-up had been done. This feedback to users has proven to be very valuable.
5)	IT WORKS: The system works. The partnership works. It is always easier to discuss problems and lose sight of the fact that the system functions very well and is orders of magnitudes improved over all previous state radio communications. It covers more than 95% of the state, provides very clear audio and allows many different user agencies to talk at will with any other user anywhere in the system. The partnership with NPPD proved the state can share the ownership and management of a system, and set a tone to continue expanding partnerships with other agencies. The system is successful because we worked to establish best practices while addressing user issues and expectations migrating to a new technology.

Additional Comments
Use this section to insert comments / concerns not included in any other section.

This project was not simply a matter of implementing a large complex communications system and partnership. There were disruptive changes required that included developing interoperability between agencies and understanding how to use the technology.

As can happen with a large enterprise project, we have seen significant changes across the public safety landscape for the better, but this is just a beginning. We learned that providing the tools to communicate well takes time and ongoing effort to continue improving awareness, outreach, education, training, and continually expanding the sandbox as more users of diverse disciplines come on the system. We now have a variety of federal law enforcement and other federal agencies participating in the system, interoperability with 82% of Nebraska counties, most state agencies and increasing interest in local agencies to join the system.

Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information			
Project Name			Date
NeSIS PeopleSoft Campus Solutions ADA Compliance			9/19/2014
Sponsoring Agency			
University of Nebraska			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Jim Zemke	402-472-5195	jzemke@nebraska.edu	UNCSN
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Don Mihulka	402-472-8344	dmihulka@nebraska.edu	UNCSN

Project Start Date	08/01/2010	Estimated End Date	12/31/2011	Project End Date	09/01/2014

Key Questions		Explanation
1. Did the scope of the project change?	x Yes ☐ No	This project began as an effort to assess the level of ADA compliance for the Campus Solutions Student Information System and evolved into a project to also address the compliance short comings that were discovered. Staff were assigned to complete a comprehensive ADA compliance review of Campus Solutions to include not only the base Oracle Campus Solutions system but also all UN/State College system modifications and enhancements. A visually impaired student worker was also hired to assist in this evaluation and he was able to provide unique and very valuable insight into usability and access issues. Modifications were implemented to better align Campus Solutions with UN ADA compliance policy. Additionally, compliance guidelines were established to continually monitor both vendor distributed Campus Solutions system modifications and to guide future system development and modifications to insure future compliance.

Lessons Learned Documentation

2. Did the project meet the expectations of the stakeholders?	X Yes	Yes. The initial expectation was completion of an assessment of the level of Campus Solutions compliance. That was achieved. The project then moved forward to also address the compliance issues that were discovered and to put in place procedures to insure ADA compliance is addressed on a continual basis in the future.
3. Did the project costs exceed the budget provided?	X Yes	No specific budget was established for this project at its outset since the scope of the project could not be determined until the assessment of the level of compliance was determined. Oracle/PeopleSoft, the Campus Solutions vendor, had stated that Campus Solutions was, in their opinion, fully ADA compliant but that was their own subjective opinion. Our analysis did reveal some problems with the base Campus Solutions system when measured against what we (i.e. the University of Nebraska and the State Colleges) felt was a reasonable level of ADA compliance. That, in turn, led to extending the scope of the project to also address these issues and problems and put in place processes and procedure to insure a reasonable level of compliance was maintained in the future.

Significant Project Milestones
Insert additional lines as necessary.

Milestone	Met	Not Met	Original Date	Actual Date	Impact (if late)
Phase I - perform initial ADA compliance evaluation – base Campus Solutions system and core functions.	X		12/31/2011	12/31/2013	
Phase II – perform ADA compliance evaluation for in-house implemented base system modifications (i.e. campus portals, identity management/authentication, online admissions application, etc).	X			3/1/2014	

Lessons Learned Documentation

Phase III – perform ADA compliance evaluation for all in-house developed system modifications and enhancements and ancillary components (i.e. guest access, student dashboards, admin/staff dashboards, etc)	X			6/1/2014	
Develop mitigation strategy and implement modifications and enhancements to improve ADA compliance.	X			9/1/2014	Work continues to migrate the mods and enhancements that have been developed to address identified compliance issues into our production environments.
Put in place processes and procedures to continually monitor ADA compliance and insure future Campus Solutions modifications and enhancements meet the UN/SC reasonable level of ADA compliance standards.	X			9/1/2014	

What went wrong during the project and recommendations to avoid similar occurrences in the future Provide a summary of what went wrong during the project, including the problem or issue, the impact and the recommendation to avoid those occurrences in the future.
This project evolved over time which resulted in significant scope creep. However, that occurred because once the initial assessment of compliance was completed it was obvious that we needed to implement changes to address the issues and problems identified during the evaluation phase. In hindsight, this project could've been broken down into multiple separate projects aligned with the project phases organized around the project milestones noted above. Progress was slower than we would've liked due to a number of issues. Staffing constraints and a general lack of knowledge concerning how to best go about evaluating ADA compliance was an issue initially. Additional staff were added to the project to address the staffing issue and time was spent researching and becoming familiar with the testing and evaluation tools and techniques required. We also employed a visually impaired student worker to assist in the evaluation process which was very beneficial. Once we began the analysis we realized the definition of ADA compliance and "reasonable accommodation", which is institution specific, required clarification. That is, the ADA statutes are quite vague concerning any specific evaluation criteria. Considerable time was spent on research and establishing UN/SC evaluation criteria and finding appropriate tools to assist in the evaluation process. Evaluation of compliance was then found to be a very time consuming process. The vendor's position that Campus Solutions was ADA compliant complicated our ability to address some of the compliance issues that were exposed during our evaluation process since we have a policy to minimize modifications to any vendor supplied base system functionality. We did report the findings of our evaluation to Oracle, the Campus Solutions vendor, and they have agreed they will attempt to address the compliance issues we identified in future releases.

Lessons Learned Documentation

What went right during the project and how similar projects may benefit from this information Provide a summary of what went right during the project, including the success or accomplishment, the impact and how future projects may benefit from this information.
Although this project did take much longer to complete than initially anticipated that was largely because the scope of the project was extended from evaluation of ADA compliance levels of the base Campus Solutions system to the actual implementation of modifications, enhancements, and processes and procedures to address compliance on a long-term basis for the entire Campus Solutions system and all associated additional components. As noted above it may have been appropriate to break this entire effort down into multiple smaller projects with more distinct objectives. However, it is doubtful that would have resulted in any time or cost savings.

NITC Reporting/Process Improvements and Recommendations Use this section to insert NITC Enterprise Reporting improvements and recommendations.
If it is desired that the monthly project status updates are cumulative for the duration of the project it is suggested that each monthly entry for each section include a date/time stamp and the initials of the person entering the update for tracking purposes and improved readability.

Additional Comments Use this section to insert comments / concerns not included in any other section.
Monitoring and insuring ADA compliance is an ongoing issue. Not all of the modifications and enhancements required to address identified compliance issues identified to date have been fully implemented in all production environments.

Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information			
Project Name			Date
AFIS Upgrade			March 3, 2014
Sponsoring Agency			
Nebraska State Patrol			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Tony Loth	402-479-4007	Anthony.Loth@nebraska.gov	Nebraska State Patrol
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Tony Loth	402-479-4007	Anthony.Loth@nebraska.gov	Nebraska State Patrol

Project Start Date	06/12/2013	**Estimated End Date**	02/13/2014	**Project End Date**	02/25/2014

Key Questions			**Explanation**
1. Did the scope of the project change?	☐ Yes	☒ No	
2. Did the project meet the expectations of the stakeholders?	☒ Yes	☐ No	
3. Did the project costs exceed the budget provided?	☐ Yes	☒ No	

Cost Management
Show the actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate.

Fiscal Year [2013]

Budget Item	Budget at Completion (BAC)	Actual Costs (AC)	Cost Variance (CV = BAC – AC)
Salaries			
Contract Services	$750,000	$750,000	$0
Hardware			
Software			
Training			
Other Expenditures*			
Total Costs	$750,000	$750,000	$0

Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc.

Lessons Learned Documentation

Significant Project Milestones Insert additional lines as necessary.					
Milestone	Met	Not Met	Original Date	Actual Date	Impact (if late)
Signed Contract	☒			6/12/2013	
Delivery of Requirements Definition Document (RDD) from MorphoTrak	☒		7/8/2013	7/17/2013	
Approval of Requirements Definition Document	☒		8/6/2013	8/21/2013	No impact
Site Preparation Survey	☒		8/16/2013	8/30/2013	No impact
Procurement of Hardware	☒		9/5/2013	8/23/2013	
Installation/Transition Plan	☒		9/20/2013	10/30/2013	No impact
Approval of Acceptance Test Procedure	☒		9/20/2013	9/30/2013	No impact
Data Migration	☒		11/13/2013	11/18/2013	No impact
Training Plan	☒		11/15/2013	11/15/2013	
Hardware Delivery	☒		12/2/2013	11/4/2013	
Onsite Installation	☒		12/10/2013	11/5/2013	
Go Live/Site Acceptance Test	☒		12/13/2013	12/13/2013	
Final Acceptance (60-day review)	☒		2/13/2014	2/25/2014	

What went wrong during the project and recommendations to avoid similar occurrences in the future
Provide a summary of what went wrong during the project, including the problem or issue, the impact and the recommendation to avoid those occurrences in the future.

Overall this project was very smooth. There were a handful of milestone dates for deliverables that were not met but none of these had an adverse impact on the progress of the project. Final completion was about two weeks late due to some last minute bugs that needed to be resolved.

What went right during the project and how similar projects may benefit from this information
Provide a summary of what went right during the project, including the success or accomplishment, the impact and how future projects may benefit from this information.

In my opinion, communication was the key factor for the success of this project. There was a clearly defined implementation plan established at the very beginning and everyone was on board with that plan and everyone knew the expectations of all parties. When there was going to be a delay on the part of one party or the other, this was communicated to the other party so that adjustments to the plan could be made and expectations could be modified. We held bi-weekly meetings to discuss the status of the project, identify potential hang-ups and adjust our plan as needed. As implementation grew near, these meetings were increased to weekly.

Lessons Learned Documentation

NITC Reporting/Process Improvements and Recommendations Use this section to insert NITC Enterprise Reporting improvements and recommendations.
The form was easy to complete and really helped me to keep the documentation of the project in order. The only suggestion I would have would be to provide an online form to simplify the completion and submission of the form. Ideally we would be able to call up our last monthly report and make changes to it rather than complete it from scratch each month.

Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information			
Project Name			Closed Date
Fusion Center			December 10, 2013
Sponsoring Agency			
Nebraska State Patrol			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Kevin Knorr	(402) 479-4930	Kevin.knorr@nebraska.gov	Nebraska State Patrol
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Sam Shah	(703) 556-4031 x19874	Sam.Shah@sas.com	SAS/Memex

Project Start Date	05/01/2010	**Estimated End Date**	12/15/2010	**Project End Date**	07/31/2013

Cost Management Show the actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate.			
Fiscal Year [2012]			
Budget Item	Budget at Completion (BAC)	Actual Costs (AC)	Cost Variance (CV = BAC – AC)
Salaries	$0	$0	$0
Contract Services	$1,136,000	$1,136,000	$0
Hardware	$79,982.26	$79,982.26	$0
Software	$943,912	$943,912	$0
Training	$36,000	$36,000	$0
Other Expenditures*	$925,000	$925,000	$0
Total Costs	$3,120,894.26	$3,120,894.26	$0
Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc.			

The Nebraska State Patrol led this project which would create an intelligence network connecting the Records Management System, Computer Aided Dispatch and most importantly Intelligence records from the State Patrol and the Lincoln and Omaha Police Departments. They would also integrate numerous other data sources to include the Patrol Criminal History, Sex Offender registry and NCJIS. The project would total 17 data integrations.

The budget for the project was $3,120,894.26 that was paid for by Homeland Security Grant Funds and Nebraska State Patrol Seizure funds. No additional state or local funds were required to complete the project as proposed.

Lessons Learned Documentation

CHALLENGES

- The timeline proposed by the vendor was 165 days, which proved to be inaccurate. The last data integration was completed on July 31, 2013, which was 1,186 days after the project began. Delays resulted from a combination of vendor coordination issues, complications relating to dual layer authentication and limited NSP and associated agency IT resources.
- None of the associate agency IT units were prepared to commit the resources required to support the size of this project. The project had reached substantial completion in September 2012 when the initial training was completed and NSP troopers started using the system.

POSITIVES

- Officers now have the ability to query information from multiple agencies including the 17 original data sources all in a single application.
- Officers from multiple agencies can now submit intelligence information and search the entire intelligence database from a single application.
- There are now 38 different agencies across the state that is now sharing information using the Nebraska Fusion information network. The number continues to grow as we train new officers across the state.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Insist that the proposal clearly defines the necessary IT support needed from each of the associated agencies and then have those resources committed at the highest levels within each organization.
- Train the trainer environments have limited success in a law enforcement environment. The different training areas had various levels of enthusiasm and underlying knowledge. This led to varied levels of user acceptance and use of the system. They would recommend a smaller training team and multiple training events presented by one or two teams.
- The NITC reporting process was smooth for the Nebraska State Patrol.

Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information			
Project Name			Closed Date
Law Enforcement Message Switch Replacement			9/10/2013
Sponsoring Agency			
Nebraska State Patrol – Funded by City, County, State and Federal Law Enforcement Agencies			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Suzy Fredrickson	402-471-4545	suzy.fredrickson@nebraska.gov	Nebraska State Patrol
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Jonatan Guaita	402-471-4545	jonatan.guaita@nebraska.gov	Nebraska State Patrol

Project Start Date	08/01/2011	**Estimated End Date**	05/15/2012	**Project End Date**	01/23/2013

Cost Management
Show the actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate.

Fiscal Year [2011-2012]

Budget Item	Budget at Completion (BAC)	Actual Costs (AC)	Cost Variance (CV = BAC – AC)
Application Software	$234,000	$234,000 (Omnixx)	$0
System Software	$184,444	$57,141 (BizTalk)	$127,303
Maintenance and Support	$84,872	$0	$84,872
Hardware	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$127,500	$130,000	-$2,500
Installation	$95,000	$125,000	-$30,000
Integration	$45,000	$35,000	$10,000
Data Conversion	$30,000	$20,000	$10,000
Business Continuity	$25,000	$20,000	$5,000
Migration	$42,500	$0	$42,500
Training	$30,000	$30,000	$0
Documentation	$35,000	$43,200	$8,200
Total Costs	**$856,644**	**$694,341**	**$162,303**

Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc.

Lessons Learned Documentation

Criminal Justice Overview:

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) provides a number of systems and services for use by criminal justice agencies around the country for criminal justice purposes. The FBI has adopted the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy that sets forth a number of requirements Nebraska must meet in order to connect to the FBI's criminal justice information repositories.

The CJIS Security Policy requires that each state have a CJIS Systems Agency (CSA) – a criminal justice agency that provides the single connection point for criminal justice agencies in the state to the FBI. The CJIS Security Policy also requires that each CSA has a CJIS Systems Officer (CSO) who is an employee of the CSA as well as an Information Security Officer (ISO).

The Nebraska State Patrol is the CSA for the state of Nebraska and is responsible for administration and management of the statewide law enforcement message switch. Tom Prevo is designated as the CSO responsible for the administration of the CJIS network and Steve Carey serves as the ISO responsible to coordinate information security efforts at all CJIS interface agencies.

Challenges Encountered:

The Nebraska State Patrol implemented the UNISYS switch in 1995 and spent the next 17 years refining every aspect of it. During that timeframe, the Nebraska State Patrol had four subsequent system administrators supporting and advancing the switch functionality. This resulted in the evolution of a very high level of system complexity. Additionally, the UNISYS switch was developed in a proprietary format and had reached its end of life.

Taking these factors into consideration, we understood it would not be a seamless process. This scenario presents any new vendor with quite a challenge when implementing a replacement system without significantly impacting business continuity, which is essential when providing a critical service to all law enforcement within Nebraska, operating in a 24/7 environment.

Thankfully, we had Tom (CSO) and Steve (ISO) on board as longtime resident experts, who were able to work closely with the new switch vendor to provide valuable historical information which was critical to a successful system migration.

Cutover to the new switch occurred on January 23, 2013. The vendor was onsite for the first week to address issues as they were identified and has returned onsite once for follow up work requiring the vendor's full attention. The Nebraska State Patrol continues to have daily conference calls with the

vendor to review reported issues and discuss troubleshooting initiatives. Reported issues are being tracked in a spreadsheet. The daily priorities are identified and assignments made. NSP receives a list of items for testing to verify resolution of issues. NSP is also kept informed of any issues arising with the locals.

Some additional challenges we faced were:

- The switch replacement project began in August, 2011 with a Datamaxx and NSP Project Manager in place.
    - The Project experienced the first vendor Project Manager turnover in June, 2012, and an interim Project Manager was assigned by Datamaxx.
    - The new Datamaxx Project Manager was assigned in July, 2012, and unfortunately, experienced significant health issues off and on throughout the remainder of the project and, as of this week, is no longer with Datamaxx.
    - The NSP Project Manager resigned in July, 2012 and interim Project Manager, Jonatan Guaita was assigned.
    - The new NSP Project Manager, Dan Johnson, was assigned November, 2012.
- The initial project was scheduled to take 9 months but due to the extensive testing and verification of fixes required, it took substantially more time and effort than anticipated and the project was extended an additional 8 months. (Milestone 7 of 10)
- Some of the locals were not following the recommended, not mandated, CJIS standards, therefore, special accommodations had to be put in place to maintain business continuity.

Some positive factors include:

- NSP has worked with Datamaxx since 1986, therefore, Jonathan Waters of Datamaxx was somewhat familiar with our existing system and able to provide some reverse engineering.
- Nebraska was already using the Omnixx user interface on 150 clients. Implementing both a new switch and client software simultaneously would have been significantly more challenging.

Lessons Learned:

It's important to clearly define vendor requirements:

- What is the definition of data migration?
    - Is it just moving data or is it also converting it to a useful format?
    - What if the information to be migrated is in a proprietary format and the former vendor isn't willing to cooperate?
    - It's critical to detail ALL information required to be migrated.
- Define implementation and the expected timeframe.

- It's important to define the criteria the vendor is required to meet after go-live and is expected to remain onsite until complete.
- How will unforeseen issues be addressed as they arise after implementation?

There was little incentive for the vendor to complete the project prior to the six month time frame due to contract language.

- *"The entire retainage amount will be payable upon six (6) months after successful completion of the project."*
- NSP would recommend a shorter period for final payment.
- NSP does not recommend fining a vendor for each day they are late on go-live, as this will be incentive for vendors to implement and incomplete product. Fortunately, we did not use this method on this product or this would have been the case.

Critical need for extensive and accurate testing.

- Testing and database searching guidelines were provided by the vendor and should have been agreed upon by the customer before proceeding.
- Since testing was based on a minimal sample dataset many issues went undetected. All users testing all data will inherently result in the discovery of new issues.
- With the exception of the Towed file, NSP will begin migrating as many HOTfile data sources to the FBI as possible to avoid the need for future modifications specific to Nebraska.

Agencies need to take into consideration the impact of switching vendors after 15+ years have been spent customizing a proprietary system.

- We will continue to persuade locals to become compliant with federal standards to eliminate the need for future customization. (OFML)

Project Reporting Assessment:

We found the reporting process to be efficient and self-explanatory. We used the previous month's report and updated any relevant information.

Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information					
Project Name				Date Closed	
ACCESSNebraska				8/14/2012	
Sponsoring Agency					
Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)					
Contact		Phone	Email		Employer
Scot Adams		(402) 471-1878	Scot.Adams@Nebraska.gov		DHHS
Project Manager		Phone	Email		Employer
Karen Heng		(402) 471-9644	Karen.Heng@Nebraska.gov		DHHS
Project Start Date	September 2008	**Estimated End Date**	June 2012	**Project End Date**	June 2012

ACCESSNebraska is the re-engineering of Economic Assistance Service Delivery offered by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). ACCESSNebraska utilizes technology and program policy changes to create operational efficiencies. The federal program involved include: Medicaid, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), Child Care, Aid to Aged, Blind and Disabled and Social Services Block Grant Program (SSBG).

The project was approved by the Governor in September 2008. Full implementation was completed in June 2012. The project contains four components: Web Services, Document Imaging, Customer Service Centers and Universal Case Management System.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

- ACCESSNebraska project was completed according to planned timelines.
- Project was completed within proposed budget
- ACCESSNebraska transition team guided the project, this included: three project chairs, administrators and supervisors from each service area, a program policy administrator, Information System and Technology administrator and two project managers.
- Project utilized extensive staff involvement – over 30 operational committees.
- Customer service center locations were determined by utilizing a Request for Proposal process.
- Partnerships with the Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Service, State Department of Economic Development, State Department of Labor, State Department of Revenue to develop the Customer Service Centers and the telecommunications system.
- Project was awarded an $824,611 grant from USDA Food and Nutrition Services to assist customers in utilizing technology and to develop electronic submissions of documents.
- Partnerships with community agencies, especially Food Bank of Heartland and Lincoln Food Bank to assist customers in utilizing ACCESSNebraska. DHHS Community Support Specialists working with the community agencies.

Lessons Learned Documentation

PROJECT STRENGTHS

- Utilized research from other state government agencies (Florida and Utah) as well as private business (Cabela's, West Corporation, Verizon) and the University of Nebraska to determine the best solutions and plan for service delivery.
- Utilized a detailed project plan, business plan complete with estimated timeframes.
- Utilized time studies, forecasting and time projections to assess workloads and work volumes.
- Project was developed utilizing state staff from the Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Department of Health and Human Services. Technical Contractor was utilized on the IVR development and the ACCESSNebraska dashboard development.
- Input and involvement of staff, policy and program specialists, technical experts to design the best model.
- Utilized gradual implementation of project components, conducted operational pilots on document imaging system and customer service center with universal case management prior to implementation.
- Extensive testing was completed on all technology prior to pilots and implementation which resulted in very few changes post implementation.
- All components designed to be able to rapidly adjust to changes in policy, service delivery.

PROJECT CHANGES & CONSIDERATIONS

The following are changes that took place from the original plan:

- Document imaging case conversion was completed utilizing 5 regional scanning hubs on the Canon desk top scanners. This change was made due to delays in purchasing and programming of the IBML scanners
- The Scottsbluff Customer Service Center was opened ahead of the Lexington Customer Service Center. The Scottsbluff site needed less remodeling than the Lexington site.
- The Integrated Voice Response System was planned to begin operation in August 2010, this was delayed until November 2010.

The following are considerations of what we would do differently.

- Expertise and experience in Customer Service Center telecommunications operations was a weak point. Consider having a staff member or contractor with this experience on the project.
- Implementation around the Universal Case Management System has to be carefully calculated considering level of staff training and experience. From July 2011 through December 2011, the case volume in the system was greater than the staff available to handle the work load which resulted in long call wait times and work processing delays.
- Staff training needs to integrate the technology and teach the use of all the technology first. Staff should have a comfort level with operating the technology in order to build speed and improve customer service.

Lessons Learned Documentation

General Information			
Project Name			Date Closed
Enterprise Content Management Shared Service			2/14/2012
Sponsoring Agency			
OCIO			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Kevin Keller	402-471-0655	Kevin.keller@nebraska.gov	OCIO
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Kevin Keller	402-471-0655	Kevin.keller@nebraska.gov	OCIO

The ECM software vendor is OnBase by Hyland Software, and the implementation vendor is eDocument Resources. The ECM project currently has nine agencies participating: Health and Human Services, Roads, Labor, Revenue, Worker's Compensation Court, Office of the CIO, Agriculture, Environmental Quality and Natural Resources.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Set proper expectations to Agencies
- Set proper expectations within our organization
- Don't grow too fast