Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday October 23, 2001 - 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
38th and Holdrege, Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

1. Roll Call and Meeting Notice

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes* - September 11, 2001

4. Project Reviews

- Information Technology Infrastructure Fund Reviews (ITIF Statutes)
  > Crime Commission - NCJIS Access to Federal Data - Michael Overton*
  > Division of Communications - Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process - Mike Jeffres*
  > NIS - Update on status of NIS conditions - Tom Conroy
- Informational Review
  > ESU 10 - Center for Emerging Technology - Alan Wibbels
- State Records Board Grant Applications
  > Nebraska Library Commission - Value-Added Book Reviews*
  > Dept. of Agriculture - On-line Fee Collection*
- Government Technology Collaboration Fund Grant Reviews*

5. State Enterprise Architecture

- Standards and Guidelines*

Accessibility Architecture	- Accessibility Policy - Accessibility Checklists	Comments Received - None
Hardware Architecture	- Minimum Workstation Configuration Guidelines	Comments Received
Security Architecture	- IS Technical Staff Handbook - Security Officer Instruction Guide - Computer User's Security Handbook TO BE SET FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: - Incident Response and Reporting Procedure for State Government	Comments Received - None
Video Architecture	- Video Standard for Distance Learning	Comments Received

6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)

- Wireless project
- Network Architecture Work Group (NETCOM)
- Security Architecture Work Group
- Accessibility Architecture Work Group
- E-Government Architecture Work Group

- Video Standards Work Group

7. Other Business

8. Future Meeting Dates

    November 13, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
    December 11, 2001, 9:00 a.m.

9. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Items

NITC and Technical Panel Websites: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/
Meeting notice posted to the NITC Website: 15 OCT 2001
Meeting notice posted to the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar: 15 OCT 2001
Agenda posted to the NITC Website:17 OCT 2001

TECHNICAL PANEL

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday September 11, 2001 - 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room, 38th and Holdrege
Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Beach, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission
Steve Henderson, Department of Administrative Services, State of Nebraska
Christy Horn, Compliance Officer, University of Nebraska
Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska
Walter Weir, Chief Information Officer, University of Nebraska

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rick Golden, University of Nebraska
Tom Rolfes, Office of the CIO/N.I.T.C., State of Nebraska

ROLL CALL AND MEETING NOTICE

The Chair, Walter Weir, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Roll call was taken. There were five members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. The meeting notice was posted to the N.I.T.C. Web site on August 23, 2001 and on the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on September 4, 2001. The meeting agenda was posted to the N.I.T.C. Website on September 7, 2001.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Weir wanted to provide the group with an update on the University's I.T. networking efforts. A PowerPoint presentation entitled "Network Nebraska". The purpose of Network Nebraska is to achieve interconnectivity between campuses thru NETCOM by being inside and a part of the TINA pipe. Next steps of the project are as follows: determine commitment; research other states; prepare a business plan; and submit a proposal to the N.I.T.C.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - AUGUST 22, 2001

Mr. Schafer moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Henderson seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Beach-Yes, Henderson-Yes, Horn-Yes, Schafer-Yes, and Weir-Yes. The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

STATE ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE

Video Architecture - Video Standards.
The N.I.T.C. meets on October 31st. The Technical Panel meets on October 23, just prior to the N.I.T.C. meeting. The Video Architecture Standards and Guideline document would need to be out for public comment prior to all testing being done. It was recommended to include a comment under Section G-Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines stating that the migration and implementation plan will be available at a future date.

Mr. Weir moved to accept document to be posted for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Beach seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Schafer-Yes, Horn-Yes, Henderson-Yes, and Beach-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Hardware Architecture: Minimum Workstation Configuration Guidelines.
Members expressed concerns regarding the CPU speed of 133 MHz and whether this should be increased to 500. Members discussed revisions to the document.

Mr. Schafer moved to accept the document for the 30-day public comment period after making recommended changes and circulating to Technical Panel members for review . Mr. Beach seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Horn-Yes, Schafer-Yes, Weir-Yes, Beach-Yes, and Henderson-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Resource Materials - Security Architecture:
Mr. Schafer emphasized that these are templates and that persons can choose sections that apply to their particular department or division. Mr. Schafer posed the question that since there are not standards, does the Technical Panel want the N.I.T.C. to endorse the resource materials.

1) IS Technical Staff Handbook

2) Security Officer Instruction Guide; and

3) Computer User's Security Handbook

Mr. Weir moved to accept the template documents for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Schafer seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Henderson-Yes, Beach-Yes, Weir-Yes, Schafer-Yes, and Horn-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

PROJECT REVIEWS

Mr. Schafer provided a brief history regarding the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund and provided a copy of the statutes defining the N.I.T.C. and Technical Panel's responsibilities. Currently, there are a couple of projects being funded by the fund. This information was brought to the Technical Panel's attention in anticipation of future project reviews.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Wireless project. Ms. Decker was not available for a report.

Network Architecture Work Group (NETCOM). Ms. Decker was not available for a report. Mr. Schafer reported that four bids were submitted: Worldcom, ATT, Qwest, and Alltel. The project will be hearing the vendor's oral presentations this week.

Security Architecture Work Group – Steve Schafer. The Work Group has been focusing on conducting a security forum to create awareness. The N.I.T.C. had requested a review regarding security after a year of its adoption. This will be put on their agenda for a future meeting.

Accessibility Architecture Work Group. Ms. Horn reported that the draft has been out for public comment, and that she will be attempting to get the group together soon.

E-Government Architecture Work Group. Mr. Schafer reported that a Government Technology Collaboration Fund grant application has been submitted to proceed.

Video Standards Work Group. Mr. Beach reported that some equipment has arrived and some equipment had to be sent back. It is anticipated that testing will be completed and recommendation will be ready for the Technical Panel's October 23rd meeting. Written testing procedures are being developed.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

The next meetings of the N.I.T.C. Technical Panel will be held on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, 9:00 a.m. (tentatively-if needed) and on Tuesday, October 23, 2001, 9:00 a.m.

Minutes taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker, Office of the CIO/N.I.T.C.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

New or Additional State Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

Project Title	**NCJIS Access to Federal Data**
Agency/Entity	**Nebraska Crime Commission**

About this form…

This form is to be completed for all technology projects for which new or additional funding is requested from the Nebraska Legislature. An expanded description of the requests for which this form needs to be completed is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.

For questions or comments about this form, contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at:

Mail: Office of the CIO/NITC
521 S 14th Street, Suite 200
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone: (402) 471-3560
Fax: (402) 471-4608
E-mail: info@cio.state.ne.us

Completed forms should be submitted as an e-mail attachment to info@cio.state.ne.us or on paper to the address above.

Section I: General Information

Project Title	NCJIS Access to Federal Data
Agency (or entity)	Nebraska CrimeCommission

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	Michael Overton
Address	PO Box 94946
City, State, Zip	Lincoln, NE 68509
Telephone	402-471-3992
E-mail Address	Moverton@crimecom.state.ne.us

Section II: Executive Summary

Provide a one or two paragraph summary of the proposed project. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project and the information technology required.

NCJIS (Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System) was developed to provide secure, cost effective access to a variety of data for authenticated criminal justice users. It is an Internet based data mart that currently provides access to a variety of state and local data such as criminal histories (PCH), jail bookings, corrections holds, probationers, parolees, registered sex offenders and driver histories.

This project will build on NCJIS by developing a link to NCIC (the national crime database maintained by the FBI). NCIC is currently accessed by about 125 agencies in Nebraska via dedicated lines through the NSP switch. By bridging between the switch and NCJIS we will greatly expand the use and affordable access to NCIC and other state's data at the FBI. It must be noted that this will not replace the switch but instead provides another data path.

Section III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

1. Describe the project, including: specific goals and objectives; expected beneficiaries of the project; and expected outcomes.

This project will expand on one of the main tools necessary for effective law enforcement and public safety: information. Information is maintained in a number of local, state and federal databases. These are sometimes available only locally or through very controlled means. A key effort of the CJIS Advisory Committee has been to expand access to data for a broad range of users. This will build upon our efforts to make state and local data available by expanding to federal data.

There is one main database available for national criminal data. This is NCIC (National Crime Information Center) maintained by the FBI. It collects or indexes data on crime and criminals in a standard format. States report information on things ranging from current criminal activity to warrants to criminal histories. In addition to NCIC there is an adjunct set of files called NCIS that contains Nebraska specific information but which are accessed via NCIC. These can then all be used by verified law enforcement agencies nationwide.

NCIC (and therefore NCIS) are accessed through a closed network that the FBI maintains. The Nebraska portion is called NbLETS (or sometimes NLETS). It has recently been converted to TCP/IP but is only accessed over dedicated lines to the NSP switch, a messaging switch that routes queries and replies to NCIC or NCIS. These dedicated connections are particularly essential since one of the biggest groups of users is dispatchers who need a very fast response to reply to officers in the field seeking information on traffic stops, for instance. The speed and reliability are essential in these types of situations. There are now about 125 connections.

This project will build an alternate path to NCIC. There are a number of law enforcement agencies and users who want or need federal data (such as probation officers or typical investigators) but either do not need the speed guaranteed by NbLETS or can not afford the connectivity costs. By using NCJIS as a gateway to the NSP switch we can provide greatly expanded access to a variety of users while maintaining the integrity of NbLETS.

It is anticipated that the main beneficiaries will include smaller law enforcement agencies, probation officers, parole board, corrections officers and investigators. They will then be able to access NCIC through NCJIS, over the Internet, with no anticipated additional costs.

2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

The obvious outcome will be a successful implementation of the interface and the ability for agencies to do queries (no input will be included).

While the technical aspects of doing this connection are challenging and will require meeting various federal constraints there are a variety of policy issues. NCIC access comes with a number of training, audit and review criteria. New policies and procedures to deal with training and ongoing oversight will be necessary. This must be implemented in a way that does not hinder or overburden current staff.

3. Describe the project's relationship to your comprehensive information technology plan.

The Crime Commission hosts the CJIS Advisory Committee as a standing committee. It is comprised of about 25 state and local criminal justice agencies and associations. While the CJIS budget is a component of the agency budget we look at the CJIS Advisory Committee and its projects as being best overseen and directed by this cooperative group. The agency's technology plan reflects the direction and priorities established by the CJIS group.

In 1997 the first CJIS Strategic Plan was completed. It was developed to establish priorities, plans and potential projects for improving statewide automation and data sharing. That plan has provided essential direction to the group ad been the basis for projects. It was updated in 2001 to reflect activities and new needs. The Strategic Plan can not be seen as a static document but instead must be seen and used as the way for agencies, using CJIS funds or their own, to move forward and measure progress. This project builds upon the goals and identified projects and needs set out in those plans.

Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case

Please provide the project justification in terms of tangible benefits (an economic return on investment) and/or intangible benefits to the agency or public. The narrative should address the following:

1. Tangible benefits: Economic cost/benefit analysis.

Economic benefits can be broken down into a few areas.

The obvious benefit is in the direct comparison of potential access for those who have no NCIC access at this time. Many smaller agencies can not afford the approximate $350 per month for NCIC terminal access. This cost covers a PC and connectivity. However, given the availability through NCJIS there will be no new costs. Agencies will be able to use an existing PC and Internet access they have for NCJIS to get to NCIC.

Broader benefits accrue when we look at multiple users. Even if an agency has current NCIC access, there will be a wide range of users that can now obtain NCIC access without having the full constraints of NCIC. Additionally, one of the ongoing concerns for NCIC is response time. By using NCJIS we will be able to more easily prioritize queries that are submitted to NCIC, thereby being sure that the workload to the switch is steady. (NCIC queries submitted through NCJIS will be given a lower priority.)

There are also a whole host of agencies, such as probation offices, that rely on criminal history information but are not typical candidates for NbLETS connectivity. By using NCJIS we can reach out to

those valid users. This takes a load off of other agencies on whom probation has relied for information. When looking at state data through NCJIS, Probation says that its officers are now saving approximately 45 minutes to 2 hours per investigation by being able to run state data over NCJIS. Considering that they do approximately 12,000 per year this saves considerable time. Without NCJIS they have to have local police or sheriffs (with NCIC access) run all background checks. While they largely rely on state data they will likewise use NCIC to check for national data.

2. Intangible benefits: Benefits of the project for customers, clients, and citizens and/or benefits of the project for the agency.

Access to information is essential for law enforcement and criminal justice. As has been easily demonstrated in any number of high visibility cases, crime and criminals are mobile. This is true not just of big crime but of small crime and reflects our changing society. NCJIS is providing better access to data from across the state but more and more we are seeing people who either travel across state lines or move across states. This makes access to national data even more critical.

Some of the aspects seen in Nebraska that reflect the need for national data are the continued use of I-80 as a drug transport route between the coasts, the large number of illegal aliens arrested in Nebraska and the rise in the use, manufacturing and distribution of methamphetamine.

3. Describe other solutions that were evaluated, including their strengths and weaknesses, and why they were rejected. Explain the implications of doing nothing and why this option is not acceptable.

NCJIS has proven to be a reliable, efficient and stable environment for sharing data. We looked at a number of alternatives but NCJIS will provide a consistent platform with solid technology to meet our needs.

One alternative is the continued and expanded use of direct connections to the switch. This creates large concerns for both initial costs as well as the ongoing costs for connectivity.

Another possibility was the use of web enabling software that has been developed by Datamaxx, maker of the switch interface. This software, called Cyberlinks, would allow broader access to the switch and is going to be deployed by the Patrol to its users. However, it appears it would require a closed network to guarantee connectivity and security. NCJIS provides a broader access path and a single environment that users are already familiar with.

It should be pointed out that two other states have implemented similar solutions for broader NCIC access. It is key that we use any knowledge gained in other states on these types of alternatives since we must have any proposal approved by the FBI prior to moving ahead.

Kansas was the first state to be granted Internet based access to NCIC. We have actually worked closely with them as we have used some of the same consultants and developers. Much of our NCJIS design and security scheme parallels theirs. We will bring in their security expert and architect to review our methods prior to moving ahead. She is also involved in the update of the FBI CJIS security standards.

Pennsylvania has a project similar to NCJIS called JNET. They are testing with the FBI a plan parallel to what we are intending. They generate a query on JNET and then pass it to their switch which then packages the request into proper NCIC format, issues the query to NCIC and then controls the reply. This mirrors our intention and should provide the basis for FBI approval of our plan. The security and policy issues will still be key.

4. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

- Not a mandate -

Section V: Technical Impact

Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or if new systems are being added. The narrative should address the following:

1. Descriptions of hardware, software, and communications requirements for this project. Describe the strength and weaknesses of the proposed solution;

The majority needs of this project will rely on existing implementation. NJCIS is based upon 2 Dell NT servers that reside in IMS. They have backbone and Internet connectivity already. Along with most standard Microsoft products we use SQL and html code for the bulk of user interaction. It is anticipated that this will allow sufficient connectivity to be able to securely pass data to the NSP switch. We will need to do a fairly significant amount of programming to be able to accept and pass queries to the switch as well as receive and post replies from NCIC.

We will add one additional server to run security token software (from RSA). This will be another Dell 6400 running Windows 2000 Server.(Our current security structure relies on digital certificates that we issue. An earlier analysis recommended the use of tokens instead of certificates. We will revisit that issue as the technology has changed in the last few years. We currently use Netscape certificate manager.) We will need to boost memory on the existing servers to handle additional overhead.

2. Issues pertaining to reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation);

3. Conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards;

There is no foreseen conflict with NITC standards and guidelines. We have focused on industry standard products and approaches to guarantee longevity and the ability to be easily flexible. We will also be driven by FBI standards for security and connectivity.

4. Compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

This project will meld well with the existing NCJIS infrastructure and the updated NSP switch. All rely on IP and standard architectures. By using IMS for support and housing we will guarantee good connectivity and consistency.

Section VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance;

The CJIS Advisory Committee will be the primary sponsor for the project. The committee will maintain overall oversight and project control. Michael Overton, CJIS Chair, will be the project manager. A project subcommittee will have day-to-day project oversight. That subcommittee will be composed of Crime Commission, Nebraska State Patrol and IMS representatives as well as invited local representatives from probation and law enforcement to be sure we meet operational needs.

The CJIS Advisory Committee is composed of voting members from Clerks of the District Courts, Douglas County Information Systems, League of Municipalities, Lincoln Police Department, Nebraska Association of County Court Employees, Nebraska Association of County Officials, Nebraska Attorney General's Office, Nebraska Coalition for Victims of Crime, Nebraska Commission on Public Advocacy, Nebraska County Attorneys Association, Nebraska Crime Commission, Nebraska Criminal Defense Attorneys Association, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (Office of Juvenile Services), Nebraska Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Coalition, Nebraska Interagency Data Communications Advisory Committee, Nebraska Parole Board, Nebraska Probation Department, Nebraska Sheriffs Association, Nebraska State Court Administrator's Office, Nebraska State Patrol, Omaha Police Department, Police Chiefs Association of Nebraska, Police Officers' Association of Nebraska and a representative of County Correctional Departments. It exists to improve automation and data sharing in the criminal justice community. It is a voluntary and truly cooperative project that is ongoing only by the choice of the members. Projects such as this affect many agencies and levels of government and the CJIS group provides a way to collectively address issues and projects.

Any project must be submitted to the CJIS Advisory Committee for review and approval prior to being submitted to the Crime Commission. A Project Review Committee has reviewed and recommended projects as well as initially developed budget recommendations. The CJIS Advisory Committee adopted a Framework for CJIS Project Proposal and Strategic Plan Review which guides project adoption and the funding of all programs.

2. Define the roles, responsibilities, and required experience of the project team;

The project team is the core players who deal with and have operational oversight of NCJIS and NbLETS. The development and maintenance of the existing systems provides a solid base for the expansion of services and consistency with state and federal requirements.

Crime Commission participants will include Michael Overton (CJIS Project Manager). He has been involved in the development and design of NCJIS. State Patrol personnel will include Lt David Dishong (CID Chief), Lt Dave Shelton (CTO, head of NbLETS and communications) as well as their IT staff. Rod Lemke has been the main IMS contact and should continue in that role for this project.

Because of the nature and sensitivity of the project and the data we will need to focus a lot of our efforts on security. The two initial resources expected to be used. Norma Jean Schaffer of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation maintains security for KBI and has worked on the FBI security rules. She has agreed to help us in establishing direction and do initial review for security before we have to gain acceptance from the FBI. Fishnet Consulting is a major security consultant who did our original estimate as well as much of the Kansas design. We anticipate using them again.

3. List the major milestones and deliverables for each milestone;

This project will be driven by certain events which will then drive our timeline and the pace at which we can proceed. As mentioned earlier the Patrol is in the process of implementing a new switch. Until that is completed we can not us primary NSP resources or begin a new, major initiative. However, it does provide a prime opportunity to review the new installation and be sure that there are no glaring inconsistencies or potential problems. The new switch is to begin testing in January, 2002.

Additionally, NSP will be going through a major audit of systems related to NbLETS in November, 2001. They will be installing Cyberlinks in November, 2001. These events will allow us to begin the security design this year and move to actual implementation in 2002.

Following approval of the plan by NITC we will begin full project implementation planning. The subcommittee has met to look at resources and priorities. It is hoped that we can finalize internal reviews of NSP and FBI security considerations by December, 2001. In January, 2002 we will begin detailed security design (technical and policy). This will entail bringing in Ms. Schaffer as well as visiting Kansas. Fishnet will be contracted with for direct services. We will target having the design done by July, 2002 for presentation and approval by the FBI.

Following approval we will proceed with programming and acquisition of security components, anticipated to take six months. In this time we will formulate training and auditing plans to address new users. We should be ready to begin implementation in January, 2003.

4. Training and staff development requirements and procedures;

No training related to new processes will be necessary.

As mentioned, training and procedures for users will be necessary. We will need to develop training criteria to parallel NCIC requirements. Required onsite auditing (as well as using the transaction level tracking already built into NCJIS) and processes for compliance or removing users will need to be well documented. Regional training for existing users will probably be augmented with enhancing our current NCJIS training curriculum.

5. Ongoing support requirements, plans and provisions.

It is anticipated that there will be limited support necessary. While there will certainly be a need to change code and processes to meet new data or requirements we are envisioning putting in a system that does not collect new data nor affect databases. There will be continued use of audit code and processes at the agency level.

We currently contract with IMS for basic server support and that will continue. Analysts International (AI) has done the programming for NCJIS and administers the servers. That will continue as the servers will be seen as essential but not mission critical (as the switch is). AI provides support on security as well as the system and that expertise will continue to prove valuable. This will be covered through the standard CJIS appropriation.

Section VII: Risk Assessment

Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. List the identified risks, and relative importance of each;

The main hurdle to address in this project is meeting FBI security considerations. We feel we have developed NCJIS with that goal and are confident in meeting and exceeding all requirements. However, as technology changes we will be forced to continually assess our position, vulnerabilities and costs. Having targeted this for years as well as being able to build upon the experience of Kansas and Pennsylvania should help us tremendously.

The need to meet FBI audit and training requirements may present real obstacles. There is limited staff at NSP who are in charge of meeting these tasks. The Crime Commission will assist in any way possible but the arrangements with the FBI require them to be the final overseers of this type of connectivity. We do not anticipate there being an ability to hire more staff in the short run and will build in as much functionality as we can using technology to limit the impact.

2. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

CJIS has always taken a structured approach to the projects. The true cooperative attitude guarantees an approach that all involved entities must agree to. This project will not move ahead without knowledge that we can address ongoing support, training and audit concerns.

The initial planning for NCJIS targeted an eventual link to NCIC. This means that we took an early look at security and FBI needs. Combined with involvement on other state's projects this means that we are taking measured steps to concrete goals.

We had done preliminary design and gotten an initial estimate a few years ago from Fishnet Consulting for approximately $485,000. Since then we have implemented numerous technologies (new switch, NCJIS, various interfaces, etc) and the industry as well as FBI requirements have changed. We will need to review the process, design and requirements. We feel that the factors are still fairly consistent but we may ned to modify our approach.

Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

1. Financial Information

   Financial and budget information can be provided in either of the following ways:

   (1) If the information is available in some other format, either cut and paste the information into this document or transmit the information with this form; or

   (2) Provide the information by completing the spreadsheet provided below.

   Instructions: Double click on the Microsoft Excel icon below. An imbedded Excel spreadsheet will be launched. Input the appropriate financial information. Close the spreadsheet. The information you entered will automatically be saved with this document. If you want to review or revise the financial information, repeat the process just described.

   
   Excel Spreadsheet
   (Double-click)

   Budget information is contained in the embedded spreadsheet. It must be pointed out that while the budget amounts and appropriations match per year there is a very real expectation that the bulk of spending will be after the first year. As mentioned, the concerns with implementing the new switch (not scheduled to begin testing until January, 2002) will drive a lot of this project. We have been told by Budget that we will be able to carry those funds over.

   The purchase of software (security token licensing) and 'other' (the tokens themselves) may occur later. Those purchases are based upon incremental additions of 1,000 user blocks.

2. Provide any on-going operation and replacement costs not included above, including funding source if known:

Ongoing operation is estimated for two factors. These will come form the CJIS appropriation for NCJIS operations.

a) housing of the new server at IMS - $125 / month
b) ongoing support of the system - $10,000 / year after 2003

Tokens will be purchased that have a life of five years. This will need to be replaced at that point. These could be replaced by state/federal funds or through local replacement.

Program management at the Crime Commission and Patrol will be part of ongoing and regular operating costs.

3. Please indicate where the funding requested for this project can be found in the agency budget request, including program numbers. Also, please provide a breakdown of all non-state funding sources and funds provided per source.

The funding appeared in the CJIS portion of the Crime Commission budget. It is in Program #215.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Project Proposal Form
Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

Project Title:
Agency/Entity:

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2001/2002 (Year 1)	Request for FY2002/2003 (Year 2)	Request for FY2005 (Year 3)	Request for FY2006 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs (a)							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design		$ 25,000.00					$ 25,000.00
2.2 Programming		$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00				$ 200,000.00
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel		$ 5,000.00					$ 5,000.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures (b)							
8.1 Hardware		$ 23,000.00					$ 23,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 41,500.00	$ 41,500.00				$ 83,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other		$ 82,000.00	$ 82,000.00				$ 164,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 276,500.00	$ 223,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00
General Funds		$ 276,500.00	$ 223,500.00				$ 500,000.00
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 276,500.00	$ 223,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00

NOTES:

(a) If new FTE positions are included in the continuing costs/request, please provide a breakdown by position, including separate totals for salary and fringe benefits, on a separate sheet.
(b) Please itemize equipment on a separate sheet.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

New or Additional State Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

Project Title	**Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process**
Agency/Entity	**DAS-Division of Communications**

About this form…

This form is to be completed for all technology projects for which new or additional funding is requested from the Nebraska Legislature. An expanded description of the requests for which this form needs to be completed is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.

For questions or comments about this form, contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at:

Mail: Office of the CIO/NITC
521 S 14th Street, Suite 200
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone: (402) 471-3560
Fax: (402) 471-4608
E-mail: info@cio.state.ne.us

Completed forms should be submitted as an e-mail attachment to info@cio.state.ne.us or on paper to the address above.

Section I: General Information

Project Title	Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process
Agency (or entity)	DAS-Division of Communications

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	Brenda Decker or Mike Jeffres
Address	521 South 14th Street, Suite 300
City, State, Zip	Lincoln, NE 68505
Telephone	402-471-3717 or 402-471-3719
E-mail Address	bdecker@doc.state.ne.us or mjeffres@doc.state.ne.us

Section II: Executive Summary

Provide a one or two paragraph summary of the proposed project. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project and the information technology required.

State Statutes 86-1803 through 86-1811 outlines the Legislature's instructions to the Division of Communications for the planning and procurement of a statewide public safety wireless communications system for state agencies and other Nebraska Public Safety entities. The legislation also provided for representation through the Wireless Communications Advisory Board, which was appointed in 1999, and is comprised of local and state public safety representatives to assist the DOC in the project.

Section III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

1. Describe the project, including: specific goals and objectives; expected beneficiaries of the project; and expected outcomes.

RFP Procurement Support

The Division of Communications issued a Request For Proposals on June 29, 2001 to conduct the competitive procurement process for the statewide wireless communications system. Federal Engineering, an independent consulting firm, has been hired to provide procurement support from issuance of the RFP through proposal evaluation and contract award. Federal Engineering has been under contract with the DOC since the beginning of the project.

Proposal Evaluation Process (including Evaluation Tool Design and Training)

The Division of Communications and Federal Engineering are developing the proposal evaluation materials and evaluation plan, and will conduct the training for the evaluation team. This will include all instructions for executing the proposal evaluations, scoring and ranking. The DOC will oversee and review the results with assistance from the Wireless Advisory Board.

The Evaluation Team will be appointed by the DOC to analyze and score the vendor proposals. The evaluation team will be comprised of public safety professionals who are knowledgeable in communications issues including technical, management and engineering expertise, and who have no conflicting interests with this competitive procurement. Organizations whose personnel participate as evaluators, and who are not state employees, will be reimbursed for their travel and other actual expenses.

Contract Finalization and Intent-to-Award

After completion of the proposal evaluations, the DOC will review the evaluation scoring results and recommendations of the evaluation team. The DOC, with assistance from the Board, will determine whether the proposals received and scoring results are sufficient to proceed with contract finalization. The DOC, with assistance from the consultant, will begin finalizing a contract with the vendor. In the event an agreement is reached the Intent-to-Award will be issued. An Interlocal agency comprised of government entities will sign and administer the Contract as stated in the RFP. This Interlocal agency will work with the Nebraska Legislature to determine the funding method and receive Legislative Approval for this funding mechanism as necessary.

Beneficiaries and Needs Addressed

Local, state and federal public safety entities of all types have expressed interest in this project. Current state systems have lacked adequate capabilities for years and demand is high for a consolidated system with advanced technologies. Local and federal entities are increasingly seeking to coordinate with the State to address these common interests. In addition, public safety entities will be able to coordinate their equipment expenditures to invest in mutually beneficial solutions. The Legislature is anticipating cost information for the system during the 2002 legislative session. Governor Johanns has advocated implementing the system and Senator Bromm, Chairman of the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee, introduced LR 185 to explore funding options for the system.

Expected Outcomes

The expected outcome for this project is that a public safety wireless radio system design and contract will be approved and set for implementation. This system will meet the specific needs identified by the public safety community as defined in the Statewide Public Safety Wireless Communications Plan for Nebraska (See Section 4, Assessment of Alternatives).

2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

All scoring and ranking of the vendor proposals will be conducted on score sheets and mathematically analyzed for consistency and to reveal any anomalies or disparities in the evaluation scoring. The anticipated results of this evaluation and award process will produce the necessary information through the scoring and ranking to determine the adequacy of the proposals, and to determine the costs to implement the system.

At the conclusion of the proposal evaluation process, the DOC will determine whether adequate responses have been received. One or more sufficiently high scoring proposals that address the RFP requirements will be eligible for negotiations, beginning with the vendor(s) submitting the highest ranked proposal. If agreement can be reached with a vendor, the DOC, with approval of the Board, will issue the Intent-to-Award.

Contract award is contingent on funding. The DOC will notify the Legislature of the system costs as soon as the information can be determined. The Interlocal agency, after determining the funding method for the system, will sign and administer the Contract.

3. Describe the project's relationship to your comprehensive information technology plan.

The Public Safety Wireless Communications System is a consolidation of the State's need for radio communications and interoperability. It will replace obsolete state systems and provide the means to migrate state and local agencies onto a common infrastructure. The DOC statutory responsibilities include provisioning telecommunications services to state agencies and political subdivisions. In addition, the system will provide opportunities for ongoing coordination and collaboration with federal agencies that operate within the state and work with state and local public safety entities. This project is a specific and intregal piece of the Department of Administrative Services and Division of Communications comprehensive information technology plan.

Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case

Please provide the project justification in terms of tangible benefits (an economic return on investment) and/or intangible benefits to the agency or public. The narrative should address the following:

1. Tangible benefits: Economic cost/benefit analysis.

After the system is implemented agency investments in their own radio communications will be redirected to begin migrating user agencies onto the new system. Duplicate, incompatible expenditures will be reduced and ultimately eliminated. Future agency strategies and planning processes regarding radio communications will be directly coordinated with all participating interests as a result. Cost/benefit will be measurable through initial and long-term state agency migrations as participation grows.

2. Intangible benefits: Benefits of the project for customers, clients, and citizens and/or benefits of the project for the agency.

Local and federal public safety agencies have a large variety of perceived needs that will progressively place demands for system resources and intercommunications. Over the long-term system growth will meet these varied demands through the cooperation of a growing body of stakeholders. This will translate into increased investment in a common infrastructure and should also result in reducing the cost per user for participation.

3. Describe other solutions that were evaluated, including their strengths and weaknesses, and why they were rejected. Explain the implications of doing nothing and why this option is not acceptable.

The assessment stage of the project revealed the current situations and expectations of various local, state, tribal and federal entities in the state. While a variety of technical solutions and piecemeal technical solutions can alleviate some of the current problems, only a consolidated system approach will result in addressing the long-term joint communications needs of all users. Doing nothing is unacceptable since all public safety entities either require solutions immediately or will need the solutions within 5 years. The need for joint communications is a daily reality now and is no longer a matter of if or when it will be necessary. An assessment of an overall replacement of every piece of public safety wireless communications equipment was evaluated as too costly. The ultimate issue is how best to accomplish the objective and at what costs.

4. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

There is no mandate to implement this project.

Section V: Technical Impact

Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or if new systems are being added. The narrative should address the following:

1. Descriptions of hardware, software, and communications requirements for this project. Describe the strength and weaknesses of the proposed solution;

The system requirements call for a substantially more complex and capable communications infrastructure and will provide enhanced user features, which are today necessary, but unattainable with the current systems. The proposed trunked system will replace current radios and establish the infrastructure to deploy future capabilities and required. This is not possible with the current systems. Migrating agencies to the new system will be logistically challenging, but the larger benefits in the consolidated system will far out weigh the short-term difficulties. The current RFP defines requirements

and service offerings needed by the Public Safety community, but does not identify a specific solution. The State is asking the vendor community to provide a solution to the problem identified.

2. Issues pertaining to reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation);

The system requirements call for a scalable approach to support the initial user agencies. The system will be able to expand as necessary to accommodate other agencies and municipalities, as well as federal agencies. Security and reliability will be similar to those of the telecommunications industry. The equipment will be available for those agencies requiring higher levels of communications security.

3. Conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards;

The system will be accessible by any public safety or public service agency. Technical standards and guidelines will ensure uniform and efficient use of the system resources, and also provide flexible options to reduce barriers to participating. The system solution is multifaceted in that it recognizes the immediate needs of some agencies and the future needs of other potential participants. Shared infrastructure and leveraging costs will be primary motivators to participating in the system.

4. Compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

The system will utilize available telecommunications throughout the state, ostensibly through the NETCOM project. Current radio systems would be incompatible with the new system.

Section VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance;

Senator Gene Tyson of District #19 was the initial sponsor of LB 446, Nebraska Public Safety Wireless Communication system Act, which created the Wireless Advisory Board and funded the Wireless Design Study and development of the Wireless Communications Plan for Nebraska. During the 1999 Legislative Session, the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee took over sponsorship of LB 446. Governor Johanns and Senators Bromm and Wehrbein have been instrumental in raising the awareness and need for a new public safety communications system for Nebraska public safety entities. While the legislation specifies the requirement to develop the plan for a wireless communications system for state agencies, it also recognizes the importance of providing access to local and federal agencies to enhance public safety operations, facilitate interoperability among disparate radio systems.

The Wireless Advisory Board is comprised of local and state public safety officials and has assisted the DOC since the project began in 1999. The board has represents the majority of public safety interests and concerns in the state. The board individuals represent the Department of Correctional Services, the Department of Roads, the Game and Parks Commission, the Nebraska State Patrol, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency, the Nebraska Sheriffs Association, the Police Officers Association of Nebraska, the League of Nebraska Municipalities, the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee, professional firefighters, volunteer firefighters and emergency medical services. During the Wireless Design Study over 500 individuals participated in interviews, focus groups, public forums and surveys. There is overwhelming consensus to proceed with developing the statewide communications system, and provide non-mandatory opportunities for local government participation. Early stakeholders and potential participants have expressed widespread support in legislative hearings, local and regional conferences and at many other government events.

2. Define the roles, responsibilities, and required experience of the project team;

The Division of Communications is charged with managing the project. Federal Engineering, a private consulting agency, is assisting the DOC throughout the procurement and evaluation process, in addition to ongoing assistance from the Board. During the evaluation process the Evaluation Team will analyze and score the proposals with DOC supervision and direction from the consultant. Evaluators will be thoroughly instructed and familiar with the Wireless Communications Plan, NEVCOM RFP and evaluation materials prior to commencing the evaluation process.

Upon completion of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team will make their recommendation to the DOC as to the top scoring vendor(s). The DOC will determine whether the proposals and Evaluation Team recommendations are adequate to proceed with contract finalization. The DOC may reject any and all proposals. If the DOC is able to finalize an agreement with the selected vendor, the DOC will then issue the Intent to Award. Contract award will be contingent on funding and approval of the funding method by the Interlocal agency.

3. List the major milestones and deliverables for each milestone;

Project milestones and deliverables have been outlined in a SOW with Federal Engineering for the following tasks:

Vendor Pre-Proposal Conference	July 23, 2001
RFP Addenda - Vendor Q&A	August 7 and August 31, 2001
DELIVERABLE: Program Management Approach	September 4, 2001
DELIVERABLE: Proposal Evaluation Materials	October 1, 2001
Vendor Proposals Due	November 2, 2001
Proposal Evaluations Completed	December 14, 2001
Vendor Best and Final Presentations	December 21, 2001
Vendor Recommendations from Consultant	January 14, 2002
Contract Negotiations Completed	February 15, 2002

4. Training and staff development requirements and procedures;

The evaluation team will undergo three days of training provided by the Division of Communications and Federal Engineering regarding the evaluation tool and procedures to be used. This training will be mandatory for all evaluation participants.

5. Ongoing support requirements, plans and provisions.

Much of the management and support functions will be handled through the Division of Communications during the RFP process under this request. Ongoing support requirements, plans and provisions will be totally dependent on the legislative action that results from the outcome of this RFP.

Section VII: Risk Assessment

Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. List the identified risks, and relative importance of each;

Accessibility to a common system is the largest barrier to consolidating and leveraging resources. Until a common wireless infrastructure exists, agencies will continue on isolated paths or achieve a minimal level of coordination. The State is in a unique position to coordinate these common interests, which is not possible on the federal or local level.

Costs are a significant barrier to overcome before the available technical capabilities can be realized by most user agencies. Even a fully funded infrastructure will not mitigate the cost of purchasing new subscriber radios. Ongoing coordination, state assistance and progressive migration will be necessary in order to leverage the full benefits of the system.

Understanding the technical requirements and value of sharing spectrum resources must be an ongoing function of the State and User Board. No single entity can become of full participant of the system without a willingness to cooperate with the larger system goals and intent. Ongoing coordination between the interests of each entity and expanding the system will require long-term commitments from participating entities to be successful.

2. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

All state agencies will migrate to the system. This will provide a necessary catalyst for the State to be an anchor tenant of the system. As system resource-sharing increases, cost per user will decrease and should further minimize subscriber fees. The wireless infrastructure will provide the necessary platform to deploy other necessary technologies such as mobile data, location technology and Computer Aided Dispatching. Investment by all levels of government will contribute to the value of the system and encourage further migrations.

Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

1. Financial Information

Financial and budget information can be provided in either of the following ways:

(1) If the information is available in some other format, either cut and paste the information into this document or transmit the information with this form; or

Contracted Services (Federal Engineering)	$76,780
Contracted Services (Evaluators)	$12,000
Contracted Services (Personnel)	$154,575
Radio Comm Manager Salary & Benefits (75%)	$44,500
Travel Expense	$ 3,500
Telecommunications	$ 600
Supplies	$ 1,000
Office Space	$ 8,500
Hardware	$12,000
Software	$5,000
Total	$318,455

(2) Provide the information by completing the spreadsheet provided below.

Instructions: Double click on the Microsoft Excel icon below. An imbedded Excel spreadsheet will be launched. Input the appropriate financial information. Close the spreadsheet. The information you entered will automatically be saved with this document. If you want to review or revise the financial information, repeat the process just described.

Excel Spreadsheet
(Double-click)

2. Provide any on-going operation and replacement costs not included above, including funding source if known:

The DOC initially contracted with Federal Engineering, which was funded through LB 446 (1999). This funding period ended June 30, 2001. The remaining requirements of the legislation call for selecting a qualified Contractor though competitive procurement. The DOC negotiated an SOW with Federal Engineering for procurement support through contract award.

The Legislature appropriated $1.5M for FY2002-03 into the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund, Program No. 240 to support implemementing the public safety communications system project. This RFP Evaluation and Award Process will complete several necessary steps toward fulfilling the statutory requirements and Governor Johanns' intent toward implementing the system.

3. Please indicate where the funding requested for this project can be found in the agency budget request, including program numbers. Also, please provide a breakdown of all non-state funding sources and funds provided per source.

Information Technology Infrastructure Fund, Program No. 240.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Project Proposal Form
Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

Project Title: Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process
Agency/Entity: DAS - Division of Communications

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Request for FY2002 (Year 0)	Request for FY2003 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004 (Year 2)	Request for FY2005 (Year 3)	Request for FY2006 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs (a)							$ -
Radio Comm Mgr (75%)	$ 33,000.00						$ 33,000.00
Benefits for RCM (75%)	$ 11,500.00						$ 11,500.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
Federal Engineering Inc.	$ 76,780.00						$ 76,780.00
Contract Svs w/eval.'s	$ 12,000.00						$ 12,000.00
2.4 Other							$ -
Grants Coordinator	$ 46,575.00						$ 46,575.00
Network Manager	$ 60,750.00						$ 60,750.00
Admin Assistant	$ 33,750.00						$ 33,750.00
Support Staff (50%)	$ 13,500.00						$ 13,500.00
3. Supplies and Materials	$ 1,000.00						$ 1,000.00
4. Telecommunications	$ 600.00						$ 600.00
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel	$ 3,500.00						$ 3,500.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
Rent/Space	$ 8,500.00						$ 8,500.00
8. Capital Expenditures (b)							
8.1 Hardware	$ 12,000.00						$ 12,000.00
8.2 Software	$ 5,000.00						$ 5,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 318,455.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 318,455.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

NOTES:

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Project Proposal Form
Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

(a) If new FTE positions are included in the continuing costs/request, please provide a breakdown by position, including separate totals for salary and fringe benefits, on a separate sheet.
(b) Please itemize equipment on a separate sheet.

The Nebraska Information Technology Commission required the following conditions for the release of Information Technology Infrastructure funds for the NIS project. Each requirement and its status is listed below.

Requirement:

Need for tangible evidence of agency commitment such as providing project team members, incorporating agency training plans per project implementation plans, participation in design workshops, and providing executives for the process decision team.

Status:

Agency directors voiced their support for the project on July 2, 2001 at a Director's staff meeting.

Governor Johanns, Treasurer Byrd and Auditor of Public Accounts Witek spoke in support of the project at the NIS kickoff meeting on October 9, 2001. 350 state employees from over 40 agencies attended the meeting. Informal comments from the attendees were very positive.

The project team includes full time members from DAS, HHS, Education, Roads, NET, DEQ, DNR, Corrections and Military. Other agencies have indicated a willingness to supply team members as required.

The process decision team (PDT) includes HHS, Roads, Education, Game & Parks, DEQ, DAS, Auditor of Public Accounts, Secretary of State, Corrections, Arts Council and Labor. Tom Lamberson from DEQ chairs the team.

The first workshops have been well attended by a variety of agencies. Training assessments are being scheduled. The assessments will be used to design training plans.

Requirement:

Written empowerment from the Project Sponsor allowing the Project Director and the NIS Project Team to make time critical decisions.

Status:

We have obtained a copy of the University empowerment letter and of a sample from IBM. The initial PDT task has been to define the boundaries of empowerment for the PDT, the project team and the steering committee. This information will be the basis for written empowerment statements.

Requirement:

Detailed process for evaluating and eliminating duplicative systems.

Status:

The discovery process for duplicative systems has started with a review of current interfaces to NEIS and NAS. A request for information has also been prepared to gather information about agency-specific financial systems. This information will be used as input for the evaluation. After the discovery process, the NIS project team will work with agencies to compare functionality and analyze different options. Decisions on what constitutes a duplicative system and when to eliminate it will follow the requirements established by the NIS Steering Committee:

> "Large State agencies have compensated for the lack of functionality in the state's accounting, payroll, and other enterprise systems by developing their own computer programs. Often these programs are closely tied to other agency-owned automated systems. In some cases, the functionality serves needs unique to the agency. The new Nebraska Information System will duplicate some of the functions in some agency-owned applications. State agencies will shift these functions to NIS, unless there is a clear cost advantage to retaining the agency-owned system. Unique requirements of the agency or following nationally recognized best practices are reasons for retaining agency-owned systems, if those systems are able to provide NIS with the data it requires. The timetable for shifting functions to NIS will take into consideration the availability of resources in state agencies to make corresponding changes to agency-owned systems, which are to be completed by 6/30/2005."

Requirement:

Detailed description of the NIS project scope, including base functionality and management of contingency funds to address unforeseen events.

Status:

The NIS project scope is defined in the NIS contract. It includes full implementation of the following J.D. Edwards OneWorld XE modules:

OneWorld® Xe Modules	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Phase V
Address Book Management	**X**				
General Ledger	**X**				
Financial Reporting	**X**				
Accounts Payable	**X**				
Accounts Receivable	**X**				
Procurement	**X**				
Electronic Commerce	**X**				
Human Resources		**X**			
USA Payroll		**X**			
Financial Modeling and Budgeting				**X**	

OneWorld® Xe Modules	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Phase V
Contract Management			**X**		
Grant Management			**X**		
Project Accounting/Job Costing			**X**		
Fixed Assets			**X**		
Inventory Management					**X**

Relevant sections from both the RFP and the J.D. Edwards proposal that describe the project scope are also included in the contract.

Contingency funds will be managed at the Steering Committee. The Project Director will identify proposed uses for the funds. The Steering Committee will approve or deny the proposed expenditures.

Requirement:

Contract negotiations result in a total project budget not to exceed $29,728,529.

Status:

The contract negotiations resulted in a total project budget of $29,331,177.

Requirement:

Prepare a realistic post implementation budget.

Status:

An initial post implementation budget was developed. Support cost estimates derived from this budget were shared with all agencies in June. Paul Carlson, who will be responsible for the ongoing support of NIS after the project ends, is now further refining the budget. The post implementation budget will include adequate staff and resources to allow ongoing training and technical support necessary to achieve the benefits identified in the project charter.

Requirement:

Development of an independent project management review process that involves state government representation and management.

Status:

Agreement has been established with IBM for a representative of the State Chief Information Officer to participate in the independent IBM quality management review of the project. The quality review is completely independent of the project team.

APPLCATION FOR STATE RECORDS BOARD GRANT TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO PUBLIC INFORMATION

1. **Name of agency applying for grant:**
   Nebraska Library Commission

2. **Title or brief description of project:**
   Value-Added Book Reviews: Any Time, Any Place

3. **Grant request amount:**
   $11,096

4. **Will there be a fee for accessing records associated with this project?**
   No

5. **If yes, provide any statutory reference or authorization for the fee**
   Not applicable

6. **Please describe the project in detail**
   Since 1993 the Nebraska Library Commission has provided book reviews of selected books appropriate for children and young adult readers via a number of videoconference hookup sites, and afterward via videotapes of these presentations. Each presentation (and video) shows a reviewer presenting their reviews of a number of titles that they have chosen within broad subject categories. Both the face of the reviewer and, alternately, a video shot of the front cover of the book and several pages and/or illustrations from the book are displayed while the reviewer delivers the oral review. After the videoconferenced reviews are presented, multiple copies of the videotaped sessions are provided to all six library Systems in the state as well as several copies added to the Commission's circulating collection.

   As more and more public and school libraries gain access to higher speed Internet access, we have noted and verified an increased interest in access to these reviews by "user friendlier" means. We have heard, for example, from library staff that indicate that having to sit through approximately six hours of videotapes which offer no indexing system to allow moving to specific titles, authors or categories (except by guess work) is too time consuming. With the steady increase in the number of computer stations (and the higher speed access mentioned above), many users are ready to move to something more convenient and efficient for them. The preferred mode is via the Commission web site, an approach that will allow access any time, any place. It also allows direct access by specific book title, by author, by genre, and by reader age, among others.

   During the last year we have worked closely with Nebraska Educational Telecommunications where the book reviews are currently videotaped every six months to seek a solution to provide this enhanced service. In essence we have

developed a solutions that will allow improved, timesaving access any time and any place in Nebraska. Library staff will now be able to view the book reviews at work, at home or any place else that has Internet access. The value-added reviews (because the titles are selected according to quality criteria before reviewing) will allow school media staff and public library staff to offer quality titles they have seen and heard reviewed in an unbiased manner. This makes this service superior to services such as Amazon.com, for example, since such sources tend to offer only positive reviews for any titles they carry since their primary objective is to sell the books. The importance of this issue cannot be stressed enough especially since many of Nebraska's libraries have staff untrained in materials selection generally, and in selection of children's and young adults' materials specifically.

Goals:

- Access any time, any place to quality-selected book reviews of young adult and children's titles by Nebraska librarians
- Updated methodology for providing these reviews statewide via a variety of access points
- Use of up-to-date technology by the Nebraska Library Commission and by local libraries to provide enhanced services to library staff with responsibility for these library materials

Objectives:

- To provide on-line access via the Commission's web site to book reviews
- To develop methods that will be easy and intuitive for library users in order to facilitate access to this information
- To work with Nebraska Educational Telecommunications staff to initiate this improved method of delivery and to investigate the possibility of making this service available to other interested states on a pay-as-you-go basis
- To encourage the use of time-efficient methods for local libraries in accessing this information
- To ensure the continued provision of quality books titles for Nebraska's public and school libraries in their services to children and young adults
- To test the usefulness and employment of this new method for providing this service through the gathering of use data during the first year of operation; to follow up with a survey to determine interest in continuing

7. Please describe who the beneficiary or recipient of this service will be and projected activity for access or use of the proposed service

Beneficiaries: Library staff with responsibility for selecting book titles for the library's children and young adult customers who are the ultimate beneficiaries because they will have access to high quality materials.

We expect the following benefits to accrue:

- Savings in terms of time commitment by library customers who can now access the reviews at times and places convenient to them, rather than

having to travel to videoconference sites or wait for later check out of a finite number of videotape sets

- Faster access to the reviews of the titles, thus speeding the ordering process for local libraries and helping to ensure the acquisition of quality books for children and young adult library customers
- Increased use of new technology in libraries with the resulting improvement in skill level of local library staff; potential access of these reviews by other library customers such as day care personnel, parents, students, etc.
- Contribution toward the attainment of one of the goals of the Nebraska Library Commission to improve library services statewide by helping to provide quality library services to all citizens

Projected Activity: We expect that those library staff who are comfortable with using current library technology will use this newer method of providing access to these reviews immediately. This has been verified in a computer lab setting during which we demonstrated a demo version, and numerous comments from those who have heard about this approach indicate a very positive reception. Since this will be accessible through our web site, we expect the high hit rate will both ensure good use of these reviews and increase the use of our web site.

8. Estimated timeline for implementation:

October 1, 2001 – Due date for submitting grant request to Nebraska State Records Board

Late October or early November, 2001 – State Records Board meets and decides on grant applications – If grant proposal is approved, then the following schedule, etc. would apply:

November 15, 2001 – Set up of dynamic window by NET to allow later input of raw data; testing

November 20, 2001 – Sign off by Commission on dynamic window as workable for use by Commission staff to input raw data

[October 26 and November 2, 2001 – Videotaping of reviews at NET]

[November 12, 2001 – Final corrections made on list of book reviews, code sheets, etc.]*

November 20, 2001 – Begin input of raw data via dynamic window

*Note: The two items in square brackets above will be completed whether or not this project is funded; the videotapes are done each six months.

9. Agency contribution to project (labor, equipment, etc.):

Agency staff members have worked with staff of the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications for over a year, meeting and planning for this project. In addition members of our computer team staff have researched various approaches and have reviewed proposals from NET as to their feasibility for local libraries to gain access and for our staff to provide support. If this project goes forward, our Computer Team staff will have responsibility for ensuring that it is available to libraries statewide via our web site. It is also likely that our staff who possess

expertise in re: children's and young adult's books will have increased responsibilities at least until any "glitches" are worked out with this new means of access.

10a.Has this project ever been submitted as a budget request (explain)?:

No. We have recently submitted a request for funding support to the NITC for this project.

10b.Does the project require additional statutory authority (explain):

No, it does not.

10c.Why is the grant money needed for the project, and, if applicable, how will the service be sustained once the grant money is expended?:

The agency does not have sufficient funding available for this project for the first year's greater start-up costs, although we do have sufficient funding to sustain this project in subsequent years. This project will allow us to investigate whether or not we will discontinue the current delivery method for these book reviews (six hours of videotapes every six months) or whether this new method will replace that method, or enhance it. We will also be exploring the possibility of financial support from surrounding states, some of which already ask for and use copies of the videotapes we produce of these book reviews. This may yield additional resources to help support this activity in the future.

11. Please describe how this project will enhance the delivery of state agency services or access to those services:

This project will enhance the delivery of and access to the Nebraska Library Commission's reviews for children's and young adult's book titles by providing the following:

- Access to these value-added reviews any time and any place that a computer terminal is available
- Quicker, and broader access to these reviews rather than having to wait for a finite number of videotapes
- Increased and improved access points through computer-assisted searching so that individual titles, authors, genres, age groupings, etc. can be found, versus attempting to locate specific portions of the non-indexed videotapes
- Reduction in travel time required for local viewing of reviews by participants who wish to have early access to this information at various videoconferencing sites
- Possible elimination of the videotape and videoconference access approaches to providing this service, should this newer approach prove superior (not, however, if that reduces access and use of these reviews)
- Improved visual access to book covers, and interior pages, versus sometimes problematic access via videotape
- Geographic equality of access, no matter the distance from Lincoln or from videoconferencing sites

- Integration into the state of Nebraska's vision of offering one-stop shopping for state services via its web site
- Ultimately, the improvement of book titles available for Nebraska's children and young adults through their public and school libraries

12. **Please describe how this project will 1) Improve the efficiency of agency operations; 2) Facilitate collaboration among state agencies. . . .**

Improve the efficiency of agency operations:

- It will build on our continuing efforts to facilitate the use of our web site for access to Commission services and information
- It will allow us to offer access to these book reviews on a self-serve basis, and to a greater number of people
- It may reduce the need for check out and scheduling of videotapes, both on our part and on the part of the regional library Systems who house one copy of the videotapes regionally

Facilitate collaboration among state agencies:

- It will allow us to expand our cooperative efforts with Nebraska Educational Telecommunications by enhancing the current videoconference/videotape services

Facilitate collaboration between state agencies and other public institutions:

- It will offer any time access to these book reviews for any public or school library (and other interested parties) by eliminating the need to attend videoconference sites on specified dates, or by having to wait in line to check out the videotape copies available
- It will engender further the use of the Commission's web site (and ultimately the state's web site) for access to these services
- It will encourage greater use of new library technology in our public and school libraries, resulting in improved services for local citizens and students

13. Contact person for any questions regarding this application:

Richard Miller
Director of Library Development
Nebraska Library Commission
471-3175
rmiller@nlc.state.ne.us

Signed this _____ day of _____, _____

_____
Agency Director

NSRB Grant Application
Nebraska Department of Agriculture
Online Fee Collection

1. Name of agency applying for grant
   Nebraska Department of Agriculture (lead), Nebraska Corn Board, Nebraska Ethanol Board, Nebraska Grain Sorghum Board, Nebraska Wheat Board

2. Title or brief description of the project
   Online Fee Collection for Commodity Checkoff Fees. The Department of Agriculture collects, reports and summarizes statutory fees for the Nebraska corn Board, Nebraska Grain Sorghum Board, Nebraska Wheat Board, and beginning in October, 2001, the Nebraska Ethanol Board. This grant will support development of an online system for reporting data and transmitting fees electronically.

3. Grant request amount
   $7,500

4. Will there be a fee for accessing records associated with this project?
   No.

5. If yes, provide any statutory reference or authorization for the fee
   Not applicable.

6. Please describe the project in detail

   Since about 1976, the Department of Agriculture has administered a joint fee collection program for different commodities. By statute, collections are made quarterly by first purchasers, and monthly for grain put under loan through the USDA Farm Services Agency. At the time the program was started, the commodity programs were a budget program within the Department of Agriculture. Over time, the Nebraska Wheat Board, Nebraska Corn Board and Nebraska Grain Sorghum Board became separate agencies. However, the fee collection responsibility was retained within the Dept. of Agriculture.

   The agency system to process information for the fee collection program has undergone several changes over the years, but remains a slow, inflexible application that needs to be updated. Grant funds from another source are being sought to support the work necessary to upgrade the back-end application The purpose of this grant application is to support the work of Nebrask@ Online to develop the eGovernment portion of the application to allow reporting of data and online payment by those who collect the fees.

   For example, elevators and other entities could report data online and make payments via an electronic funds transfer or via credit card. Users would be provided a web-enabled form to enter data and fee information. The information would be transmitted electronically via Nebrask@ Online to the Department s system where final processing would occur.

7. Please describe whom the beneficiary or recipient of this service will be and projected activity for access or use of the proposed service

Beneficiaries of this service will include purchasers of agricultural commodities who are responsible for collecting check-off fees, reporting information and paying the fees to the Department. These include grain elevators, the USDA Farm Services Agency, and large corporate commodity purchasers such as Conagra, Peavey, Cargill, Scoular, and others. Contact has been made with the Nebraska Grain & Feed Association, whose members make up the largest percentage of reporting entities. They as well as several of the corporate purchasers have indicated a strong interest in using electronic filing.

Approximately 700 quarterly reports are filed and a total of about $7,725,000 in fees are collected. We hope to see a considerable amount of this volume move to electronic filing and payment once the system is operational.

The Department of Agriculture and commodity boards will also be significant beneficiaries of the program. Error checking built into the application will reduce the number of reporting errors that must be dealt with by agency staff. The efficiency of reporting for agency purposes and a much easier method of retrieving information from the database will improve the overall efficiency of the process. Commodity boards will have more timely information, and the state should benefit from quicker processing of fee payments.

8. Estimated timeline for completion

Changes to the internal system are scheduled for completion by the end of 2001 to accommodate the need to begin collecting fees for the Ethanol Board, a requirement set in state law. We plan to have the online reporting and fee collection portion of the project completed by April 1, 2002.

9. Agency contribution to the project (labor, equipment, etc.)

We anticipate having the revisions to the agency system provided by in-house programmers, utilizing our existing AS400 platform. Estimates for agency personnel time devoted to the project are approximately 350 hours.

10. A. Has this project every been submitted as a budget request (explain)?

No

11. B. Does the project require additional statutory authority (explain)?

No.

10. C. Why is the grant money needed for the project, and if applicable, how will the service be sustained once the grant money is expended?

Grant funds are requested to support initial development of the online filing and reporting system by Nebrask@ Online. Any ongoing costs for support and maintenance of the online system will be negotiated with Nebrask@ Online and paid from agency funds. Ongoing maintenance and support of the internal application will be part of the agency s annual operating budget.

11. Please describe how this project will enhance the delivery of state agency services or access to those services.

Elevators and other entities will be able to report data online and make payments via an electronic funds transfer or via credit card. Users would be provided a web-enabled form to enter data and fee information. The information would be transmitted electronically via Nebrask@ Online to the Department's system where final processing would occur.

12. Please describe how this project will 1) improve the efficiency of agency operations; 2) facilitate collaboration among state agencies; 3) facilitate collaboration between state agencies and other public institutions; 4) support public/private partnerships in the delivery of public services (you may respond to any or all of these criteria in your answer)

Error checking built into the application will reduce the number of reporting errors that must be dealt with by agency staff. The efficiency of reporting for agency purposes and a much easier method of retrieving information from the database will improve the overall efficiency of the process. Commodity boards will have more timely information, and the state should benefit from quicker processing of fee payments.

The application will enhance existing collaboration between the Department of Agriculture and the various boards. More timely and accurate information can be provided to the boards for their use. Transfer of funds becomes more efficient and cost-effective. The grant proposal builds on an existing public/private partnership between the Records Board and the network manager of Nebrask@ Online.

13. Contact person information

Robert Storant
Administrator, Finance & Personnel
Department of Agriculture
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509
402.471.6821

	Agency	Project Title	GTCF Request	Total Project Cost	Reviewer # 1	Reviewer #2	Reviewer #3
2001-01	Assistive Technology Partnership	Workforce Investment Act Resource Centers	$25,000	$112,910	Becker	Horn	Byers
2001-02	State Fire Marshal	All-Incident Reporting System	69,956	99,922	Becker	Henderson	Overton
2001-03	Office of the CIO	E-Government Architecture Study	50,000	80,000	Beach	Weir	Harvey
2001-04	Office of the CIO	HIPAA Assessment and Strategy for State Government	30,000	40,000	McGee	Horn	Flanagan
2001-05	Office of the CIO	Security Assessment	46,800	62,500	Decker	Golden	Ogden
2001-06	Dept. of Natural Resources (Multiple Agencies)	Creating a Common Framework for Integrating Surface Water Data	25,000	56,200	Becker	Beach	Rolfes
2001-07	IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Information Technology Support Tools Project	105,000	142,000	Becker	Weir	Ogden
2001-08	IMServices	Enterprise E-Government Security Software	151,000	415,000*	Becker	Golden	Lemon
2001-09	IMServices	Enterprise Security Awareness Training	36,620	93,620	Becker	Golden	Gettemy
2001-10	IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Lotus Notes Interagency Collaboration Education Project	1,000	1,935	Becker	Schafer	Rolfes
2001-11	IMServices and Workers' Compensation Court	Enterprise Content Management Study	100,000	135,000	Becker	Weir	Gettemy
2001-12	IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Automated Legislative Bill Tracking	20,000	26,700	Becker	Decker	Rolfes
2001-13	Nebraska Arts Council	Continuation of E-Granting Conversion Project	40,000	54,000	Becker	Schafer	Lemon
2001-14	State Patrol	Mobile Data Computer (MDC) Project and Remote Terminal Server (RTS) Project	53,227	153,227	Becker	Decker	Overton
2001-15	Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired	Accessible E-Government	26,900	37,387	Becker	Horn	Shanahan
2001-16	HHSS (Multiple Agencies)	Employee Training Record System	15,000	20,000	Becker	Byers	Shanahan
2001-17	UNL - Conservation and Survey Division	Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey Division Aerial Photography Collection	57,200	129,800	Becker	Rolfes	Schafer
2001-18	Commission on the Status of Women	Grant Proposal	5,512.50	7,350	Becker	Henderson	Byers
2001-19	Dept. of Agriculture (Multiple Agencies)	Fee Collection Program	9,900	13,200	Becker	Schafer	Harvey
2001-20	Library Commission	Value-Added Book Reviews: Any Time, Any Place	8,322	11,096	Becker	Beach	Byers
2001-21	Board of Parole	Criminal History Integration into Corrections Tracking System (CTS)	12,000	16,000	Becker	Henderson	Overton
		TOTALS	$888,437.50	$1,707,847.00			

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-01

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Assistive Technology Partnership (Comm. for the Blind and Visually Impaired; Vocational Rehabilita-tion	Workforce Investment Act Resource Centers	$25,000.00	$87,910.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project will integrate assistive technology solutions into the Workforce Development One Stop Resource Centers to increase awareness of the potential of assistive technology to enhance the employability and productivity of persons with disabilities in competitive employment. Assistive technology solutions available for demonstration will include devices and accessibility alternatives that provide access to information technology (information systems, applications, and websites). Demonstration equipment at the One Stop Resource Centers will be available to individuals with disabilities, employers, programmers, and developers, which include the general public as well as state agencies and universities.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			$11,520		$11,520
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$25,000	$76,390			$101,390
Total	$25,000	$76,390	$11,520		$112,910

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	14.3	15
TOTAL	**84.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Providing assistive technology that will ensure access to the services in the One Stop Resource Centers is an important project.
- Beneficiaries are well defined.
- Training will be provided for the staff.
- Commitment by VR and others is excellent.

WEAKNESSES

- The project should focus on the assistive technology that will provide access to the OSRCs' services and to e-government.
- The technology that will be provided is not specific to the goals of the OSRC and could be a difficulty. There should be more evidence of coordination with NCBVI, NCDHHI and Voc Rehab.
- Technology proposed will not provide optimum access to the services of the OSRCs for individuals with disabilities and therefore will not be demonstration of what assistive technology can provide for individuals with disabilities.
- There is no indication that the OSRC have agreed to participate. There is no real time line even for the Centers that are about to open.
- The assistive technology provided will not provide access to blind individuals, as Zoomtext requires some sight in order to use it. The software outlined runs on different platforms and some of it is more appropriate for K-12 environments than the employment world. Some of the software cannot be loaded on the same system as it will not operate together (e.g. Dragon and Zoomtext).

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-02

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
State Fire Marshal and Nebraska Forest Service at the Univ. of Nebraska	All-Incident Reporting System	$69,956.00	$29,966.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The State Fire Marshal and the Nebraska Forest Service at the University of Nebraska either direct or require emergency response organizations to report fire emergencies. Last year NITC funded a State Fire Marshal project to survey the feasibility of computerized reporting and the necessity of reporting to the State by local emergency response organizations. The statistics and analytical reports support the proposed project to assist in the purchase and training for incident reporting software. This project would provide funding support for purchasing vendor software for the emergency response organizations and provide them with sufficient training to submit these required reports per any time constraints.

Management of the project will be coordinated through a reimbursement program for those emergency response organizations to receive funding after purchasing vendor software for incident reporting. Additionally, the project will assist in the funding of training courses on the operation and implementation of the software at the local level. For those emergency response organizations that have already purchased vendor software, a retroactive reimbursement will be offered. Options will be provided for additional software program levels to be purchased which will assist the organizations with other necessary documentation that enhances the overall data collection and statistical analysis completed by State Agencies, such as records on personnel, training, apparatus, equipment, and budgeting issues.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			17,560.00		17,560.00
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	69,956.00				69,956.00
Supplies and Materials			2,000.00		2,000.00
Training			1,100.00		1,100.00
Travel			9,306.00		9,306.00
Total	69,956.00		29,966.00		99,922.00

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.0	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.0	15
TOTAL	**81.0**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Good overall description of project. Good evidence of benefit to other entities.
- Moderately good narrative about other possible approaches. Documented statutory reference. Reasonable narrative about intangible benefit
- Stakeholder analysis is thorough.
- Hardware, software not particularly risky.
- Standardizing software/reporting is essential.

WEAKNESSES

- Dramatic increase in reported incidents may be somewhat optimistic
- Virtually no cost/benefit analysis based on hard numbers.
- Implementation info is extremely high-level.
- Security issues not addressed very thoroughly. Related to scalability, coordination among many sources of input not very thoroughly discussed.
- Not much commentary on implementation risk.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-03

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Office of the Chief Information Officer	E-Government Architecture Study	$50,000	$15,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The purpose of this project is to define the technical architecture for deploying e-government services in state government. A well-defined technical architecture will guide investments in the technical infrastructure that is essential to facilitate rapid and cost-effective implementation of e-government services.

Section 86-1506 (6) requires the Nebraska Information Technology Commission to adopt technical standards, guidelines and architectures upon recommendation by the Technical Panel. In August 2000, the Technical Panel created a work group to evaluate the adequacy of the state's technical infrastructure for e-government and make recommendations. The charter for the work group included the following goals:

1. Prepare a checklist of key foundational prerequisites for implementing e-government
2. Inventory capabilities of the state's foundation for e-government;
3. Assess capabilities of the state's foundation for e-government
4. Review and revise best practices for the electronic government architecture
5. Recommend policies, standards and guidelines for the electronic government architecture

The work group accomplished part of the first goal by developing a draft document on e-government architecture. (A copy is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/egovernment/index.htm.) The draft document identified principles, components, and guidelines for the presentation layer and enterprise services that together comprise two of the conceptual layers of the technical infrastructure for e-government. The workgroup was not able to develop guidelines for applications and data, which constitute the third layer.

The work group lacks the resources to complete the task assigned to it. This grant would enable the work group to retain a consulting firm to assist it. Finishing the inventory, assessment, and best practices and documenting standards and guidelines for the e-government architecture will provide the state with a benchmark for evaluating future progress.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			10,000	5,000	15,000
Contractual Services	50,000	5,000		10,000	65,000
Total	50,000	5,000	10,000	15,000	80,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	19.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	14.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.7	10

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Section VII: Technical Impact	9.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	10.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	14.3	15
TOTAL	**96.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Directly relates to state technical plan and emphasis on improving e-government.
- Well thought out. Clear and concise with realistic objectives and approaches.
- Beneficiaries and outcomes are well defined. Measurements and assessment methods well stated.
- This project is not technically difficult. The issue will be culture and a willingness of agencies to work together for the common good of all.
- Again the biggest risk is culture and willingness to change how we do things. This study will go a long way towards convincing agencies that proceeding with E-Government is realistic and achievable.
- As important as this study is I hope we don't short change ourselves. I for one would suggest spending even more if necessary. The benefits will surely out way the costs if we do this right.

WEAKNESSES

- No specific reference to NIS or other such initiatives already in progress.
- Open ended study of how to study. "Recommendation for on-going evaluation of the state's e-government architecture." Will there be a request for further funds to accomplish this?
- Tangible economic benefits are hypothetical.
- Doing nothing is the only alternative examined. They might have examined conducting the study using only state personnel, or only consultants with no state personnel.
- Who are the stakeholders?

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-04

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Office of the Chief Information Officer	HIPAA Assessment and Strategy for State Government	$30,000.00	$10,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In 1996 Congress enacted the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). So far, two rules have been finalized. A final rule regarding security is expected soon. Other rules are still in progress. Below are the publication dates and compliance deadlines for three rules that demand immediate attention. Further information is available at http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/admnsimp/.

Rule	Publication Date	Compliance
Transaction and Code Set	Final rule -- 8/17/2000	10/16/2002
Privacy	Final rule -- 12/28/2000	4/14/2003
Security	Notice of Proposed Rule -- 8/12/1998	TBA

There are both civil and criminal penalties for non-compliance. Criminal penalties range up to $250,000 and 10 years in prison for anyone obtaining or disclosing protected health information with the intent to sell, transfer or use it for commercial advantage, personal gain or malicious harm.

HIPAA represents a significant challenge for state government, because of legal liability, the complexity of the regulations, uncertainty about what entities are affected, cost of compliance, and the short timeframe for implementation. In general, HIPAA affects agencies that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Do you bill for medical services?
- Do you pay for medical services?
- Do you generate, maintain, or use individually identifiable health information?
- Do you have information that is used for eligibility or enrollment in health-related programs?
- Are you a business partner of an entity that conducts any of these activities?

The complexity of the federal regulations and the potential liability to the state suggest the need for agencies to cooperate with each other and coordinate their efforts. Agencies must analyze the impact of HIPAA and decide on a course of action to achieve compliance.

The Department of Health and Human Services has conducted an initial self-assessment and is organizing a HIPAA project office to oversee its department-wide effort to achieve compliance with HIPAA requirements. Other state agencies have not begun a self-assessment and may not even be aware of HIPAA regulations.

This project will assist agencies in evaluating the impact of HIPAA regulations on their operations and technology systems and to prepare a course of action to achieve compliance.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			10,000		10,000
Contractual Services	30,000				30.000
Total	30,000		10,000		40,000

PROJECT SCORE

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	19.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	14.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**91.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Good intro and connection to the enterprise/collaborative nature of the project and mission.
- Goals and objectives are specific and clearly explained.
- Scope and projected outcomes contain specifics about products and how success will be measured.
- This is a project with significant justification for carrying it out and significant risk if it is not undertaken.
- Challenges are well defined.

WEAKNESSES

- Budget lacks detail.
- Key challenge is the time to do the self-assessment. The expert training proposed is a key ingredient.
- Question the validity of the time line and costs.
- Strategies on time and cost identified, but question if they will work.
- In kind match from the agencies may be very difficult to get with the budget cuts and NIS already taking agency resources.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-05

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Office of the Chief Information Officer	Security Assessment	$46,800	$15,700.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In January, the NITC adopted a set of security policies. The parent policy (Information Security Management Policy) provides guidance for establishing effective security programs. One requirement is to conduct regular security audits. The Network Security Policy states that "an audit of network security should be conducted annually.

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

The purpose of this grant is to engage a qualified firm to conduct a security audit and security testing of the state's information technology infrastructure.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			12,500		12,500
Contractual Services	46,800	3,200			50,000
Total	46,800	3,200	12,500		62,500

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.0	15
TOTAL	**87.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Meets the comprehensive technology plan and describes how it furthers electronic government.
- An enterprise approach for this type of project is probably the most appropriate way to handle a security review.

- The timeline is fairly aggressive, however, I believe this is strength.

WEAKNESSES

- Identifying the weaknesses in security is only one step. The report needs to be sure that it provides remedies on correcting the problems.
- I am concerned about the statement that for the dollars available it will be difficult to achieve all of the objectives of the study. Are the dollars being requested too low or are the objectives too high? Which one should be adjusted?
- Expected outcome should have more detail concerning the report.
- The number of servers/systems that will be scanned will determine the cost of the project. More detail on the number of servers is needed to determine if this cost is appropriate.
- An additional outcome should be the review by the auditor with each agency of the results and possible remedies. Another assessment may be an evaluation of the results by the CIO's office AND each of the agencies audited.
- This needs to be mandatory for agencies. Their cooperation should be in developing the RFP statement of work.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-06

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Department of Natural Resources (Multiple Agencies)	Creating a Common Framework for Integrating Surface Water Data	$25,000.00	$18,200.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project is part of a larger collaborative effort to develop a standardized, statewide, surface water features database (map), to facilitate the collection and integration of data and public policies of multiple state, local, and federal agencies that make or implement public policies related to Nebraska's surface water. Specifically, this project will develop a digital, (1:24,000-scale) geospatial database (map), with associated attributes, for the surface water features in the Lower Elkhorn Watershed in eastern Nebraska (all or parts of these counties: Burt, Dodge, Stanton, Washington, Platte Sarpy, Saunders Thurston, Cuming, Madison, Wayne Colfax, and Douglas). This geospatial database will be based on a National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) model, which has been endorsed by the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee and which was specifically designed to provide a common reference, surface water database to facilitate multipurpose use and inter-agency collaboration.

The project will convert existing paper maps to digital geospatial format, update the stream locations from these 1950-60s vintage paper maps based on modern aerial photography, and provide standardized database identifiers for all surface water features. The project will facilitate the collaborative use of modern information technology, such as geographic information systems (GIS), in the important public policy area of surface water by developing a standardized database for this one geographic area. The project will make information more accessible to the general public by facilitating the use of information technology tools, such as GIS, to graphically display the implications of public policies and issues related to surface water. The project is a collaborative effort undertaken by the Department of Natural Resources, the Conservation and Survey Division of the University of Nebraska, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Department of Roads, and the Lower Elkhorn Natural Resources District.

This project is a response to the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee decision to prioritize the development a standardized, statewide hydrographic dataset. Work has already been completed in the Logan Creek watershed and is about to begin in the Salt Creek Watershed. As part of a larger effort to pool the resources from multiple agencies and thereby enable the statewide development this database, this grant funding would also be used to provide a match for federal funding that will be used to complete other basins.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs	$2,000		$15,800		$17,800
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$ 4,000 hdwr $ 5,000 sftwr			$5,000 Roads	$14,000
Contractual Services	$12,000 othr		$1,000	$3,000 - LENRD $5,000 - NDEQ	$21,000
Supplies and Materials			$ 1,400		$1,400
Training	$2,000				$2,000
Total	$25,000		$18,200	$13,000	$56,200

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.7	20

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	14.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	9.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.7	15
TOTAL	**93.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Multi-agency and integration of state system with federal system.
- Following existing standards and formats.
- The project makes excellent use of collaboration among a number of state agencies. It responds especially well to the State Government Council's goal of implementing electronic government.
- The listing of beneficiaries, expected outcomes, and measurement methods are excellent.
- The evaluation of other potential solutions was well-detailed and complete. The intangible benefits include the suggestion of a precedent or statewide standard for future hydrographic databases--a desired outcome.
- The implementation plan is complete and well thought-out.
- Risk assessment was very complete and detailed--an excellent analysis.

WEAKNESSES

- DNR listed as responsible for on-going costs, but no statement as to how those specific costs would be covered by DNR.
- Hardware and software of initial system well defined, but no accommodation for increased LAN infrastructure and bandwidth as public begins to access system.
- The proposal does explain how the grant will benefit the Lower Elkhorn Watershed and its utilization as a Federal match for other hydrographic databases but does not explain how much more state money may be required to complete the entire statewide database.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-07

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Information Technology Support Tools Project	$105,000.00	$37,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The project to implement an IT Support Tools System is a joint project with the Department of Correctional Services, the Department of Labor's Workforce Development group, Health and Human Services Systems, Worker's Compensation Court, and DAS Information Management Services. These agencies are working together to replace and upgrade aging technical support software. The project also provides some of the agencies with new, needed software function. The system will include problem management (help desk), hardware/software management (technology assets tracking), change management, and knowledge bases. We anticipate that the selected product could become an enterprise-standard software because it offers current technologies, improved efficiency and effectiveness in overall technical support, and will benefit agencies with better communication, exchange of support data, and cost-effectiveness.

A number of agencies use some type of formal help-desk software. In addition, some agencies have adopted automated methods of tracking technology assets. The agencies recognize the need to link these two sources of information to each other and to the change management process and any available knowledge bases. The project aims towards this goal and would fulfill the immediate needs of several state agencies. In addition, we anticipate that in the future as agencies seek to replace their current software, a well-planned, solid enterprise-wide solution would be in place.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			5,000		5,000
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)					
- Servers		30,000			
- Software, licensing	100,000				
- Maintenance	5,000				135,000
Training			2,000		2,000
Total	$105,000	$30,000	$7,000		$142,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**86.3**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- I agree with what they are proposing, but just not clear on the details.
- If the project succeeds the outcomes will be significant. I am still confused as to whether this is an ERP type of solution, a smaller system focus or a help desk focus. I find myself having to re-read the document several times
- The business case for similar IT support tools is clear. Key, in my view, is the commitment of senior leadership. Another question is why limit this to just a few agencies?
- The risks that were identified are real. I think they should use the commitment to NIS to leverage the need for this project

WEAKNESSES

- Seems a bit optimistic judging from previous meetings concerning this effort.
- One of the biggest risks in my estimation is that the agencies participating will either not agree on the software requirements or that the requirements will be so broad that a solution will not be easily implemented.
- It seems to me that the participating agencies (especially the large ones could generate more cash to support the project. I am also concerned about annual support costs as $5,000 seems a little low for a $100,000 product. I would expect it to be more.
- Server costs seem low and I would rather see more allocated to that component. Training costs are also low.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-08

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
IMServices	Enterprise E-Government Security Software	$151,000.00	(See Funding Summary)	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In January, 2000, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) adopted the first statewide E-government Strategic Plan, which was later endorsed by the Governor. This plan outlined four priorities to help guide the effort. Two of the items deemed critical to the success of the E-government Strategic Plan were Security and Technical Infrastructure. This project is an Enterprise approach to address those two items. It will implement a technical infrastructure that will aid in keeping the State's data secure, reduce redundant software purchases between Agencies, and provide a technical starting point for allowing Agencies to easily share data.

This enterprise approach would allow for all collaborating Agencies, Boards, and Commissions to have a central point where their users' computer accesses could be added, maintained, and deleted through the use of integrated computer security software. This project would purchase, implement, administer, and train State staff in the use of this Enterprise Computer Security Software. A central staff would administer this software, and would act as a resource for those Agencies, Boards, and Commissions that chose to use the software to maintain their users' computer access records. It would also be possible for this administration staff to maintain the computer accessibility records of Agencies, Boards, and Commissions that do not have the staff or resources to do so. In this way, the State's staff and resources would be leveraged to improve services, as well as increase efficiency and effectiveness of the State's operations.

This project would also provide software to assist in Enterprise directory management, security rules management, authentication, and intrusion detection in the State's networks. This software would utilize an Enterprise approach to address the seven policies of the NITC's Security Architecture work group. Addressing these policies will also help enable the State of Nebraska to comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

The Enterprise Computer Security software would be used to manage computer logon accessibility and authentication, and other security concerns for the State's computer systems. The computer systems would include the Internet and Intranet systems, all aspects of the State's Enterprise server (i.e., CICS, VM, TSO, and other sub-systems), the State's AS/400 computers and networks, and PC LAN/WAN accesses and security for any Agency, Board, or Commission wishing to participate.

This software could be purchased and implemented at one time, or it could be purchased and implemented in phases. Anticipated costs for both approaches are included in this grant.

FUNDING SUMMARY

NOTE: There are 2 approaches used on this grant. The first approach is for purchase and implementation in one phase, with a 2-year maintenance and support agreement. The second approach is for a multi-phased approach over 2.5 years, with an additional 6-month maintenance and support agreement. See the grant application for more detail on the funding

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			$1,587,000		
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$1,200,000				
Contractual Services	$275,000				
Total	$1,475,000		$1,587,000		$3,062,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.0	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.3	15
TOTAL	**87.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Extensive information on how this will be implemented.
- Enterprise Goals are consistent with the State's E-government strategy.
- This Project is of potential benefit to nearly all state agencies
- Potential benefit is much greater than the cost
- Looks to be a well thought out implementation plan

WEAKNESSES

- Not a clear definition of the alternative solutions or what happens if we do nothing
- Cost is high, and benefits somewhat difficult to quantify

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-09

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
IMServices	Enterprise Security Awareness Training Grant	$36,620.00	$57,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In January, 2000, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) adopted the first statewide E-government Strategic Plan, which was later endorsed by the Governor. It was stated in this document that security was a priority of the State at an Enterprise level. The NITC Security Architecture Workgroup developed 7 policies, one of which addresses Education, Training, and Awareness. It is stated in this policy that all State employees and other State agents need to be aware of their responsibility towards Security.

The Federal Government is also beginning to mandate certain security steps be taken before states and other organizations can use certain data. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) has issued five rules. The State of Nebraska has until February, 2003, to comply with the Security and Privacy Rule. Although this seems far into the future, the items listed in this rule will take time to implement.

Funding is needed for a Security Awareness training program to occur at an Enterprise level. Some initial plans are being developed for the initial Rollout of this program. This grant will fund some initial training and will provide a Security Consultant to assist the Security Officers as they attempt to understand Security in their Agencies, Boards, and Commissions.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs	$30,770		$57,000		
Supplies and Materials	$5,850				
Total	$36,620		$57,000		$93,620
		❶	❷		❸

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.7	15
TOTAL	**87.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Project meets E-government strategy and does a good job of describing the goals and objectives of the project.
- Project proposal does and excellent job describing specific outcomes.
- Seems reasonable for security training costs.

WEAKNESSES

- I think agency security personnel should be involved in defining security training needs and this is not noted in the application.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-10

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Lotus Notes Interagency Collaboration Education Project	$1,000.00	$935.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Lotus Notes Interagency Collaboration Work Group, sponsored by the State Government Council, seeks a grant for the purpose of promoting knowledge about Lotus Notes and similar methods for interagency collaboration. The goal is to better educate participating agencies about current state technologies and promote the use of Lotus Notes and other advance methods for interagency collaboration solutions.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			600		600
Contractual Services	500				500
Supplies and Materials	500		335		885
Total	1000		935		1935

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	7.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	8.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	11.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	6.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.3	15
TOTAL	**59.7**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Costs appear reasonable.

WEAKNESSES

- Although seeking a modest budget, the proposal failed to detail the specific goals and objectives to be accomplished.
- Tangible and intangible benefits were referred to in very general terms. It was difficult to get a sense of the actual benefits that would be delivered.
- It is not clear what events are planned, who the audience is, or what is hoped to be accomplished.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-11

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
IMServices and Workers' Compensation Court	Enterprise Content Management Study	$100,000.00	$35,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Enterprise Content Management Project is a two-phase undertaking to address the methodology of systematically organizing the State's electronic information resources so that the resources can be managed, secured, and made available as required. Conceptually, the need for enterprise content management combines interagency business knowledge, policies, information content, work processes, and technology with an overlying architecture that can deliver the content via a flexible, adaptive, portal-based service accessed with a single sign-on.

During phase one, collaborating agencies will investigate the needs of the different sectors of government for information resources management. Agencies have begun work with the Secretary of State in this effort. They also will research and analyze enterprise-wide solutions to determine a course of action. The Court Administrator's Office is looking at content management as a potential solution for their case management system. During phase two, a process will be implemented to begin the transition to an enterprise-wide solution. It will provide a working production model and a set of best practices.

The issue of managing electronic content or informational resources, is that as more and more state documents are stored electronically rather than in traditional filing cabinets, it is necessary to rethink the process and adjust how we manage records and data. Moving from the physical and cumbersome limitations of paper-based business methods to the potential of unlimited and instant access in the computerized and networked world makes it a requirement to adjust policy and practice.

In addition, the large investment in a diversity of automation and storage solutions in state government has created the need to offer a common portal to all information and insure a sound method of maintaining, securing, and preserving it. A Gartner, Inc. study confirms that, because of funding methods and political boundaries, much of government has responded to e-business initiatives with "individual agency silos" which can disrupt efforts for information, application, and infrastructure reuse.

Additionally, the Internet has changed the expectations in the business place, including state government business. Today citizens, businesses, and employees demand that information in all forms will be there at their fingertips and will be accessed easily and efficiently.

The technology to deliver better service in information resource management has been developing quickly and a number of companies are promoting different methodologies to implement it. The collaborating agencies will analyze what is available and determine a solution which best meets the identified needs and will begin the process required to implement it.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs					30,000
Phase 1	0	0	5,000		
Phase 2	0	0	25,000		
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)					55,000
Phase 1	0	0	0		

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Phase 2	50,000	0	5,000		
Contractual Services					50,000
Phase 1	50,000	0	0		
Phase 2	0	0	0		
Total	100,000		35,000		135,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.7	15
TOTAL	**86.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- I like the notion of the two-phased approach.
- I believe the benefits will more than outweigh the costs. This is a good project

WEAKNESSES

- I do have a worry with this statement "After the completion of the first phase, it will be necessary to involve top administration to review the feasibility of the proposal and whether it successfully addresses the enterprise-wide needs of state government."
- Still concerned about the apparent lack of senior level support.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-12

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Automated Legislative Bill Tracking	$20,000.00	$6,700.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

Workers' Compensation Court, Health and Human Services, and the Department of Administrative Services' divisions currently use a 'legislative bill' tracking application that requires manual entry of bill information. The application allows Lotus Notes users to enter information about legislative bills of specific interest to their agency along with their working notes. State agencies need to handle large subsets of bills and bill data during each session while coordinating efforts and maintaining working notes.

These agencies, along with the Department of Roads, have joined in a collaborative project to plan enhancements to the application and provide it with automation. The objective of this project is to analyze the requirements to automate much of the data entry and then implement a solution to offer the best return on investment. Coordination with the Clerk of Legislature's office is necessary for data access. At a minimum, the application would access the 'one-liner' file to retrieve pertinent bill information. A more sophisticated solution would emulate some of the functions of the previous mainframe system known as NLSIS. It would update the user's tracking file with the most current bill status information from a read-access to the Legislature's database. In addition, it would link to relevant web sites such as the Unicameral home page.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs	20,000		6,700		26,700
Total	20,000		6,700		26,700

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.0	15
TOTAL	**79.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- This project has a strong collaborative component with apparent buy in from some very major players.

- The possibility of automating bill tracking for various agencies appears very promising. The suggested ideas for enhancements to the process are right on target.
- The technical description of the project seems reasonable.

WEAKNESSES

- An estimate is given of 85 hours of analysis work, but no estimate is given of the time needed to do the development work.
- I am bothered that this project does not have buy-in from the one entity that holds the show stopping card. If the Legislature says no, does the grant money come back?
- The estimate of 85 hours for the analysis phase seems high. I would think that agencies already know the content or critical elements of bill tracking.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-13

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Nebraska Arts Council	Continuation of E-granting conversion project	$40,000.00	$14,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Arts Council is requesting funds to continue the conversion of its grant application and review process to an **e-granting system**. Converting the agency's grants system to e-granting will eventually allow the agency to manage the entire application and review process electronically. This would drastically simplify the application process for nonprofit organizations requesting grant funds, and would allow the agency to re-allocate staff resources to other agency priorities. The NAC will work with schools, libraries, and higher education institutions to ensure Internet access for all applicants.

Background:

The NAC annually processes between 400 and 500 grant applications, submitted by schools, churches, and nonprofit organizations across the state. The applications go through a review process that includes an evaluation of the proposal by either a private citizen who has volunteered to be a grant reviewer, or by a panel of citizens who assemble at a public meeting to review grants. Currently, applicants submit from three to 18 hard copies of the application and attachments; this requires considerable time to assemble their grant application packets, and often represents a considerable investment for copying and mailing.

NAC staff must enter application information into the grants management database, collate the grants into books for panel reviews, and send the applications to panelists two to three weeks prior to the public grant panel review meeting. Panelists receive boxes containing up to 35 grant applications to read and assess, and must bring all the applications to the panel meeting in Omaha.

During 2000-01, the NAC worked with the State of Nebraska's Information Management Services in developing a pilot project to put one of its most-used grant applications online. This application should be available online by the first of January, with four other applications online shortly thereafter. During 2001-02 the NAC will also work with a vendor to develop on-line final reporting forms. By 2004 the agency will have in place a system for receiving applications with digital signatures.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			$14,000		$14,000
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$5,000				$5,000
Contractual Services	$35,000				$35,000
Total	$40,000		$14,000		$54,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	3.7	10

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.3	15
TOTAL	**79.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Scope and outcome seem manageable and well laid out.
- Project justification and business case is well laid out.
- Emphasis on working with customers (grant applicants) is good

WEAKNESSES

- Would like to see a little more detail before I am entirely comfortable with projected costs.
- It is not clear how much work was accomplished with the original NITC grant and why the NAC plans to buy a completely different e-granting system rather than building on the original pilot project.
- It is not clear how many grant programs will be automated, if this project is approved.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-14

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
State Patrol	Mobile Data Computer (MDC) Project and Remote Terminal Server (RTS) Project	$53,227.00	$100,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The State Patrol is requesting $49,927 in grant funds to improve public safety by increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of approximately 150 Nebraska State Patrol officers and to further the Agency's technological goals and objectives. This application focuses on two areas of business process improvement. The first project is referred to as the MDC (Mobile Data Computer) Project. The objective of the MDC Project is to increase the amount of information provided to four (4) Headquarters Troop traffic officers by installing mobile data computers and 800 MHz radios in their marked patrol vehicles. The MDCs will have connectivity to the City of Lincoln's 800 MHz trunked radio system which allows them wireless, high speed connectivity to the Nebraska State Patrol Switcher. The Switcher is the device that allows access to all Federal and state databases. The project will provide the officers with the tools necessary to access these law enforcement data systems directly. Currently, officers often wait in que for dispatcher response. The goal of this project is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of four Nebraska State Patrol troopers. This directive will enhance a pilot project consisting of one officer utilizing the MDC system in cooperation with the City of Lincoln. This project will require the purchase of laptops, computers, wireless network infrastructure hardware, software and licensing. The City of Lincoln is providing the 800 Mhz radios to the Nebraska State Patrol.

The second project is referred to as the RTS (Remote Terminal Server) Project. The goal of the RTS project is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of approximately 150 Nebraska State Patrol officers using dial up connections to the agency's network. The objective is to decrease the amount of time officers spend completing on-line reports (some extremely lengthy) due to slow dial up infrastructures. The solution proposed is to implement a Microsoft Terminal Server system that will allow the officers to fill out their reports over the low cost dial up lines at an increased speed. This solution will require a server, security appliances, network infrastructure hardware, software and licensing.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$49,527.00			$100,000.00	$149,527.00
Telecommunications	$3,300.00				$3,300.00
Other costs	$400.00				$400.00
Total	$53,227.00			$100,000.00	$153,227.00

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.3	10

Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.7	15
TOTAL	**82.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Clearly shows how the projects (there are two distinct projects in this request) relate to the Patrol Tech Plan.
- The MDC project appears to increase officer efficiency and the RTS project appears to increase efficiency at other locations.
- MDC is a joint project involving not only State Government but also the City of Lincoln. The City has been doing MDC for some time and implementation should not be an issue.
- It is clear that these projects would increase the efficiency of the State Patrol operations.

WEAKNESS

- All information appears to be based on testimonials and stories. Measurements of project outcomes will also be measured by testimonials. It would appear that a clearer measurement would be the number of inquiries, reports filed, etc. In order to evaluate the MDC project we believe a much tighter scope and list of outcomes should be set.
- The RTS project does not contain a description of the hardware, software or communications required for this system that can be evaluated. An "enterprise-class" server does not adequately allow for a technical assessment of the hardware. At one point the application refers to "wireless network infrastructure" related to RTS. I am not sure what the technical aspects are.
- The financials are very weak. It appears that there is a grant request for $100,000 that will be used as a match. However, the projects clearly state (under the implementation portion of the app) that a grant application was submitted in March 2001 for a COPS grant that has not been received and notifications should be made in early fall. It is impossible to determine whether there are matching funds for each project or they were submitted together so that the $100,000 would more than match both projects. These should have been submitted as two separate projects since they are not inter-dependent.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-15

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired	Accessible E-Government	$26,900.00	$10,487.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project will allow the Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (NCBVI) to complete the network infrastructure needed to facilitate more effective methods of information storage and processing. The project will involve setting up local area networks in each of NCBVI's six offices across the state. This will allow each office to have centralized, secure data storage as well as share resources such as printers and high speed Internet connections, paving the way for a wide area network over which all Commission staff can share data from a comprehensive case management system. It will allow Commission staff to readily access state and federal E-Government services available via the Internet, thus enhancing opportunities for high quality employment outcomes for blind and visually impaired persons receiving services from the Commission. This project will have an emphasis on training clients as well as staff to take advantage of E-Government services available from other government entities. This will also involve training to use Internet resources from outside of our offices, which is of particular importance in rural areas of the State where it is not feasible to have clients come to our office for service and training. The project will greatly improve the efficiency of NCBVI's service delivery system by establishing staff access to client and fiscal data statewide, eliminating parallel duplicative information management systems in the six offices, and facilitating collaboration with all other Nebraska state entities operating via electronic, on-line systems.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			4,179		4,179
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	18,000		2,268		20,268
Contractual Services	8,900		4,040		12,940
Total	26,900		10,487		37,387

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.0	15
TOTAL	**80.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Goals and objectives are clearly stated and would serve to further the implementation of e-government.
- Beneficiaries and their needs are clearly provided. Expected outcomes are also clear and assessment procedures will verify project outcomes.
- Project justification and business case were well and comprehensively presented. The implementation plan is comprehensive. Risks and strategies were well presented. Budget is well-defined and looks to be reasonable for the project.

WEAKNESSES

- Needed to identify cost/benefit beyond the federal match this would make available, for example dollar savings in staff time, reductions in other costs, etc.
- Little discussion of stakeholder acceptance, little specific identification of training and support planning

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-16

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
HHSS and IMServices	Employee Training Record System	$15,000.00	$5,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

HHSS maintains employee-training records for the purpose of assuring participation in required sessions. These records are used to satisfy accreditation of facility services and/or specific professional licensing boards for employees needing to maintain a professional license/certification/competency. This proposal is for a single agency-wide tracking system that will meet this need and interface with employee records housed in the Nebraska Information System in the future. Currently, HHSS tracks employee training records using two mainframe applications and one stand-alone PC database. In the absence of a single database, generating uniform and consistent information for system-wide reporting or analysis is not feasible.

The application is Lotus Notes-based and electronic workflow and web accessibility is part of the design plan. Once completed, IMServices and other state agencies using Lotus Notes for e-mail could adopt the system.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			2,000		2,000
Contractual Services	15,000	1,500			16,500
Training			1,500		1,500
Total	15,000	1,500	3,500		20,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	11.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	15.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**80.0**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

WEAKNESSES

- Was a non-Lotus Notes database program considered? If an off-the-shelf Lotus Notes product cost more than a custom application, is Lotus Notes really a good investment for the State of Nebraska? A stronger business case could have been made.
- Training and staff development requirements are not detailed. Good narrative description but no financial estimates included in cost benefit section.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-17

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
UNL – Conservation and Survey Division	Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey Division Aerial Photography Collection	$57,200.00	$40,300.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Conservation and Survey Division (CSD), University of Nebraska-Lincoln, houses a large and valuable collection of tens of thousands of aerial photographs. The majority of these 9"x9" photographs were taken between the 1930s and 1970s. The aerial photography collection is a critical and widely used resource for natural resource planners, land managers, educators and the general public. In addition, many of the land areas have multiple images spanning different time periods. The spatial and temporal aspects of the aerial photography make for a unique and historically significant collection. This project has been identified as a high priority by the CSD administration.

Currently, the collection only exists as hardcopy photographs. The only availability to our clientele is to physically visit our office. When photographs are requested, our only option is to have high quality copies made from the UNL Printing and Duplicating office. The cost of duplication is significant and adds to the handling and wear of the original photography. Due to the age and heavy use of these photographs, a significant portion of the aerial photography collection is rapidly deteriorating. In order to preserve the collection for future users, it is necessary to digitally archive the collection as soon as possible.

In June 2000, we were fortunate to receive an initial $32,300 grant from the NITC for this project. These funds allowed us to purchase the necessary equipment and to scan and store approximately 22,000 aerial photographs. Since that time, it has become clear that we have many more aerial photographs than originally thought. In addition, we have come across a significant number of photographs that need cleaning prior to scanning. Several years/decades ago these photographs were marked on with grease pencils by the public and/or researchers. As a result, we have had to devote extensive efforts to clean these prior to scanning.

At the time of this writing, there was approximately $1,500 left in this original grant. Clearly, this will not be enough to finish this project. Therefore, with the funds requested in this application, as well as the funds recently received from the Nebraska State Records Board, we hope to complete this important project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match (1)	In-Kind Match (2)	Other Funding Sources	Total (3)
Personnel Costs	$ 52,000.00		$ 13,000.00	$25,000.00 $32,300.00	$ 122,300.00
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$ 4,200.00		$ 300.00		$ 4,500.00
Supplies and Materials	$ 1,000.00		$ 1,000.00		$ 2,000.00
Training			$ 1,000.00		$ 1,000.00
Total	**$ 57,200.0**		**$ 15,300.0**	**$ 57,300.0**	**$ 129,800.00**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.0	20

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	11.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	3.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	8.0	15
TOTAL	**73.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- There is a strong relationship between the project and the agency's comprehensive technology plan. The goals and objectives are simple and accomplishable. The e-government component described would be advantageous for Nebraska's citizens and state agencies.
- The beneficiaries and outcomes are clearly defined.

WEAKNESSES

- One goal is to improve public access to the aerial photographs, but the objectives do not include the option of Internet access.
- Scope is not well defined. The original project greatly underestimated the amount of work to be done. The current project still does not quantify the amount of work to be done
- The application does not quantify the number of requests handled in a typical month and the time saved by staff from having 22,000 photographs in digital form.
- The application refers to the need for additional storage space, but does not explain how this will be addressed.
- Given the experience of digitizing 22,000 photographs, the budget explanation should be based on solid projections of remaining photographs and average time to clean and scan them.
- There is some risk in that the project, if funded, may not complete the digital scanning before the grant funds expire or are exhausted.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-18

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Commission on the Status of Women	Hardware Upgrades and Software	$5512.50	$1837.50	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

As a result of technological upgrades, and with assistance & instruction from a database consultant the Commission staff will be more time and cost efficient in serving the women of Nebraska and thirty Commissioners across the state.

The essential goal is to purchase two computers to update the remaining two staff, who are still using Windows 95, Pentium 133 Mhz, with 16 MB RAM. An IMS specialist recently stated the two computers are at a high risk of "crashing". Additionally, they are unable to load an anti-virus software, and are unable to open most email attachments/files from other agencies. The CD-RW Drives will allow present computers a means of backing-up and sharing files.

With the acquisition of Adobe Acrobat 5.0 the staff webmaster could quickly convert documents, the Commission newsletter, forms, legislative information the Commission follows, and questionnaires to upload on the Commission website.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.) **2 IBM Computers**					
3 Color Inkjet Printers	**1800.00**		**600.00**		**2400.00**
2 External CD-RW Drives	**562.50**		**187.50**		**750.00**
Adobe Acrobat 5.0	**300.00**		**100.00**		**400.00**
	225.00		**75.00**		**300.00**
Contractual Services **(approx. 50 hrs @ $50/hr**	**1875.00**		**625.00**		**2500.00**
Telecommunications **"Campus Connection" cabling & set-up**	**375.00**		**125.00**		**500.00**
Other costs **Digital Camera**	**375.00**		**125.00**		**500.00**
Total	**$5512.00**		**$1837.50**		**$7350.00**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	11.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	9.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	11.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.7	15
TOTAL	**67.7**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- This is a simple project and implementation should be fairly simple.
- Risks are minimal.

WEAKNESSES

- Too general. Not much evidence of benefit beyond agency itself. Is grant process designed to assist in technology updates in agencies?
- Seemingly most direct benefactors are within agency - more focused on current/replacement activities.
- Some general argument for upgrades, but not much in terms of cost/benefit or business case.
- Assumed that match should have been “Cash” not “In-Kind”

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-19

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Dept. of Agriculture (Multiple Agencies)	Fee Collection Program	$9,900.00	$3,300.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Department of Agriculture (NDA) has administered a joint fee collection program for different commodities since approximately 1976. By statute, collections are made quarterly by first purchasers, and monthly for grain put under loan through the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA). At the time the program was started, the commodities were a budget program within the NDA. The Wheat Board became a separate agency and the other commodities followed suit. When the various commodities were legislated into law, the NDA set up a central fee collection program. The computer program set up was a federal Ag Statistics program. Form were delivered over to the Federal Building, where they were key punched and batch processing took place. In the mid 1980s, when NDA set up a central data processing unit at the NSOB, several programs, including the fee collection program was transferred over to NDA and converted to run on a Data Point midrange computer system. Later, the NDA upgraded to an IBM AS400 central processor, which we currently operate. The fee collection program was upgraded to an RPG program format, currently used. The system is currently batch processing fee forms received. The reporting has had minimal changes over the last 25 years. The program works, but is slow, inflexible and needs updated to meet current needs.

To meet current needs, the fee collection program needs several updates made to it. The NDA proposes to make the program an online application so forms are calculated and edit checks are done at time of data entry. A deposit listing would be generated daily to accurately distribute revenue to the correct cash fund, versus putting the fees in suspense account and transferring once or twice a week. Edit error listings and exception reports could be ran and printed as needed. The new system would have the ability to run online queries and generate reports that contain only information the user needs. Currently, the computer system is capable of generating hard coded report formats set up 20+ years ago.

Also, the application would be made e-government compliant. Elevators and other entities could report data online and make payments via an electronic fund transfer or via credit card. We do accept credit card payments currently, but this is a manual process. This would shorten the time frame in receipting funds. Contact has been made to the Nebraska Grain and Feed Association, whose members make up the largest percentage of entities of first purchasers that report data each quarter. Due to consolidation, the number of first purchasers has decreased, but the entities reporting are the larger corporation types that have branch and terminal locations throughout the state. For example, the list includes Conagra, Peavey, Cargill, Scoular, Farmland Co-op's, Bunge, DeBruce etc. These corporate-type entities are all computerized, with central reporting locations that have capabilities to utilize e-government. They have indicated an interest in utilizing electronic filings. Several have indicated they want to know more of the details or see examples. For the calendar quarter of July, August and September, 2001 the department has submitted a survey to all first purchasers in the state. The results will not be known until after November, 2001.

The attached proposal would rewrite the current batch processing program to an online system to make the collection process accessible via internet and make the program e-government compliant.

A summary of the dollar amounts collected for each fund is a follows:

Corn Board	$2,500,000
Grain Sorghum Board	225,000

Wheat Board	1,000,000
Ethanol EPIC fund	4,000,000

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs	$8,025	$2,675			$10,700
Contractual Services	$1,500	$500			$2,000
Supplies and Materials	$375	$125			$500
Total	**$9,900**	**$3,300**	**-0-**	**-0-**	**$13,200**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	6.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.7	15
TOTAL	**83.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Great project. Multi-agency alignment critical

WEAKNESSES

- It is not clear who the project sponsor is or what milestones have to be achieved to meet the goal of finishing an application by the end of this December.
- User authentication is not addressed.
- Risks include the short timeframe, getting agreement of the several commodity boards, and acceptance of businesses paying the fees. Strategies are needed for these and any other risks that pertain to the project.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-20

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Library Commission	Value-Added Book Reviews: Any Time, Any Place	$8,322.00	$2774.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

Public and school libraries throughout Nebraska depend upon the Nebraska Library Commission to provide access to value-added reviews of books for young adults and children. Since 1993 the Commission has provided video recordings of oral reviews for 300 book titles twice a year. These reviews contain expertly chosen titles, presented in order to guarantee quality and usability for our nearly 280 public libraries and 600 school libraries. The reviews are broadcast over the state's videoconferencing system and then are made available via recorded videotape following the broadcast. Time required to watch all the tapes: approximately six hours.

Many people prefer the reviews as they are presently available, but an increasing number of libraries want the reviews to be made accessible in a greater variety of ways. Through a series of telephone interviews we have determined that the preferred alternative mode is via the Commission web site, an approach that will allow access any time, any place. It also allows direct access by specific book title, by author, by genre, and by reader age, among other categories. Through work and cooperation with staff of Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET), we have found a solution to providing this vital service. In essence each book review will present a digitized photo of the book's cover, and of one or more interior pages to show examples of illustrations and typeface; in addition the oral review by each reviewer will be presented via sound output.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Contractual Services	8,322	2,774			11,096
Total	8,322	2,774			11,096

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	9.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.3	15
TOTAL	**88.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Excellent stakeholder analysis.

WEAKNESSES

- No mention of potential increase in operational costs due to increased bandwidth demands as system increases in use. Who will cover those costs?
- One-time consultant project. What if it works and becomes popular? Will there be a follow-on request? On-going requirements were identified, but no funding source to cover them.
- No technical equipment costs or operational costs listed.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-21

Agency	Project	Request	Match	Recommendation
Board of Parole	Criminal History Integration into Corrections Tracking System (CTS)	$12,000.00	$4,000.00	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Board of Parole is requesting support of a grant from the Government Technology Collaboration Fund in its effort to integrate the Criminal History Assessment instrument (CHA) into the Corrections Tracking System (CTS).

The Board of Parole is proposing that the CTS be the data platform for the CHA. This project would effectively streamline the CHA process by eliminating duplication of data entry.

The following is a summary of the criteria used in implementing the Criminal History Assessment:

Nebraska Revised Statute 83-192, Subsection E (introduced in July, 1994 & implemented in July, 1996) required the implementation of an objective parole risk assessment criteria.

A Criminal History Assessment (CHA) study was developed to assist the members of the Parole Board in determining the risk factors involved when making decisions on whether to grant or deny parole at the time of an offender's initial parole review. This initial study was based upon research conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCDD).

It is the Board's written policy that a CHA be completed and included in each offender's file at such time the offender is eligible for parole consideration, and included in each offender's file prior to his/her initial appearance before the Board.

The CHA instrument is completed from information compiled from offender files, pre-sentence investigation reports, and rap sheets:

- Total number of convictions (broke down into categories of assault convictions, property convictions, traffic convictions, and any other convictions)
- Total number of prison sentences (prior and current incarcerations)
- Prior parole revocations (total number of prior and current revocations)
- Age at first criminal conviction
- Age at earliest parole eligibility date
- Alcohol abuse
- Drug use

A score is given for each category listed above. The scores for each category are added and totaled which then determines the level of risk involved in paroling a particular offender.

A post-release recidivism study is completed within 24 months of an offender's parole or discharge from prison to determine the percentage of new convictions received after an offender has been discharged from prison or while an offender is on parole status.

The CHA integration into the Department of Corrections' tracking system would eliminate duplication of data that is already maintained and obtainable in such database, i.e. offender's name, institutional number, FBI number, DOB, NE SID number, race, number of prior prison sentences, prior parole revocations & dates, etc.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Contractual Services	**$12,000**	**$4,000**			**$16,000**
Total	**$12,000**	**$4,000**			**$16,000**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	14.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	15.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**78.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Clear indication of objectives.
- Improves internal operations; builds on CTS
- (Neutral comment) - Not an overly complex request.
- (Neutral comment) - Reliance on IMServices identified as largest risk - IMServices is the actual provider for efforts related to the grant.

WEAKNESSES

- Based only on IMServices estimate. Although some benefit to Parole, is the intent of the grant process to subsidize budget issues?

Title	**Accessibility Policy**
Category	**Accessibility Architecture**
Date Adopted	**(DRAFT)**
Date of Last Revision	**August 22, 2001**

A. Authority

Section 86-1506 (6). "(The Nebraska Information Technology Commission shall) adopt minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel created in Section 86-1511."

B. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this document is to define and clarify policies, standards, and guidelines that will help agencies meet the needs of people with disabilities.

LB 352 (2000) required the Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, and the Chief Information Officer to develop a technology access clause by January 1, 2001. The Technology Access Clause applies to all purchases of information technology. The clause includes the following provisions:

> "The intent and purpose of these standards is to ensure that the needs of Nebraskans with disabilities are met through reasonable accommodation of the information technology products and services of the state. Future information technology products, systems, and services including data, voice, and video technologies, as well as information dissemination methods, will comply with the following standards to the greatest degree possible.
>
> 1. Effective, interactive control and use of the technology including, but not limited to, the operating system, applications programs, and format of the data presented must be readily achievable by individuals with disabilities. The intent is to make sure that all newly procured information technology equipment; software and services can be upgraded, replaced or augmented to accommodate individuals with disabilities.
> 2. Information technology made accessible for individuals with disabilities must be compatible with technology used by other individuals with whom the individual with a disability must interact.
> 3. Information technology made accessible for individuals with disabilities must be able to be integrated into networks used to share communications among employees, program participants, and the public.
> 4. Information technology made accessible for individuals with disabilities must have the capability of providing equivalent access to telecommunications or other interconnected network services used by the general population.
> 5. These provisions do not prohibit the purchase or use of an information technology product that does not meet these standards provided that:
>   a. There is no available means by which the product can be made accessible and there is no alternate product that is or can be made accessible; or
>   b. The information manipulated or presented by the product is inherently unalterable in nature (i.e., its meaning cannot be preserved if it is conveyed in an alternative manner).

c. The information technology products or services are used in conjunction with an existing information technology system, and modifying the existing system to become accessible would create an undue burden.

d. The agency is able to modify or replace the information technology product with one that will accommodate the needs of individuals with disabilities.

"When development, procurement, maintenance, or use of electronic and information technology does not meet these standards, individuals with disabilities will be provided with the information and data involved by an alternative means of access."

The primary objectives of accessibility standards and guidelines include:

1. Where feasible, people with disabilities can use the same information technology systems as people without disabilities;
2. Early planning for accessibility will make it easier to provide reasonable accommodations when information technology systems are not accessible.

C. Standards and Guidelines

1. FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (SECTION 1194.31)
   a. General-Alternative Access
      (1) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user vision shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are blind or visually impaired shall be provided.
      (2) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require visual acuity greater than 20/70 shall be provided in audio and enlarged print output working together or independently, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are visually impaired shall be provided.
      (3) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user hearing shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are deaf or hard of hearing shall be provided.
      (4) Where audio information is important for the use of a product, at least one mode of operation and information retrieval shall be provided in an enhanced auditory fashion, or support for assistive hearing devices shall be provided.
      (5) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user speech shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people with disabilities shall be provided.
      (6) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require fine motor control or simultaneous actions and that is operable with limited reach and strength shall be provided.

2. SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS AND OPERATING SYSTEMS (SECTION 1194.21)
   a. Navigation

(1) When software is designed to run on a system that has a keyboard, product functions shall be executable from a keyboard where the function itself or the result of performing a function can be discerned textually.
(2) A well defined, on-screen indication of the current focus shall be provided that moves among interactive interface elements as the input focus changes. The focus shall be programmatically exposed so that Assistive Technology can track focus and focus changes.

b. Image / Information Display
(1) Sufficient information about a user interface element including the identity, operation and state of the element shall be available to Assistive Technology. When an image represents a program element, the information conveyed by the image must also be available in text.
(2) When bitmap images are used to identify controls, status indicators, or other programmatic elements, the meaning assigned to those images shall be consistent throughout an application's performance.
(3) Textual information shall be provided through operating system functions for displaying text. The minimum information that shall be made available is text content, text input caret location, and text attributes.
(4) Software shall not use flashing or blinking text, objects, or other elements having a flash or blink frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.

c. Compatibility.
(1) Applications shall not disrupt or disable activated features of other products that are identified as accessibility features, where those features are developed and documented according to industry standards. Applications also shall not disrupt or disable activated features of any operating system that are identified as accessibility features where the application programming interface for those accessibility features has been documented by the manufacturer of the operating system and is available to the product developer.

d. Use of Color
(1) Applications shall not override user selected contrast and color selections and other individual display attributes.
(2) Color-coding shall not be used as the only means of conveying information, indicating an action, prompting a response, or distinguishing a visual element.
(3) When a product permits a user to adjust color and contrast settings, a variety of color selections capable of producing a range of contrast levels shall be provided.

e. Animation
(1) When animation is displayed, the information shall be displayable in at least one non-animated presentation mode at the option of the user.

f. Forms.
(1) When electronic forms are used, the form shall allow people using Assistive Technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form, including all directions and cues.

3. WEB-BASED INTERNET INFORMATION AND APPLICATIONS (SECTION 1194.22)
   a. Navigation
      (1) Redundant text links shall be provided for each active region of a server-side image map.
      (2) Client-side image maps shall be provided instead of server-side image maps except where the regions cannot be defined with an available geometric shape.
      (3) Row and column headers shall be identified for data tables.
      (4) Markup shall be used to associate data cells and header cells for data tables that have two or more logical levels of row or column headers.
      (5) Frames shall be titled with text that facilitates frame identification and navigation.
      (6) A method shall be provided that permits users to skip repetitive navigation links.
   b. Image / Information Display
      (1) Documents shall be organized so they are readable without requiring an associated style sheet.
      (2) Pages shall be designed to avoid causing the screen to flicker with a frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.
      (3) A text-only page, with equivalent information or functionality, shall be provided to make a web site comply with the provisions of this part, when compliance cannot be accomplished in any other way. The content of the text-only page shall be updated whenever the primary page changes.
      (4) When pages utilize scripting languages to display content, or to create interface elements, the information provided by the script shall be identified with functional text that can be read by Assistive Technology.
      (5) When a web page requires that an applet, plug-in or other application be present on the client system to interpret page content, the page must provide a link to a plug-in or applet that complies with the provisions of Section 2 (Software Applications and Operating Systems), above.
   c. Information Display Alternatives
      (1) A text equivalent for every non-text element shall be provided (e.g., via "alt", "longdesc", or in element content).
      (2) Equivalent alternatives for any multimedia presentation shall be synchronized with the presentation.
      (3) Use of Color
         (a) Web pages shall be designed so that all information conveyed with color is also available without color, for example from context or markup.
      (4) Forms
         (a) When electronic forms are designed to be completed on-line, the form shall allow people using Assistive Technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form, including all directions and cues.
      (5) Timed Responses.
         (a) When a timed response is required, the user shall be alerted and given sufficient time to indicate more time is required.

4. TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS (SECTION 1194.23)
   a. Image / Information Display
      (1) Where provided, caller identification and similar telecommunications functions shall also be available for users of TTYs, and for users who cannot see displays.
      (2) Products that transmit or conduct information or communication shall pass through cross-manufacturer, non-proprietary, industry-standard codes, translation protocols, formats or other information necessary to provide the information or communication in a usable format. Technologies which use encoding, signal compression, format transformation, or similar techniques shall not remove information needed for access or shall restore it upon delivery.
   b. Technology Links Compatibility
      (1) Telecommunications products or systems, which offer voice communication but do not include TTY functionality, shall provide a standard non-acoustic connection point for TTYs. Microphones shall be capable of being turned on and off to allow the user to intermix speech with TTY use.
      (2) Telecommunications products, which include voice communication functionality, shall support all commonly used cross-manufacturer non-proprietary standard TTY signal protocols.
      (3) Where a telecommunications product delivers output by an audio transducer which is normally held up to the ear, a means for effective magnetic wireless coupling to hearing technologies shall be provided.
      (4) Interference to hearing technologies (including hearing aids, cochlear implants, and assistive listening devices) shall be reduced to the lowest possible level that allows a user of hearing technologies to utilize the telecommunications product.
   c. Volume Control
      (1) For transmitted voice signals, telecommunications products shall provide a gain adjustable up to a minimum of 20 dB. For incremental volume control, at least one intermediate step of 12 dB of gain shall be provided.
      (2) If the telecommunications product allows a user to adjust the receive volume, a function shall be provided to automatically reset the volume to the default level after every use.
   d. Voice Mail
      (1) Voice mail, auto-attendant, and interactive voice response telecommunications systems shall be usable by TTY users with their TTYs.
      (2) Voice mail, messaging, auto-attendant, and interactive voice response telecommunications systems that require a response from a user within a time interval, shall give an alert when the time interval is about to run out, and shall provide sufficient time for the user to indicate more time is required.
   e. Controls or Keys / Physical Operation

(1) Products, which have mechanically operated controls or keys, shall comply with the following: Controls and Keys shall be tactilely discernible without activating the controls or keys.
(2) Products which have mechanically operated controls or keys shall comply with the following: Controls and Keys shall be operable with one hand and shall not require tight grasping, pinching, twisting of the wrist. The force required to activate controls and keys shall be 5 lbs. (22.2N) maximum.
(3) Products, which have mechanically operated controls or keys, shall comply with the following: If key repeat is supported, the delay before repeat shall be adjustable to at least 2 seconds. Key repeat rate shall be adjustable to 2 seconds per character.
(4) Products which have mechanically operated controls or keys shall comply with the following: The status of all locking or toggle controls or keys shall be visually discernible, and discernible either through touch or sound.

5. VIDEO AND MULTI-MEDIA PRODUCTS (SECTION 1194.24)
   a. TV
      (1) All analog television displays 13 inches and larger, and computer equipment that includes analog television receiver or display circuitry, shall be equipped with caption decoder circuitry which appropriately receives, decodes, and displays closed captions from broadcast, cable, videotape, and DVD signals. As soon as practicable, but not later than July 1, 2002, wide screen digital television (DTV) displays measuring at least 7.8 inches vertically, DTV sets with conventional displays measuring at least 13 inches vertically, and stand-alone DTV tuners, whether or not they are marketed with display screens, and computer equipment that includes DTV receiver or display circuitry, shall be equipped with caption decoder circuitry which appropriately receives, decodes, and displays closed captions from broadcast, cable, videotape, and DVD signals.
      (2) Television tuners, including tuner cards for use in computers, shall be equipped with secondary audio program playback circuitry.
   b. Video & Multi-Media
      (1) All training and informational video and multimedia productions which support the agency's mission, regardless of format, that contain speech or other audio information necessary for the comprehension of the content, shall be open or closed captioned.
      (2) All training and informational video and multimedia productions, which support the agency's mission, regardless of format, that contain visual information necessary for the comprehension of the content, shall be audio described.
      (3) Display or presentation of alternate text presentation or audio descriptions shall be user-selectable unless permanent.

6. SELF-CONTAINED, CLOSED PRODUCTS (SECTION 1194.25)
   a. Self-contained products shall be usable by people with disabilities without requiring an end-user to attach Assistive Technology to the product. Personal headsets for private listening are not Assistive Technology.
   b. Response Time

(1) When a timed response is required, the user shall be alerted and given sufficient time to indicate more time is required.

c. Controls or Keys / Physical Operation
   (1) Where a product utilizes touch screens or contact-sensitive controls, an input method shall be provided that complies with the provisions in Section 4.e, above.
   (2) When biometric forms of user identification or control are used, an alternative form of identification or activation, which does not require the user to possess particular biological characteristics, shall also be provided.

d. Audio / Voice Output
   (1) When products provide auditory output, the audio signal shall be provided at a standard signal level through an industry standard connector that will allow for private listening. The product must provide the ability to interrupt, pause, and restart the audio at anytime.
   (2) When products deliver voice output in a public area, incremental volume control shall be provided with output amplification up to a level of at least 65 dB. Where the ambient noise level of the environment is above 45 dB, a volume gain of at least 20 dB above the ambient level shall be user selectable. A function shall be provided to automatically reset the volume to the default level after every use.
   (3) Use of Color
      (a) Color-coding shall not be used as the only means of conveying information, indicating an action, prompting a response, or distinguishing a visual element.
      (b) When a product permits a user to adjust color and contrast settings, a range of color selections capable of producing a variety of contrast levels shall be provided.
   (4) Image / Information Display
      (a) Products shall be designed to avoid causing the screen to flicker with a frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.
   (5) Location Accessibility
      (a) Products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: The position of any operable control shall be determined with respect to a vertical plane, which is 48 inches in length, centered on the operable control, and at the maximum protrusion of the product within the 48 inch length on products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls.
      (b) Products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: Where any operable control is 10 inches or less behind the reference plane, the height shall be 54 inches maximum and 15 inches minimum above the floor.
      (c) Products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: Where any operable control is more than 10 inches

and not more than 24 inches behind the reference plane, the height shall be 46 inches maximum and 15 inches minimum above the floor.

(d) Products, which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: Operable controls shall not be more than 24 inches behind the reference plane.

7. DESKTOP AND PORTABLE COMPUTERS (SECTION 1194.26)
   a. Where provided, at least one of each type of expansion slots, ports and connectors shall comply with publicly available industry standards.
   b. Controls or Keys / Physical Operation
      (1) All mechanically operated controls and keys shall comply with the provisions of Section 4.3, above.
      (2) If a product utilizes touch screens or touch-operated controls, an input method shall be provided that complies with the provisions of section 4.3, above.
   c. When biometric forms of user identification or control are used, an alternative form of identification or activation, which does not require the user to possess particular biological characteristics, shall also be provided.

D. Key Definitions

1. Agency shall mean any governmental entity, including state government, local government, or third party entities under contract to the agency.
2. Alternate formats are usable by people with disabilities and may include, but are not limited to, Braille, ASCII text, large print, recorded audio, and electronic formats that comply with this part.
3. Alternate methods are different means of providing information, including product documentation, to people with disabilities. Alternate methods may include, but are not limited to, voice, fax, relay service, TTY, Internet posting, captioning, text-to-speech synthesis, and audio description.
4. Assistive technology includes any item, piece of equipment, or system, whether acquired commercially, modified, or customized, that is commonly used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities.
5. Electronic and information technology includes information technology and any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the creation, conversion, or duplication of data or information. The term electronic and information technology includes, but is not limited to, telecommunications products (such as telephones) information kiosks, and transaction machines, World Wide Web sites, multimedia, and office equipment such as copies and fax machines. The term does not include any equipment that contains embedded information technology that is used as an integral part of the product, but the principal function of which is not the acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. For example, HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) equipment such as thermostats or temperature control devices, and medical equipment where

information technology is integral to its operation, are not information technology.

6. Equivalent facilitation provides that nothing in this part is intended to prevent the use of designs or technologies as alternatives to those prescribed in this part provided they result in substantially equivalent or greater access to and use of a product for people with disabilities.
7. Information technology is any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. The term information technology includes computers, ancillary equipment, software, firmware and similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources.
8. Operable controls are the component of a product that requires physical contact for normal operation. Operable controls include, but are not limited to, mechanically operated controls, input and output trays, card slots, keyboards, or keypads.
9. Product is an electronic and information technology.
10. Self-contained, Closed Products are products that generally have embedded software and are commonly designed in such a fashion that a user cannot easily attach or install assistive technology. These products include, but are not limited to, information kiosks and information transaction machines, copiers, printers, calculators, fax machines, and other similar types of products.
11. Telecommunications are the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user's choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.
12. TTY is an abbreviation for teletypewriter. Machinery or equipment that employs interactive text based communications through the transmission of coded signals across the telephone network. TTY's may include, for example, devices known as TDDs (telecommunication display devices) or telecommunication devices for deaf persons) or computers with special modems. TTYs are also called text telephones.
13. Undue burden means significant difficulty or expense. In determining whether an action would result in an undue burden, an agency shall consider all agency resources available to the program or component for which the product is being developed, procured, maintained, or used.

E. Applicability

GENERAL STATEMENT

These policies are intended to be sufficiently generic to apply to a wide range of governmental and educational agencies in the State of Nebraska. Each agency or operational entity must develop detailed procedures to implement broad policies and standards. Compliance with these accessibility policies and standards will be a requirement during consideration of funding for any projects requiring review by the NITC. Compliance may be used in audit reviews or budget reviews.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT STATEMENT

The Governing board or chief administrative officer of each organization must develop internal compliance and enforcement policies as part of its information accessibility efforts. Such policies should be reasonable and effective. The NITC intends to incorporate adherence to accessibility policies as part of its evaluation and prioritization of funding requests. The NITC recommends that the Governor and Legislature give due consideration to requests for accessibility improvements during the budget process.

F. Responsibility

An effective program for accessibility involves cooperation of many different entities. Major participants and their responsibilities include:

1. Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The NITC provides strategic direction for state agencies and educational institutions in the area of information technology. The NITC also has statutory responsibility to adopt minimum technical standards and guidelines for acceptable and cost-effective use of information technology. Implicit in these requirements is the responsibility to promote adequate accessibility for information systems through adoption of policies, standards, and guidelines.
2. Technical Panel Accessibility Work Group. The NITC Technical Panel, with advice from the Accessibility Work Group, has responsibility for recommending accessibility policies and guidelines and making available best practices to operational entities.
3. Assistive Technology Partnership. The Nebraska Assistive Technology Partnership provides training, loan devices and support for accommodations in compliance with Section 508 and the Technology Access Clause. Training and support is available to governmental agencies, schools, businesses, and non-profit organizations.
4. University of Nebraska Accommodation Resource Center. The Accommodation Resource Center (ARC) provides training, loan devices and support for accommodation using assistive technology in both the education and employment environment. The ARC website is http://ar.unl.edu
5. Federal Information Technology Accessibility Initiative. The Federal Information Technology Accessibility Initiative (FITA) is an interagency effort, coordinated by the General Services Administration, to offer technical assistance and to provide an information means of cooperation and sharing of information on implementation of Section 508. Questions about 508 standards can be sent to 508@access-board.gov .
6. Web Accessibility Initiative The Web Accessibility Initiative has created guidelines, which are grouped by priority and are very similar to the final Section 508 rules. The guidelines can be found at http://www.w3.org/wai .
7. Agency and Institutional Heads. The highest authority within an agency or institution is responsible for accessibility of information resources that are consistent with this policy. The authority may delegate this responsibility but delegation does not remove the accountability.
8. Information Technology Staff. Technical staff must be aware of the opportunities and responsibility to meet the goals of accessibility of information systems.

G. Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

1. Nebraska Technology Access Clause
2. Nebraska Technology Access Clause Checklist (Questions to Consider)
    a. Desktop and Portable Computers
    b. Video and Multimedia Products
    c. Software Application and Operating Systems
    d. Self-Contained, Closed Products
    e. Telecommunications Products
    f. Web Page Accessibility Questionaire
3. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
4. Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, 36 CFR Part 1194 can be found at http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/508standards.htm

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY ACCESS CLAUSE DESKTOP AND PORTABLE COMPUTERS			
QUESTION	**Y**	**N**	**N/A**
Are controls and keys tactilely discernible without activating the controls or keys?			
Are controls and keys operable with one hand without requiring tight grasping, pinching, or twisting of the wrist?			
Is the force required to activate controls and keys 5 lbs. (22.2 N) maximum?			
Is the status of all locking or toggle controls visually discernible, and discernible either through touch or sound?			
If key repeat is supported, the delay before the repeat is adjustable to at least 2 seconds and key repeat rate is adjustable to 2 seconds per character?			
If a product utilizes touch screens or touch-operated controls, an input method shall be provided that complies with the above five requirements?			
When biometric forms of user identification or control are used, an alternative form of identification or activation, which does not require the user to possess particular biological characteristics, is provided?			
Where provided, at least one of each type of expansion slots, ports and connectors comply with publicly available industry standards for connecting assistive technology devices?			
Is all product support documentation provided to end-users available in alternate formats upon request at no additional charge?			
Do end-users have access to descriptions of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request at no additional charge?			
Are individuals providing support services trained to accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities?			

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY ACCESS CLAUSE
VIDEO AND MULTIMEDIA PRODUCTS

QUESTION	Y	N	N/A
Are all analog television displays 13 inches and larger, and computer equipment including an analog television receiver or display circuitry equipped with caption decoder circuitry that appropriately receives, decodes, and displays closed captions from broadcast, cable, videotape, and DVD signals?			
Are all wide screen digital television (DTV) displays measuring at least 7.8 inches vertically, DTV sets with conventional displays measuring at least 13 inches vertically, and stand-alone DTV tuners, whether or not they are marketed with display screens, and computer equipment that includes DTV receiver or display circuitry, equipped with caption decoder circuitry which appropriately receives, decodes, and displays close captions from broadcast, cable, videotape, and DVD signals (not later than July 1, 2002)?			
Are all television tuners, including tuner cards for use in computers equipped with secondary audio program playback circuitry?			
Are all training and informational video and multimedia productions supporting the agency's mission, regardless of format, that contain speech or other audio information necessary for the comprehension of the content, open or closed captioned or a procedure in place to provide interpreting services?			
Are all training and informational video and multimedia productions supporting the agency's mission, regardless of format, that contain visual information necessary for the comprehension of the content, audio described?			
Is display or presentation of alternate text presentation or audio descriptions user-selectable unless permanent?			
Is all product support documentation provided to end-users available in alternate formats upon request at no additional charge?			
Do end-users have access to descriptions of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request at no additional charge?			
Are individuals providing support services trained to accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities?			

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY ACCESS CLAUSE
SOFTWARE APPLICATION AND OPERATING SYSTEMS

QUESTION	Y	N	N/A
Are product functions executable from a keyboard where the function itself or the result of performing the function can be discerned textually?			
Are applications designed in such a way that they do not disrupt or disable activated features of other products that are identified as accessibility features, where those features are developed and documented according to industry standards?			
Are applications designed in such a way that they do not disrupt or disable activated features of any operating system that are identified as accessibility features where the application programming interface for those accessibility features has been documented by the manufacturer of the operating system and is available to the product developer?			
Is there an on-screen indication of the current focus provided that moves among interactive interface elements as the input focus changes and is programmatically exposed so that assistive technology can track focus and focus changes?			
Is there sufficient information about a user interface element including the identity, operation and state of the element made available to allow the use of assistive technology to access the application?			
Is there text available for any image representing a program element?			
Is the meaning assigned to bitmap images used to identify controls, status indicators, or other programmatic elements consistent throughout an application's performance?			
Is textual information provided through operating system functions for displaying text including text content, text input caret location and text attributes?			
Do applications allow user selected contrast and color selections and other individual display attributes?			
Does information displayed by animation have at lease one non-animated presentation mode at the option of the user?			
Does the page include content (such as applets or content requiring plug-ins) that may cause the screen to flicker with a frequency greater that 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz?			
Does the application eliminate color coding as the only means of conveying information, indicating an action, prompting a response, or distinguishing a visual element?			
Are color and contrast adjustments that permit a variety of color selections capable of producing a range of contrast levels available?			
Do electronic forms allow people using assistive technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission or the form, including all directions and cues?			
Is all product support documentation provided to end-users available in alternate formats upon request at no additional charge?			
Do end-users have access to descriptions of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request at no additional charge?			
Are individuals providing support services trained to accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities?			

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY ACCESS CLAUSE
SELF CONTAINED, CLOSED PRODUCTS

QUESTION	Y	N	N/A
Is this self contained product usable by people with disabilities without requiring an end-user to attach assistive technology to the product?			
When a timed response is required, is the user alerted and given sufficient time and the ability to indicate more time is required?			
Are controls and keys tactilely discernible without activating the controls or keys?			
Are controls and keys operable with one hand without requiring tight grasping, pinching, or twisting of the wrist?			
Is the force required to activate controls and keys 5 lbs. (22.2 N) maximum?			
Is the status of all locking or toggle controls visually discernible, and discernible either through touch or sound?			
If key repeat is supported, the delay before the repeat is adjustable to at least 2 seconds and key repeat rate is adjustable to 2 seconds per character?			
When biometric forms of user identification or control are used, is there an alternative form of identification or activation which does not require the user to possess particular biological characteristics provided?			
When products provide auditory output, is the audio signal provided at a standard signal level through an industry standard connector that will allow for private listening and provide the ability to interrupt, pause, and restart the audio at anytime?			
When products deliver voice output in a public area, is there an incremental volume control provided with output amplification up to a level of at least 65 dB?			
Where the ambient noise level of the environment is above 45 dB, is a volume gain of at least 20 dB above the ambient level user selectable?			
Is there a function provided to automatically reset the volume to the default level after every use?			
Color coding is not used as the only means of conveying information, indicating an action, prompting a response, or distinguishing a visual element.			
When a product permits a user to adjust color and contrast settings, a range of color selections capable of producing a variety of contrast levels is provided.			
Is the product designed to avoid causing the screen to flicker with a frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz?			
If the product is free standing, is the position of any operable control determined with respect to a vertical plane, 48 inches in length, centered on the operable control, with a maximum protrusion of the product within the 48 inch length?			
If the product is free standing, are any operable controls 10 inches or less behind the reference plane with at least a 15 inch minimum and 54 inch maximum?			
If the product is free standing, are any operable controls at least 10 inches but not more than 24 inches behind the reference plane with a height no greater than 46 inches or less than 15 inches above the floor?			
Are operable controls less than 24 inches behind the reference plane?			
Is all product support documentation provided to end-users available in alternate formats upon request at no additional charge?			
Do end-users have access to descriptions of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request at no additional charge?			
Are individuals providing support services trained to accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities?			

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY ACCESS CLAUSE
TELECOMMUNCIATIONS PRODUCTS

QUESTION	Y	N	N/A
Are standard no-acoustic connection points provided for teletypewriters (TTYs). provided for telecommunications products or systems that provide a function allowing voice communication and which do not themselves provide a TTY functionality?			
Are microphones capable of being turned on and off to allow the user to intermix speech with TTY use?			
Do telecommunications products that include voice communication functionality support all commonly used cross-manufacturer non-proprietary standard TTY signal protocols?			
Are voice mail, auto-attendant, and interactive voice response telecommunications systems usable by TTY users with their TTYs?			
Do voice mail, messaging, auto-attendant, and interactive voice response telecommunications systems requiring a response from a user within a time interval give an alert when the time interval is about to run out, and provide sufficient time for the user to indicate more time is required?			
Is caller identification, and similar telecommunications functions available for user of TTYs, and for users who cannot see displays?			
Is a gain adjustable up to a minimum of 20 dB available for transmitted voice signals in telecommunications products?			
Is there at least one intermediate step of 12 dB for incremental volume control provided?			
If the telecommunications product allows a user to adjust the receive volume, is a function provided to automatically reset the volume to the default level after every use?			
Is there a means provided for effective magnetic wireless coupling to hearing technologies provided where a telecommunications product delivers output by an audio transducer which is normally held up to the ear?			
Is interference to hearing technologies (including hearing aids, cochlear implants, and assistive listening devices) reduced to the lowest possible level allowing a user of hearing technologies to utilize the telecommunications product?			
Do any products that transmit or conduct information or communication pass through cross-manufacturer, non-proprietary, industry-shared codes, translation protocols, formats or other information so that information or communication remains in a usable format?			
Do technologies using encoding, signal compression, format transformation, or similar techniques preserve information needed for access or restore it upon delivery?			
Are controls and keys tactilely discernible without activating the controls or keys?			
Are controls and keys operable with one hand without requiring tight grasping, pinching, or twisting of the wrist?			
Is the force required to activate controls and keys 5 lbs. (22.2 N) maximum?			
If key repeat is supported, is the delay before repeat adjustable to at least 2 seconds and the key repeat rate adjustable to 2 seconds per character?			
Is the status of all locking or toggle controls visually discernible, and discernible either through touch or sound?			
Is all product support documentation provided to end-users available in alternate formats upon request at no additional charge?			
Do end-users have access to descriptions of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request at no additional charge?			
Are individuals providing support services trained to accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities?			

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY ACCESS CLAUSE WEB PAGE ACCESSIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE			
QUESTION	**Y**	**N**	**N/A**
Does each non-text element on the page have a text equivalent via "alt" (alternative attribute) or does the page otherwise include a meaningful description of the non-text element in the text accompanying non-text element?			
For any multimedia content, is text captioning provided for all audible output and audible output provided for all critical visual information?			
Are all audio descriptions and text captions synchronized with their associated dynamic content?			
Is the page capable of being understood and navigated even if users do not have the ability to identify specific colors or differentiate between colors?			
If the page uses cascading style sheets or JavaScript style sheets, is it viewable without style sheets or with style sheets turned off or not supported by the browser?			
If the page uses cascading style sheets or JavaScript style sheets, is it designed so that it does not interfere with style sheets set by the browser?			
If the page includes any server-side image maps, are duplicate text links provided for all links within the server-side image maps?			
If the page includes one or more client-side image maps, does each map region have a text equivalent via "alt" (alternative text attribute) or does the page otherwise include a meaningful description of the non-text element in the text accompanying it?			
If the page includes data in tables (either HTML tables or preformatted text tables using the <PRE>tag), and if any of the tables has two or more rows (including header or data cells), does each cell provide identification or row and column headers?			
If the page uses frames, does each frame have a title that meaningfully describes it?			
Does the page include content (such as applets or content requiring plug-ins) that may cause the screen to flicker with a frequency greater that 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz?			
If the page uses scripts, such as JavaScript or scripts in Macromedia Flash content, and if the scripts affect any content displayed to the user, is there equivalent text provided by the page or the script that is accessible to a screen reader?			
If the web page uses applets, such as downloadable Java applets, does it also contain the same information and functionality in an accessible format?			
If the page uses other programmatic objects (such as Flash, Shockwave, etc. or otherwise requires the use of plug-ins or programmatic support), does the page include the link required for accessing the content of the page and is that plug-in or programmatic item accessible to people with disabilities?			
If the page includes links to .pdf (Adobe Acrobat's portable document format) files, were those .pdf files created in a way that is likely to maximize their usability for people with disabilities?			
If the page includes one or more electronic forms that are designed for completion online, does each form permit users of assistive technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form including all directions and cues?			
If the page contains one or more forms designed to be completed online but is inaccessible to people with disabilities in some respect, does the page include an alternate accessible form or a link to an alternate accessible form?			
If the page includes navigational links to other web pages within the same website, is there a link allowing users of screen readers to skip over those links?			
If the page requires users to respond within a fixed amount of time before the users is "timed out," is the user alerted that he or she will be timed out and given sufficient time to indicate that more time is required before actually being timed out?			
Taking into consideration your responses to the previous questions, if your page contains barriers to access for people with disabilities, do you have an alternative text-only page that contains the same information and is updated as often as the reviewed page?			
Is all product support documentation provided to end-users available in alternate formats upon request at no additional charge?			
Do end-users have access to descriptions of the accessibility and compatibility features of products in alternate formats or alternate methods upon request at no additional charge?			
Are individuals providing support services trained to accommodate the communication needs of end-users with disabilities?			

Title	**Minimum Workstation Configuration Guidelines**
Category	**Hardware Architecture**
Date Adopted	**(Draft)**
Date of Last Revision	**September 14, 2001**

A. Authority

Section 86-1506 (6). "(The Nebraska Information Technology Commission shall) adopt minimum technical standards, **guidelines**, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel created in Section 86-1511."

B. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this document is to recognize the responsibility of the NITC to establish recommended **minimum** configurations for personal computers. Minimum configurations are established in order to simplify technical support and enable a secure desktop environment. Minimum configuration guidelines established by the NITC will (must) change over time in response to requirements of newer applications or operating systems.

These guidelines provide a suggested set of minimum configurations that agencies can adopt or modify to meet their specific needs. These guidelines are not intended to endorse or support any single hardware or software vendor. These guidelines are subject to periodic review and revision.

As minimum configurations, these guidelines are recommendations to be considered in conjunction with other factors, including financial constraints, performance requirements of specific applications, and an agency's networking environment.

The primary objective of these guidelines include recommendations to:

A. Improve versatility and compatibility of desktop systems;
B. Insure that personal computer configurations procured with state funds can operate efficiently in today's high speed connected environment;
C. Provide a guide to agency on when to upgrade existing personal computers;
D. Reduce technical support problems; and,
E. Provide a secure desktop operating system.

As the State of Nebraska begins to develop Internet enabled applications, and e-Government and e-Business applications that are delivered over public and private Intranets and the Internet, it is imperative that agencies maintain desktop clients that can efficiently run these new applications. Agency desktop personal computers should be able to:

1. Execute network applications;
2. Support Internet technologies;
3. Extend the desktop communications to the state telecommunications backbone;
4. Support e-Business and e-Government applications; and,

5. Provide desktop security, encryption, and virus protection services when connected to the state telecommunications systems.

C. Standards and Guidelines

1. Agencies and institutions should manage desktop workstations as assets. This concept is similar to good management of other physical assets. It should include a planning process for determining, adopting, and periodically upgrading the minimum workstation configurations that meet the agency or institution's specific internal needs and any new external requirements. Requirements for new Business applications or mandated operating system upgrades should be the basis for capacity planning. Capacity planning should address options for implementation such as phasing in new purchases, moving older workstations to less demanding uses, or surplusing.

2. Existing Personal Computers:

   Agencies should develop a plan to upgrade or replace existing personal computers if they do not support the following minimum system requirements:

   Minimum Hardware Guidelines for Existing Personal Computers
   (1) CPU: 133 MHz or higher Intel or equivalent CPU
   (2) Memory: 64 MB RAM
   (3) Hard Disk: 2 GB hard disk with a minimum of 650MB of free space
   (4) Operating System:
      (a) Windows 98, 2nd Edition (physical security policies should be in place)
   (5) LAN Connection (either depending on agency LAN configuration):
      (a) Ethernet 10/100
      (b) 4/16Mb Token Ring

3. Minimum New Personal Computer Purchasing Guidelines:

   When purchasing new personal computers, an agency should consider the following minimum guidelines.

   a. Standard Desktop Hardware
      (1) CPU: 500 MHz Intel or equivalent CPU or higher
      (2) Memory: 128 MB RAM or higher
      (3) Disk: 6 GB or larger
      (4) LAN Connection: (either depending on agency LAN configuration):
         (a) Ethernet: 10/100 Mb
         (b) 4/16 Mb Token Ring
      (5) Operating System:
         (a) Windows 2000 (recommended) or
         (b) Windows NT 4.0 Service Pack 6a, (with 128 MB RAM and 128 bit encryption) or
         (c) Windows XP (requires 256 MB RAM)
   b. GIS Workstation Desktop Hardware

(1) CPU: 500 MHz Intel or equivalent CPU or higher (650 MHz or higher recommended)
(2) Memory: 128 MB RAM (256 MB RAM recommended)
(3) Disk: 10 GB or larger (e.g., SCSI)
(4) LAN Connection: (either depending on agency LAN configuration):
  (a) Ethernet: 10/100 Mb
  (b) 4/16 Mb Token Ring
(5) Operating System:
  (a) Windows 2000 (recommended) or
  (b) Windows NT 4.0 Service Pack 6a, (with 128 MB RAM and 128 bit encryption) or
  (c) Windows XP (requires 256 MB RAM)

c. Server Hardware:
(1) CPU: 500 MHz Intel or equivalent CPU or higher (650 MHz or higher recommended)
(2) Memory: 256 MB RAM minimum
(3) Disk: 10 GB Fast Open or larger (e.g., SCSI)
(4) LAN Connection:(either depending on agency LAN configuration):
  (a) 10/100 Mb (Fast Ethernet if available)
  (b) 4/16 Mb Token Ring
(5) Operating System:
  (a) Windows 2000 (recommended) or
  (b) Windows XP Server

4. Software Recommendations:
(1) Office Productivity: MS Office 2000 Standard Edition (recommended)
(2) Simple Terminal Emulation:
  (a) TELNET3270 or
  (b) TELNET5250
(3) Advanced 3270/5250 Terminal Emulation with Host Addressable Printing
  (a) IBM Host Client Access Package
(4) Internet Browser:
  (a) MS Explorer 5.0 or higher with 128-bit encryption, and XML compliance. or
  (b) Netscape 4.78 or higher with 128-bit encryption, and XML compliance.
(5) Virus Protection:
  (a) Anti-Virus software (Norton Anti-Virus recommended)
  (b) Anti-Virus subscription service to protect against newest attacks

5. All agencies and local government agencies that utilize networking services of the Nebraska Department of Administrative Services' Information Management Services Division and/or the Division of Communications should migrate to Windows NT 4.0 or Windows 2000 Professional in order to support network security.

6. Any agency or local government agency that operates a direct connection to the public Internet shall implement security procedures that are consistent with NITC security policies, including firewall services.

7. All agencies that receive public Internet e-mail service shall implement security procedures that are consistent with NITC security policies, including the requirement of virus protection on the desktop or mail server.

D. Key Definitions

1. Agency shall mean any governmental entity, including state government, local government, or third party entities under contract to the agency.
2. Networking Services shall mean any system that transmits any combination of voice, video, and/or data between users.

E. Applicability

These guidelines are intended to be sufficiently generic to apply to a wide range of governmental and educational agencies in the State of Nebraska.

Agencies should follow these guidelines whenever they intend to support networking services on the desktop. The guidelines may not apply whenever the desktop does not share network services, when there is no connection to state or local networking services, or whenever an application requires a different hardware and software configuration to perform a specific function.

F. Responsibility

1. Division of Communications The Division of Communications has the statutory responsibility to coordinate all communications functions and activities of State government. Communications is defined as the transmission, emission, or reception of signs, signals writing, images, and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, optical or other electromagnetic systems.
2. Information Management Services Division
3. Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The NITC provides strategic direction for state agencies and educational institutions in the area of information technology. The NITC also has statutory responsibility to adopt minimum technical standards and guidelines for acceptable and cost-effective use of information technology. Implicit in these requirements is the responsibility to promote adequate accessibility for information systems through adoption of policies, standards, and guidelines.

G. Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

Category 5e Cabling Standards
Other Network Architecture Standards (to be developed)
Frequently Asked Questions about Minimum Workstation Configuration Guidelines (to be developed)

Draft
Title: Incident Response and Reporting Procedure for State Government

(Date of last revision: 10/15/01)

State Agencies shall prepare procedures for reporting security breaches and incidents. Documentation on security incidents shall be filed with the Chief Information Officer for the State of Nebraska.

Policy Category Security Breaches and Incident Reporting Policy	**Policy Standard** Incident Response and Centralized Reporting	**Rule Number**
Rule Date	**Rule Revision Date** mm/dd/yy	**Date Adopted ?** mm/dd/yy
Approval NITC (pending)	**Rule Source**	**Audit Number/ Code (?)**

Explanation / Key Points

Security is a growing problem. Effective response and collective action are required to counteract security violations and activities that lead to security breaches. Agency management, law enforcement, and others must know the extent of security problems in order to make proper decisions pertaining to policies, programs and allocation of resources. Responding to security alerts will help to preempt incidents from occurring. Quick reporting of some incidents, such as new viruses, is essential to stopping them from spreading and impacting other systems. Reporting computer crimes is the only way for law enforcement to deter and apprehend violators.

Effective response to security incidents requires quick recognition of problems and fast mobilization of skilled staff to return systems to normal. This requires prior documentation of procedures and responsibilities of everyone with a role in responding to the emergency. Continuous improvement by eliminating points of vulnerability and applying lessons learned is an essential component of incident response.

Centralized reporting serves the goal of increasing awareness of vulnerabilities and threats to state government as a whole. In particular, centralized reporting is necessary to discern patterns, identify areas of vulnerability, allocate resources, and develop statewide solutions. Centralized reporting does not substitute for

internal reporting to management, reporting to law enforcement, or mobilizing a computer security incident response team (CSiRT). Agencies should develop procedures for internal and external reporting that will meet the needs of centralized reporting with little or no additional work. The centralized reporting is designed to mesh with the postmortem analysis that should follow each incident.

The ultimate goal of security incident response and centralized reporting is to protect data and prevent obstruction of government operations.

Applicability

All non-education state agencies, boards, and commissions, which receive a direct appropriation from the Legislature or any state agency that has a direct connection to the state's network. Educational institutions and other entities are encouraged to develop their own security incident and centralized reporting procedures.

Step-by-step procedure(s)

The Incident Response and Centralized Reporting Procedure for State Government requires that the agency implement the following steps for a complete security incident handling process.

1. Establish general procedures for responding to incidents;
2. Prepare to respond to incidents;
3. Analyze all available information to characterize an intrusion;
4. Communicate with all parties that need to be made aware of an incident and its progress;
5. Collect and protect information associated with an incident;
6. Apply short-term solutions to contain an incident;
7. Eliminate all means of vulnerability pertaining to that incident;
8. Return systems to normal operation;
9. Closure: Identify and implement security lessons learned.

Step 1 should include establishing a computer security incident response team (CSIRT) that can take responsibility for managing security incidents. The CSIRT can be a virtual team that includes people with a wide range of expertise. Agencies should consider forming a CSIRT that serves multiple entities. A clear description of roles and expectations is essential.

Step 2 should include methods for placing the CSIRT on alert status and ready to take preventative measures. It should include procedures for activating the team once an incident occurs.

Step 4 includes contacting users affected by an incident, security personnel, law enforcement agencies, vendors, the CERT Coordination Center (**http://www.cert.org/**), and other CSIRTs external to the organization. It is

essential that each agency establishes and follows a single channel of communication. Multiple sources of information while the incident is underway creates confusion, interrupts the work of the response team, and increases vulnerability if the perpetrator is monitoring communications within the agency.

Step 9, "Closure" is intended to give the organization an opportunity to learn from the experience of responding to an incident. Every successful intrusion or other incident indicates potential weaknesses in systems, networks, operations, and staff preparedness. These weaknesses provide opportunities for improvement. Steps should include the following points (from CERTCC security practices, http://www.cert.org/security-improvement/practices/p052.html):

1. Hold a post mortem analysis and review meeting with all involved parties. Do this within three to five working days of completing the investigation of an intrusion. Use the attached reporting form to gather information and guide discussion.
2. Prepare a final report for senior management and the Office of the CIO. This ensures awareness of security issues. Use the attached form (or online version) to report information about the security incident to the Office of the Chief Information Officer. Incidents should be reported no later than 5 working days after returning systems to normal operation.
3. Revise security plans and procedures and user and administrator training to prevent future incidents. Include any new, improved methods resulting from lessons learned.
4. Determine whether or not to perform a new risk analysis based on the severity and impact of an intrusion.
5. Take a new inventory of your system and network assets.
6. Participate in investigation and prosecution, if applicable.

Terminology

Agency. As used here, an agency is any non-education agency, board or commission, which receives a direct appropriation from the Legislature.

Security Incident. A security incident includes, but is not limited to the following events, regardless of platform or computer environment:

1. Evidence of tampering with data;
2. Denial of service attack on the agency;
3. Web site defacement;
4. Unauthorized access or repeated attempts at unauthorized access (from either internal or external sources);
5. Social engineering incidents;
6. Virus attacks affecting servers or multiple workstations;
7. Other incidents that could undermine confidence and trust in the state's information technology systems.

Related Rules

Draft security standards for the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) would establish administrative procedures to guard data integrity, confidentiality, and availability. These include security incident procedures (45 CFR Part 142.308 (a)(9):

"(9) Security incident procedures (formal documented instructions for reporting security breaches) that include all of the following implementation features:

"(i) Report procedures (documented formal mechanism employed to document security incidents).

"(ii) Response procedures (documented formal rules or instructions for actions to be taken as a result of the receipt of a security incident report)."

Attachments/ Forms

State of Nebraska
Cyber Threat and Computer Intrusion Incident Reporting Form

Point of Contact Information

Name	
Title	
Telephone/Fax Numbers	
Email	
Agency	

B. Incident Information

1. Background Information:	
a. Agency (if same as above, enter "SAME":	
b. Physical Location(s) of affected computer system/network (be specific):	
c. Date/time of the incident:	
d. Duration of the incident:	
e. Is the affected system/network critical to the agency's mission? (Yes/No)	

2. Nature of Problem (check all that apply):	
a. Intrusion	
b. System impairment/denial of access	
c. Unauthorized root access	
d. Web site defacement	
e. Compromise of system integrity	
f. Hoax	
g. Theft	
h. Damage	
i. Unknown	
j. Other (provide details in remarks)	
k. REMARKS:	

3. Has your agency experienced this problem before? (Yes/No; If yes, please explain in the remarks section.)
a. REMARKS:

4. Suspected method of intrusion/attack:	
a. Virus (provide name, if known)	
b. Vulnerable exploited (explain)	
c. Denial of Service	
d. Trojan Horse	
e. Distributed Denial of Service	
f. Trapdoor	
g. Unknown	
h. Other (Provide details in remarks)	
i. REMARKS:	

5. Suspected perpetrator(s) or possible motivation(s) of the attack:	
a. Insider/Disgruntled Employee	
b. Former employee	
c. Other (Explain remarks)	
d. Unknown	
e. REMARKS:	

6. The apparent source (IP address) of the intrusion/attack:

7. Evidence of spoofing (Yes/No/Unknown)

8. What computers/systems (hardware and software) were affected (Operating system, version):	
a. Unix	
b. OS2	
c. Linux	
d. VAX/VMS	
e. NT	

f. Windows	
g. Sun OS/Solaris	
h. Other (Please specify in remarks)	
i. REMARKS:	

9. Security Infrastructure in place. (Check all that apply)	
a. Incident/Emergency Response Team	
b. Encryption	
c. Firewall	
d. Secure Remote Access/Authorization Tools	
e. Intrusion Detection System	
f. Security Auditing Tools	
g. Banners	
h. Packet filtering	
i. Access Control Lists	
j. REMARKS:	

10. Did intrusion/attack result in a loss/compromise of sensitive or information classified as private?	
a. Yes (provide details in remarks)	
b. No	
c. Unknown	
d. REMARKS:	

11. Did the intrusion/attack result in damage to system(s) or data?	
a. Yes (provide details in remarks)	
b. No	
c. Unknown	
d. REMARKS:	

12. What actions and technical mitigation have been taken?

a. System(s) disconnected from the network?	
b. System Binaries checked?	
c. Backup of affected system(s)?	
d. Log files examined?	
e. Other (Please provide details in remarks)	
f. No action(s) taken	
g. REMARKS:	

13. Has law enforcement been notified? (Check all that apply.)	
a. Yes-local law enforcement	
b. Yes-Nebraska State Patrol	
c. Yes-FBI field office	
d. Not	
e. REMARKS:	

14. Has another agency/organization been informed as assisted with the response?	
a. Yes-Information Management Services	
b. Yes-Division of Communications	
c. Yes-CERT-CC	
d. Yes-Other (provide details in remarks)	
e. No	
f. REMARKS:	

15. Additional Remarks:

If the reported incident is a criminal matter, you may be contacted by law enforcement for additional information.

C. Closure Information (Optional, Except 9 & 10)

1. (Optional) Did your detection and response process and procedures work as intended? If not, where did they not work? Why did they not work?
REMARKS:

2. (Optional) Methods of discovery and monitoring procedures that would have improved your ability to detect an intrusion.
REMARKS:

3. (Optional) Improvements to procedures and tools that would have aided you in the response process. For example, consider using updated router and firewall filters, placement of firewalls, moving the compromised system to a new name or IP address, or moving the compromised machine's function to a more secure area of your network.
REMARKS:

4. (Optional) Improvements that would have enhanced your ability to contain an intrusion.
REMARKS:

5. (Optional) Correction procedures that would have improved your effectiveness in recovering your systems.
REMARKS:

6. (Optional) Updates to policies and procedures that would have allowed the response and recovery processes to operate more smoothly.
REMARKS:

7. (Optional) Topics for improving user and system administrator preparedness.
REMARKS:

8. (Optional) Areas for improving communication throughout the detecting and response processes.
REMARKS:

9. (Required) A description of the costs associated with an intrusion, including a monetary estimate if possible.
REMARKS:

10. (Required) Summary of post mortem efforts.
REMARKS:

Title	**Video Standard for Distance Learning**
Category	**Video Architecture**
Date Adopted	**(DRAFT)**
Date of Last Revision	**September 11, 2001**

A. Authority

Section 86-1506 (6). "(The Nebraska Information Technology Commission shall) adopt minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel created in Section 86-1511."

Section 86-1506 (7) authorizes the technical panel to, "establish ad hoc technical advisory groups to study and make recommendations on specific topics." Pursuant to this the Technical Panel established the Video Standard Workgroup on 9 January 2001. The stated purpose of the group was to, "determine the next video standard for the distance learning networks of the state of Nebraska."

B. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this document is to define and clarify policies, standards, and guidelines that will enable all existing and future interactive distance learning facilities to achieve interoperability and an acceptable quality of service for all educational applications.

C. Standards and Guidelines

The Video Standard Workgroup has selected two finalist protocols based on criteria adopted and approved by the Technical Panel. These two finalists are MPEG-2 and H.323 with H.263 video. The workgroup is currently conducting detailed testing per the established criteria regarding bandwidth and pre-determined quality level requirements.

The judging criteria include:

<u>Costs</u>
Site - any uniquely required hardware/software cost at a site
Hub - if a hub such as an MCU is required, hardware/software cost
Operational - maintenance requirements, technicians, connectivity bandwidth, scheduling personnel, etc.

<u>Bandwidth</u>
Minimum quality - rate required for NVCN / Network 3 like quality
High quality - rate required for full-motion / broadcast quality
Lip readable – rate required for language classes
ASL readable – rate required for American Sign Language
Flexibility - range available, and rate agile v. steps

Negotiation - automatic / manual bandwidth negotiation between points

Connectivity
Ubiquity - supported delivery methods (IP, ATM, dedicated line, PVC, etc.)
Broadcast / multicast - one-to-many without interactivity
Point-to-point - two interactive sites
Teleconference - several interactive sites (MCU/Switch required?)
Dial up / dial out - the ability for an external site to connect into a conference and not have to be brought in
Latency - amount of delay introduced by encoding process

Compatibility
Standard type - software standard or hardware standard
Backward compatibility - nature of compatibility
Installed base - How prolific is this standard already?
Life Cycle - ability to upgrade

Once a single standard is determined, all synchronous distance learning entities in the state must adopt this new video and audio standard to use state-owned networks, or to request future state funds regarding synchronous distance learning network projects. Given that all users cannot fiscally adopt the standard immediately, the workgroup will follow the technical standard adoption with recommended implementation strategies that will permit a phased migration over time. The ultimate intent of this process is to establish statewide interoperability of all synchronous distance learning networks while minimizing the fiscal impact.

This standard will not prohibit purchase of equipment that does not meet the standard providing:

1. No state funds are used.
2. The entity does not intend to pass the traffic across state owned networks.
3. A specific purchase can be grand fathered to a previous standard if it meets criteria as set forth in the implementation and migration strategies to be recommended by the Technical Panel and adopted by the NITC.

For background tutorial material on H.323/H.263, see:
http://www.cis.ohio-state.edu/~jain/cis788-99/h323/ and
http://www.4i2i.com/h263_video_codec.htm

For background material on MPEG-2, see:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/rd/pubs/papers/paper_14/paper_14.html and
http://www.crs4.it/~luigi/MPEG/mpeg2.html#What%20is%20MPEG-2

These resource materials are provided as a public service. Accuracy of content is neither implied nor guaranteed by the NITC or its advisory groups.

D. Key Definitions

1. Agency shall mean any governmental entity, including state government, local government, or third party entities under contract to the agency.
2. Electronic and information technology includes information technology and any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the creation, conversion, or duplication of data or information. The term electronic and information technology includes, but is not limited to, telecommunications products (such as telephones) information kiosks, and transaction machines, World Wide Web sites, multimedia, and office equipment such as copies and fax machines. The term does not include any equipment that contains embedded information technology that is used as an integral part of the product, but the principal function of which is not the acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. For example, HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) equipment such as thermostats or temperature control devices, and medical equipment where information technology is integral to its operation, are not information technology.
3. Information technology is any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. The term information technology includes computers, ancillary equipment, software, firmware and similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources.
4. Telecommunications are the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user's choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.
5. MPEG is the Motion Picture Experts Group. This association has created the standard protocol under consideration.
6. NVCN is the Nebraska Video Conference Network. It is a terrestrially based teleconference system operated by the State Division of Communications.
7. Network 3 is a satellite based teleconference system operated by the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission.
8. MCU is a multi-conferencing unit. This device allows more than two sites to participate in a teleconference simultaneously.
9. ATM means asynchronous transfer mode. It is a terrestrial data transmission protocol.
10. IP means Internet protocol. It is a communications protocol used on networks for exchange of information.

E. Applicability

GENERAL STATEMENT

These policies are intended to be sufficiently generic to apply to a wide range of governmental and educational agencies in the State of Nebraska. Each agency or operational entity must develop detailed procedures to implement broad policies and standards. Compliance with these technical policies and standards will be a requirement during consideration of funding for any projects requiring review by the NITC. Compliance may be used in audit reviews or budget reviews.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT STATEMENT

The Governing board or chief administrative officer of each organization must develop internal compliance and enforcement policies as part of its information standardization and interoperability efforts. Such policies should be reasonable and effective. The NITC intends to incorporate adherence to technical standards policies as part of its evaluation and prioritization of funding requests. The NITC recommends that the Governor and Legislature give due consideration to requests for technical standardization and interoperability improvements during the budget process.

F. Responsibility

An effective program for video standards compliance involves cooperation of many different entities. Major participants and their responsibilities include:

1. Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The NITC provides strategic direction for state agencies and educational institutions in the area of information technology. The NITC also has statutory responsibility to adopt minimum technical standards and guidelines for acceptable and cost-effective use of information technology. Implicit in these requirements is the responsibility to promote adequate quality of service and uniformity for information systems through adoption of policies, standards, and guidelines.
2. Technical Panel Video Standards Work Group. The NITC Technical Panel, with advice from the Video Standards Work Group, has responsibility for recommending video standard policies and guidelines and making available best practices to operational entities.
3. Agency and Institutional Heads. The highest authority within an agency or institution is responsible for interoperability of information resources that are consistent with this policy. The authority may delegate this responsibility but delegation does not remove the accountability.
4. Information Technology Staff. Technical staff must be aware of the opportunities and responsibility to meet the goals of interoperability of information systems.

G. Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

None currently in place.