# Agency Information Technology Projects
## FY2003-05 Biennial Budget

*November 2002*

**NEBRASKA**
**INFORMATION**
**TECHNOLOGY**
**COMMISSION**

| | Project # | Agency | Project Title | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 21-01 | State Fire Marshal | FLST Web-Based Application - Phase II | $ 20,000.00 | | 84 |
| 2 | 25-01 | HHSS | Convert Lincoln NSOB to Ethernet Topology | $ 517,750.00 | $ 517,750.00 | 81 |
| 3 | 25-02 | HHSS | Server Operating System Replacement | $ 130,375.00 | $ 130,375.00 | 75 |
| 4 | 25-03 | HHSS | Desktop Operating System Replacement | $ 589,500.00 | $ 783,300.00 | 67 |
| 5 | 25-04 | HHSS | Computer Hardware Renewal Policy and Program | $ 4,646,400.00 | $ 4,646,400.00 | 79 |
| 6 | 25-05 | HHSS | Help Desk Call Tracking System | $ 75,000.00 | | 83 |
| 7 | 25-06 | HHSS | CHARTS Project | | | 73 |
| 8 | 25-07 | HHSS | HIPAA Project | | | 84 |
| 9 | 25-08 | HHSS | NFOCUS Project | | | 78 |
| 10 | 37-01 | Workers Compensation Court | Extended Computer Automation Project | $ 326,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | 80 |
| 11 | 47-01 | NET | KLNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | $ 650,000.00 | | 90 |
| 12 | 47-02 | NET | KMNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | | $ 650,000.00 | 90 |
| 13 | 47-03 | NET | Phone System Replacement / Switch Upgrade | | $ 198,000.00 | 79 |
| 14 | 78-01 | Crime Commission | CJIS - Criminal Justice Integration and Automation | $ 1,020,112.00 | $ 790,112.00 | 88 |

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 21-01**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| State Fire Marshal | FLST Web-Based Application - Phase II | $20,000 | |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This proposed project is to complete the items that were not finished in the FLST application during the last budget cycle (security, inspections, reporting, permit printing). These were not completed due to a low estimate and misunderstandings between IMS and this agency of the requirements for the application. As a result we ran out of money to complete the application as planned. Some minor modifications to a few existing components also need to be made during this phase. We cannot fully implement the application without these components, particularly security and reporting, being added to the application.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Contractual Services | | | |
| 2.1 Design | $ 15,500.00 | $ 5,600.00 | $ 21,100.00 |
| 2.2 Programming | $ 55,097.00 | $ 14,400.00 | $ 69,497.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 70,597.00 | $ 20,000.00 | $ 90,597.00 |
| General Funds | | | $ - |
| Cash Funds | $ 70,597.00 | $ 20,000.00 | $ 90,597.00 |
| Federal Funds | | | $ - |
| Revolving Funds | | | $ - |
| Other Funds | | | $ - |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 70,597.00 | $ 20,000.00 | $ 90,597.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|------------------|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 11 | 12 | 12.3 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 20 | 21 | 21.7 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18.3 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7.3 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8.0 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 17 | 15 | 17 | 16.3 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 84 | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Good explanation of alternatives.

Weaknesses
- No real explanation of the stakeholders and has shown / will show acceptance by them.
- Phase 2 is a result of "a low estimate and misunderstandings between IMS and this agency" of Phase 1. I'm not sure how much confidence I have in the budget.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Objectives are consistent with an e-government project, and measurement methods should provide a good indication of whether the project is having the desired impact.
- The business need and the rationale for dismissal of the alternative solution are adequately stated.
- The statements regarding the technical need for the project and adherence to standards are clear.
- Outline seems generally complete
- Risks are well-stated

Weaknesses
- There is no actual explanation of the project, although it seems to be the continuation of a project previously undertaken.  Presumably the explanation is contained in the previous project proposal.
- There is no indication the agency considered NOL services as an alternative, but given that a large portion of the project is for the benefit of agency employees and other agencies, that option could be reasonably dismissed.
- Detail on tasks and timelines is lacking
- Not really a weakness in the application, but communication (or lack thereof) appears to be the primary risk.
- The budget summary provides little detail that can be used to assess reasonableness of cost.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- This Proposal supports e-Government goals.
- Will allow people outside Lincoln to have access to the data.  Also, sponsor will be able to generate many of their reports themselves.  These are intangibles that are difficult to put a dollar amount on them.
- The approach uses good current technical solutions.
- The sponsor did identify, in appropriate detail, the tasks and milestones to accomplish the project.
- The sponsor appears to understand some of the more common reasons that projects can be at risk.  They have been through a project already, so they have experience.
- This project is not a high cost item, compared to many other agency projects.

Weaknesses
- Not sure how they will get "better data".
- Did not see tangible dollars identified (only a description of the benefit).
- No specific timeline has been established, but is estimated to take about 6 months.  Not sure what approach was used to determine this duration.
- The sponsor did not state specifically how they were going to ensure better communication and monitor the project more closely.

**Project # 25-01**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | Convert Lincoln NSOB to Ethernet Topology | $517,750 | $517,750 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project proposes to replace the Token Ring network topology used by HHSS (Health and Human Services System) in the NSOB (Nebraska State Office Building in Lincoln) with Ethernet. Ethernet is the leading network topology in use today and, as such, benefits from technological advancements in reliability, scalability and cost containment. Existing Token Ring equipment has exceeded its technical life expectancy (in use since the 1970s) and we are seeing a high rate of failure. Replacement parts are getting scarce making them very expensive. Technically skilled people required to maintain the Token Ring environment are much harder to find.

This project also addresses data cabling issues. The data cabling in place no longer meets approved standards and cannot support today's higher data transmission rates required by increased utilization and newer applications. Existing data cabling needs to be replaced according to guidelines and specifications from the Department of Administrative Services, Division of Communications.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through **effective** health and human services. The availability of reliable, scalable data network services is essential to the 935 staff from Finance & Support, Health & Human Services and Regulation & Licensure performing their job in the NSOB.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of coordinating investment in telecommunications infrastructure so as to aggregate demand, reduce costs and create support networks. The Division of Communications (DOC) and Information Management Services (IMS) have been asked to provide input and assistance in the design, implementation and support of this project. This collaboration of effort will ensure resulting infrastructure meets available guidelines and addresses NITC objectives.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Contractual Services | | | |
| 2.4 Other | $ 279,250.00 | $ 279,250.00 | $ 558,500.00 |
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | $ 238,500.00 | $ 238,500.00 | $ 477,000.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 517,750.00 | $ 517,750.00 | $ 1,035,500.00 |
| General Funds | $ 258,875.00 | $ 258,875.00 | $ 517,750.00 |
| Federal Funds | $ 258,875.00 | $ 258,875.00 | $ 517,750.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 517,750.00 | $ 517,750.00 | $ 1,035,500.00 |

Project is estimated to take 18 months to complete. This includes 3 months to order, install, configure and test key hardware components and 15 months complete the data cabling based 45 days for each of the ten wiring closets.

Total costs are estimated at $ 1,035,500 with expenditures spread across two budget cycles.
$ 65,000 for the core Ethernet switch in the NSOB
$ 35,000 for a layer 3 switch with both Token Ring and Ethernet capabilities for transition

$543,500 for horizontal data wiring ($169,500 for voice and $374,000 data)
$377,000 for Ethernet switches in the quadrant closets (middle of $143,000 - $610,000 range)
$  15,000 for fiber installation

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 11 | 14 | 14 | 13.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 20 | 24 | 23 | 22.3 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 16 | 15 | 19 | 16.7 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 5 | 8 | 6.7 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6.7 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 13 | 15 | 18 | 15.3 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **81** | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Reasonable explanation of the goals that HHSS is attempting to reach.  I did not see a list of projected outcomes - just goals and objectives.
- The agency gives many examples of benefits they feel will be derived from the change.
- Agency makes a valid case for the technical solution they have chosen.
- Adequate plans for implementation.

Weaknesses
- It is doubtful that the technology being replaced is over twenty-five years old, ten to fifteen maybe.  However, there is no disagreement that the technology needs replacement.
- Statements are at times undefended.  For example, a statement of "network components for Token Ring are about 5 time higher than Ethernet counterparts" is made without any substantiation.
- Statements made are somewhat misleading.  For example, the cabling in the NSOB does meet CAT3 standards.  CAT3 is not obsolete; it is the current voice grade standard.  The additional estimated cost to ensure redundancy of $15,000 is due to the design specified by HHSS.  The State is installing CAT6 based on current standards; however, it is a negotiated item with the agency.
- No outline for the agency responsibilities to prepare staff for the disruption an installation of this type will cause, or for any training of staff to make this conversion.
- The risk assessment does not include any issues associated with delays from other sources besides IM Services or the Division of Communications.  What about shipping delays, or equipment delivery delays, or equipment that does not perform to the levels expected, or the HHSS operational issues that may cause delays? Training issues??
- The budget describes Ethernet switches that ranged from $143,000 - $610,000.  The choice of budgeting for something in the middle price range ($377,000 each) appears to be a little on the high side.  It may be been more appropriate to have seen a recommended type of switch with a cost associated.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Very worthwhile project. Relationship to agency goals well documented.
- Good list of benefits. Savings are probably low, but hard to identify.

Weaknesses

- Section indicates that agency has implemented Ethernet topology in majority of existing sites, but still have not identified network equipment that will be used for this project. $467,000 is a big spread between low end and high end equipment needs. This section also indicates that "bandwidth to individual workstations will not be increased". Why not? What will be the speed to the workstations, it's not identified?
- No discussion of project sponsor, nor stakeholders. Does not address work to be performed at each workstation to change from token ring to Ethernet.
- Need to get plan better defined including final decision on equipment and its cost. Doesn't identify any costs for changing the workstations from token ring to Ethernet.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Describes why it is needed quite well.
- Seems like a somewhat conservative estimate of benefits.
- Fairly good technical plan.
- Expensive, but I would think absolutely necessary.

Weaknesses
- Is the 935 users all HHSS staff or everyone in the NSOB?
- Not sure that the acquisition and staffing ramifications are fully addressed.
- Is there a funding risk? Is there redundancy built in? Does this only address HHSS portion of the NSOB or all of NSOB and the agencies there in?
- Is this for only HHSS part or for the whole building?

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 25-02**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | Server Operating System | $130,375 | $130,375 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project addresses the Health and Human Services Systems (HHSS) IT Technology Plan goal of maintaining a stable, responsive, dependable Local Area Network Server architecture. The project includes the acquisition and installation of a new server operating system required to replace the current NTserver operating systems that will be technically obsolete as of June 30, 2003.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through effective health and human services. The replacement of the server operating systems across the HHSS supports intra-agency collaboration, communication and cooperation and security. It continues the operation of a common information technology platform upon which staff can depend and one that enables them to securely connect to HHSS information technology resources and other networks.

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

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2) | Total |
|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | | |
| 8.2 Software | $ 130,375.00 | $ 130,375.00 | $ 260,750.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 130,375.00 | $ 130,375.00 | $ 260,750.00 |
| General Funds | $ 65,187.50 | $ 65,187.50 | $ 130,375.00 |
| Federal Funds | $ 65,187.50 | $ 65,187.50 | $ 130,375.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 130,375.00 | $ 130,375.00 | $ 260,750.00 |

Cost of the purchase of Windows2000 Server licenses: $ 260,750.
No staffing in addition to permanent HHSS technical staff will be required.
No additional Hardware will be required.

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------------|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 9 | 13 | 12 | 11.3 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 15 | 21 | 15 | 17.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 12 | 18 | 15 | 15.0 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 9 | 8 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 5 | 8 | 10 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 12 | 18 | 20 | 16.7 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **75** | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Will update version levels for servers to industry current version
- No formal training needed

Weaknesses
- Project is not fully defined, upgrade of servers will have large-scale side effects but they are not discussed. 350 Servers seems to be too many.
- Other options are not actually explored; one is the possibility of consolidating servers
- It would follow that hardware that was installed with the software would not last years longer without some additional changes, evidently they will need no changes?
- Significant risk of implementation interoperability issue and probable outages. No formal training with OJT poses a significant risk in implementation.
- No hardware expenses for ANY of the 350 servers?  Server consolidation possibility should be addressed.

Reviewer 2:
Weaknesses
- Only measurement and assessment method is really like a stated outcome.
- Other solutions discussed might have been other operating systems or a slower phased in approach. Only solution discussed is Windows 2000 and full replacement of all server operating systems.
- Total budget is cost of software. I assume that means only staff will install, or if outside help will install that those funds will come from operational money already in HHSS budget.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- The description of the project and its goals is concise and focused.
- The justification clearly makes the point that the NT operating system will not be supported in the future placing reliability at risk.
- The migration process is clearly spelled out.

Weaknesses
- The measurement is simplistic and doesn't provide any real metric of success.  A migration of this magnitude including active directory needs to be assessed with respect to such criteria as usability, total cost of ownership, etc.
- Very little background is provided as to the function of the 350 servers.  If they are simply file servers there are options outside of the Windows environment including Linux, OS X Server, and UNIX with SAMBA. Those servers providing application services are, of course, constrained by platform. That assessment can't be made based on this proposal.
- In a migration of this magnitude including a change of directory structure there are many implementation issues including training.  There is no mention of technical elements outside of the upgrade from NT to 2000 or .Net.
- The staff development requirements are confined to operational staff suggesting that there are no client implications.  An upgrade of this magnitude includes client issues and these should be addressed.

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 25-03**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | Desktop Operating System Replacement | $589,500 | $783,300 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project addresses the Health and Human Services Systems (HHSS) IT Technology Plan goal of achieving a single Desktop Platform for all HHSS staff. The project includes the acquisition and installation of new operating systems, desktop memory upgrades, hard drive upgrades, and replacement of desktops unable to run the new operating system.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through effective health and human services. The standardization of desktop operating system across the HHSS supports intra-agency collaboration, communication and cooperation. It sets up a common information technology platform upon which staff can depend and one that enables them to help each other understand and effectively use the technology.

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

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2) | Total |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | | $ 418,500.00 | $ 418,500.00 | $ 837,000.00 |
| 8.2 Software | $ 193,800.00 | $ 171,000.00 | $ 364,800.00 | $ 729,600.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 193,800.00 | $ 589,500.00 | $ 783,300.00 | $ 1,566,600.00 |
| General Funds | $ 96,900.00 | $ 294,750.00 | $ 391,650.00 | $ 783,300.00 |
| Federal Funds | $ 96,900.00 | $ 294,750.00 | $ 391,650.00 | $ 783,300.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 193,800.00 | $ 589,500.00 | $ 783,300.00 | $ 1,566,600.00 |

Costs include:
Upgrade 4800 desktop operating system licenses.                    $   729,600
Upgrade 4200 desktop Random Access Memory (RAM)                    $   147,000
Replace 600 desktops                                               $   690,000

Total:          $ 1,566,600

Funding Breakdown:          $ 783,300 Federal
                            $ 783,300 State

Funding Sources will vary in state and federal funding matching rates. The overall match rate was used in the calculations.

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 11 | 5 | 12 | 9.3 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 5 | 12 | 20 | 12.3 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 15 | 13 | 20 | 16.0 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 5 | 6 | 10 | 7.0 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 5 | 3 | 10 | 6.0 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 16 | 14 | 20 | 16.7 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | **67** | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Fewer number of operating system versions to support
- Software upgrades are necessary to keep reasonably current
- Individual upgrades should have minimal impact on whole structure
- Costs appear reasonable

Weaknesses
- Section IV.4 It seems unreasonable to assume 10% could stop operation and if it could, it seems that this upgrade without significant desktop replacement would not change that situation. No other solutions explored.
- Training for workers on this new operating system is missing. Does not address support issues of these new 5500 desktops.
- No plan for training of users or support teams.

Reviewer 2:
Weaknesses
- The 2,400 Windows 95 machines are bad candidates for upgrading to higher levels of operating systems. Printing and communications drivers are prone to failure and/or very slow response times. This is very labor intensive and has a high failure probability. These are slow and very outdated.
- This plan is mix of software and memory upgrades that will require testing and good technical support staff
- I get the sense that this is being viewed as a "Heart Transplant". Just put the new equipment in and away we go. I am afraid that HHSS is not realizing the size of the commitment to training, transferring of programs and making sure every thing works correctly.
- If the predictions of lost productivity are true then there is significant risk associated with this project.
- What are the people costs? Training costs?

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- The proposal clearly states the desire for a homogeneous desktop operating environment and outlines some of the benefits for both end users and those in a support role.
- The description provides necessary information on the scope of the project and the need to update
- Clearly outlines the need for the requested update within the context of support.
- Implementation plan is clear and the timelines are reasonable.
- Risks and barriers are realistically assessed.
- Costs for listed technology are appropriate.

Weaknesses
- A project of this magnitude will fundamentally impact every end user, however, no mention is made of how the benefits to this audience will be assessed.
- No mention of the "mission critical" applications and whether alternative computing platforms would work. Declaring that there are no options can't be verified with the information provided.

**Project # 25-04**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | Computer Hardware Renewal Policy and Program | $4,646,400 | $4,646,400 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project proposes to replace one-fourth of the personal computers (PCs) in use by HHSS (Health and Human Services System) per year. HHSS operates approximately 5500 desktop PCs in 150 locations across the state. Many of these PCs are old. 25% were purchased prior to 1998. Use of old PCs hinder job performance for the user. The PCs are slow, the user can only have one program open at a time, many software programs will not run and they experience continual problems causing downtime and requiring a technician to come on-site to repair.

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

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

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| Annual Replacement of one quarter | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Regulation & Licensure | Services | Finance & Support | Total |
| Desktops = $1500 | $144,000 | $1,369,125 | $369,375 | $1,882,500 |
| Laptops = $2000 | $24,000 | $141,000 | $64,500 | $229,500 |
| Subtotal | $168,000 | $1,510,125 | $433,875 | $2,112,000 |
| Plus 10% | $184,800 | $1,661,138 | $477,263 | $2,323,200 |
| | | | | |
| Biennium: | $369,600 | $3,322,275 | $954,525 | $4,646,400 |
| | | | | |
| State | $369,600 | $2,076,422 | $954,525 | $3,400,547 |
| Federal | $0 | $1,245,853 | $0 | $1,245,853 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|------------------|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 12 | 14 | 13.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 16 | 18 | 23 | 19.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 20 | 13 | 18 | 17.0 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 6 | 9 | 7.0 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 7 | 6 | 8 | 7.0 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 15 | 13 | 19 | 15.7 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 79 | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
Weaknesses
- What is the failure rate of older PCs?  Is downtime significant, or do most of the benefits derive from better security by eliminating Win95 and better support by achieving standardization of hardware and operating systems?
- More information is needed to support the assumption that no additional staff will be needed to implement this policy initially.  For example, what is the average time to set up new equipment and prepare old equipment for surplusing?  Can that realistically be accomplished with existing staff?

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Hardware Replacement- good idea, may be advisable to increase to 30+% of PC's/year.  A $1200 PC can be bought.   Leasing is an option to consider, but do the math of costs comparison - lease $'s vs buy $'s
- No question of justification or need when considering the ages of systems. Need to consider standardization of hardware, software and training.
Weaknesses
- Need to find a low manpower way to replace many boxes…. Most vendors will pre-configure the equipment any way you want.
- Beside money problem- watch manpower and staff training needs during and after installation.
- No alternative or fail safe plan appears possible.
- Better recalculate and clarify costs- In the Desk Top Operation System portion there is 4800 software operating system licenses and in this part there is a replacement of 25% of PC's which automatically have software. That makes 6100 software upgrades plus 600 PC's listed in the software request.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- The sponsor has a good understanding of what they want to accomplish and a workable plan to accomplish it.  There is a reasonable measurement approach.  Overall, this standard replacement schedule supported by most of industries technical decision-makers.
- The sponsor appears to have a good understanding of their desktop environment.
- This project does enhance the technical environment for HHSS.
- This project has the "approval of the HHSS policy cabinet, administrators, managers and staff".
- It appears that the sponsor has given the identification of barriers and risks adequate thought.
- The sponsor appears to have a good understanding of hardware/software needs and costs.
Weaknesses
- Not very specific about funding plan using a revolving fund to be "repaid from operations".
- It may be difficult to have on-going annual support of this effort.
- Sponsor does not explain how the strategies for minimizing risks would be accomplished.
- I am not sure if the sponsor has accounted for the staffing effort (cost) needed for this project.

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 25-05**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | Help Desk Call Tracking System | $75,000 | |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of this project is to replace the current "homegrown" Lotus Notes based call-tracking system with a new improved version.   A better call tracking system will reduce Help Desk costs and increase efficiency.

The current system was developed by Andersen Consulting in Lotus Notes version 3.0.  It is expensive to maintain and nearly impossible to change.  Changes are needed to keep this system current with the ever-changing technology support demands of HHSS.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

This information is just an estimate based on research into the average cost of Help Desk Call Tracking Systems for an organization the size of HHSS.  Actual cost will vary depending on selection of the vendor.

| | |
|---|---|
| Server - | $  6,000 |
| Licenses – 45 users @ $700 per license – | $31,000 |
| Add'l software – 45 users @ $210 per license – | $  9,450 |
| Maintenance agreement (for two years) - | $ 14,550 |
| Training (including travel expenses for two people) - | $14,000 |
| Total - | $75,000 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|------------------|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12.7 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 23 | 23 | 20 | 22.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 19 | 15 | 18 | 17.3 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6.7 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 7 | 8 | 8 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 15 | 17 | 17 | 16.3 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 83 | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Help Desk - most workable of the three plans.  Their current $3000/month maintenance can payout this in less than three years ($3000 x 36 months = $108,000).

Weaknesses
- Needs more selling to potential customers and higher authority.
- Beware- 2-3 FTE are needed install, configure and implement.  There is significant training costs and problem resolution issues when dealing with multiple locations.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Goals and outcomes well defined and reasonable.
- Good logic used to discuss alternatives.

Weaknesses
- Measurement and assessment methods read more like expected outcomes. Might have described measurements such as % less time per call, % decreased call volume, % decreased calls requiring a technician, % fewer calls required to fix average problem, specific reports that would become available that aren't currently, etc.
- Maintenance contract savings only real benefit listed. Might have discussed increased productivity of employees with less time per call and fewer calls. What additional things can the employees do since they will be on the phone with clients less?
- No strengths or weaknesses described. Assumes software will run on current workstations, but doesn't say how they know that.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Seems fairly straight forward

Weaknesses
- Is technician access in the field via a ISP or a VPN or thru a dedicated state network connection. Is this a Internet or Intranet application (has security ramifications).
- I don't see the ability to interface to CAMS listed as a risk.
- Is there any HHSS staff operation support costs that should be listed, even if it is an ongoing operational cost.

**Project # 25-06**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | CHARTS Project | | |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support) is the state's Child Support computer system.  CHARTS is a tool used by the Child Support program to enforce child support orders and collect child support money for children who need it.  CHARTS is one of the reasons the state's Child Support collections have increased significantly in the last few years.  Collections have increased 13.53% or $19.2 million to an all-time high of $161.2 million for federal fiscal year 2001.

CHARTS II was designed to support centralized collection and disbursement of Child Support payments.  Previously, child support collection and disbursement is handled by Clerks of the District Court in each county.  Centralization of child support collection/disbursement is mandated by the Federal government, through the 1996 PRWORA (Welfare Reform) legislation.  Programming of CHARTS II was completed in 2001 and implemented in December 2001.

Nebraska successfully completed the implementation process for PRWORA (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996) financial distribution.  The State Disbursement Unit became fully operational statewide December 21-26, 2001.  Nebraska avoided the federal penalty of $5 million for FFY 2002.  Nebraska is already showing increased child support collections in 2002, 723,665 payouts issued to date for $153,277,750.78.  Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement acknowledged and awarded the achievement with plaques and a ceremony July 19, 2002.

Nebraska was required to implement the system statewide.  The team had to prepare synchronized work plans for the implementation period for CHARTS, the State Distribution Unit (Treasurer's State Payment Center), JUSTICE (the court information system) and Douglas County.

The CHARTSII/SDU was implemented through a "rapid Phase-in" approach.  In this approach, CHARTS II was implemented statewide, without a preliminary pilot period or graduated rollout.  The combined effect of these characteristics put this project in a relatively high-risk bracket.  The team was supported by a Steering Committee comprised of Stakeholders in HHSS/JUSTICE/Treasurers Office/DAS-IMS and the Policy Research Office.

Child support payments can now be made with credit cards, through automatic withdrawal, or by check or money order.  Child support payments can also be directly deposited into bank accounts. Almost half of the child support owed in Nebraska is collected through income withholding from paychecks.  Employers can now send one check to one location, rather than sending separate checks to each of the 93 counties where their employees might have had a child support court order.

All custodial and non-custodial parents were notified of the changes via mass mailings (monthly beginning in August 2001).  HHSS staff provided an automated Voice Response Unit to assist parents; put the Child Support Customer Call Center in place in Wausa, NE to provide personal contact for questions; met with the Clerks of the District Court to provide information and coordinate the changes. The Treasurer's offices established a call center and installed a web site at www.NebraskaChildSupport.com for information about child support payments and a toll free number, 1-877-631-9973.  Additionally child support information is available at www.hhs.state.ne.us.

## NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
### Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

### Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| Db Cd | Debit Description | Charts Budget FY03 | Charts Budget FY04 | Charts Budget FY05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 02 | MVS - R36 PROCESSOR | $ 2,344,622 | $ 2,723,640 | $ 3,002,813 |
| 03 | MVS-DB2 INQUIRY CPU | 828,515 | 967,483 | 1,065,464 |
| 11 | MVS-LOCAL PRINTING - 1 PART | 331 | 324 | 324 |
| 12 | MVS-TAPE MOUNTS | 49,682 | 66,370 | 78,113 |
| 13 | MVS-JOB SETUP | 426,105 | 433,364 | 442,031 |
| 14 | MVS-DISK STORAGE | 554,411 | 636,830 | 732,353 |
| 15 | MVS-JOB OUTPUT | 22,994 | 22,727 | 23,182 |
| 32 | MVS-DISPATCH ONLINE VIEW | 2,942 | 2,854 | 2,854 |
| 34 | MVS-CICS | 90,000 | 110,644 | 114,962 |
| 35 | MVS-CICS TEST | 1,850 | 2,192 | 2,256 |
| 42 | MVS-LOCAL PRINTING - 2 PART | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| 45 | PAGE PRINT | 81,180 | 74,911 | 73,413 |
| 46 | WARRANT PRINTING | 2,051 | 1,687 | 1,653 |
| 53 | CMS-R22 PROCESSOR PRIME | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| 64 | CMS-DISK STORAGE | 88 | 83 | 78 |
| 107 | JOB SCHEDULER | 196 | 156 | 156 |
| 109 | MONTHLY SERVER SUPPORT | 22,220 | 22,579 | 24,303 |
| 397 | SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE | 40,645 | 55,328 | 44,571 |
| Misc. | | 142 | 113 | 115 |
| | **Total** | **4,467,986** | **5,121,296** | **5,608,651** |
| | | | | |
| 900 | **Contractors** | 6,000,068 | 4,955,000 | 4,930,300 |
| 901 | **FTE** | 1,172,791 | 1,174,250 | 1,169,553 |
| | **Total Staff Cost** | 7,172,859 | 6,129,250 | 6,099,853 |
| | | | | |
| 170 | **DCS** | 210,684 | 213,084 | 213,084 |
| | | | | |
| | **Sub-Total** | 11,851,529 | 11,463,630 | 11,921,588 |
| | | | | |
| 140 | **Business Analysts** | 4,217,734 | 4,147,000 | 4,147,000 |
| | **Grand Total** | 16,069,263 | 15,610,630 | 16,068,588 |
| | | | | |
| | **HHS Budget Cost Only** | 2,827,802 | 2,827,800 | 2,827,800 |
| | **IMServices - IS & T Grand Total** | 18,897,065 | 18,438,430 | 18,896,388 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 13 | 7 | 11.3 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 23 | 16 | 21.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 16 | 15 | 10 | 13.7 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 5 | 3 | 5.0 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 9 | 8 | 3 | 6.7 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 14 | 19 | 13 | 15.3 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **73** | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:

Strengths

- The sponsor identified in detail the penalties if this is not done (millions of dollars).  It is also Federally mandated.
- It was noted that the costs to do this project are far less than the sanctions.
- There is minimal technical impact.
- This is basically a known application and project.  Not as much explanation is required.
- Items were well defined in Executive Summary.

Weaknesses

- Gives only a brief description of the schedule in the Executive Summary.
- Appeared to show total CHARTS budget, rather than the cost of this project.


Reviewer 2:

Strengths

- Good job of describing overall issues and phased approach
- Mandate very clear along with financial implications.

Weaknesses

- Success measures not clear.
- Alternative solutions? Though it sounds like the rapid development approach may have precluded it?
- I recognize that changes are enhancements to existing systems, though it might be useful to clarify the implications on workloads, growth, scalability issues, etc..?


Reviewer 3:

Strengths

- Fair description of federal mandates and financial benefit of successfully completing project.

Weaknesses

- General description of project background and objectives, but few specific goals provided
- No discussion of alternative solutions.
- There was little discussion of impact on present systems, or applicable standards and compatibility issues.  The nature of this project may assume that those standards will be met.
- Again, little information available.  Because there is an ongoing team, these issues may be addressed, but the proposal doesn't discuss them.
- Risks are identified in terms of non compliance with Federal mandates.  Risks inherent in the project are not addressed.

**Project # 25-07**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | HIPAA | | |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The State of Nebraska Health and Human Services System (HHSS) is comprised of three human services agencies.  Within HHSS, the Department of Health and Human Services Finance and Support department, hereafter referred to as the Department, is the state agency designated to administer the Nebraska Medical Assistance Program (NMAP).  Nebraska has a certified and operational Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS).  The Department serves as the fiscal agent for the NMAP.

As a 'covered entity', the NMAP must address HIPAA compliance.  The Department recently completed two planning projects related to the enhancement of the MMIS to meet HIPAA mandates and improve current business and data processes.  An assessment of the impact of HIPAA legislation on its Medicaid operations and the MMIS has been completed and a project to create a new logical database model for the MMIS was concluded earlier this year.  Both projects were approved by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS – formerly HCFA) and funded at the 90% FFP level.

Achieving compliance with HIPAA regulations will require major change to the existing MMIS.  Nebraska's 25 year old MMIS does not support all mandated functionality and will require broad system enhancements.  N-FOCUS and several other mid-range applications will also have HIPAA impacts and require changes.

While remediation of the MMIS is by far the largest effort for HIPAA compliance, additional automated application systems and programs are impacted by HIPAA.  These include Distributed Systems, AVATAR/AIMS (case management software used by the 24 hour facilities), N-FOCUS, all health systems, Mental Health and Substance abuse programs and applications, Point of Sale Drug system used by pharmacists statewide, Developmental disability programs and any other applications/programs providing direct services.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

MMIS HIPAA DEVELOPMENT

| Db Cd | Debit Description | HIPAA Budget FY03 | HIPAA Budget FY04 | HIPAA Budget FY05 |
|-------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 02/05 | Processor | $ 1,354,320 | $ 924,000 | $ 924,000 |
| 13 | Job Setup | $ 1,213 | $ - | $ - |
| 14 | Disk Storage | $ 201,600 | $ 105,000 | $ 105,000 |
| 15 | Job Output | $ 14,616 | $ - | $ - |
| 22 | LAN Segment Connection | $ 3,600 | $ 3,600 | $ 3,600 |
| 34 | CICS | $ 207,000 | $ - | $ - |
| 109 | Monthly Server Support | $ 5,760 | $ 5,760 | $ 5,760 |
| 000 | Misc. | $ 1,163,000 | $ - | $ - |
| | Total | $ 2,951,109 | $ 1,038,360 | $ 1,038,360 |
| | Total Staff Cost | $ 9,786,900 | $ 10,245,180 | $ 10,588,320 |
| 170 | DCS | $ 25,200 | $ 25,000 | $ 25,000 |
| | HHS Budget Cost (only) | $ 350,000 | $ 350,000 | $ 350,000 |
| | IMService - IS & T Grand Total | $ 13,113,209 | $ 11,658,540 | $ 12,001,680 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 13 | 9 | 12.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 23 | 21 | 22.7 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 18 | 18 | 13 | 16.3 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 9 | 8 | 6 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 10 | 10 | 8 | 9.3 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 13 | 19 | 15 | 15.7 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **84** | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Goals very specific
- Mandate well described.
- Plans/Milestones well defined
- Risks well noted

Weaknesses
- Training and ongoing support issues/implications?

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Good discussion of benefits and of mandates leading to project.
- Milestones identified, and high level tasks.  Some discussion of project team in other sections was utilized for this scoring.
- Good discussion of some specific strategies.

Weaknesses
- No discussion of sponsors, training requirements, or ongoing support requirements.
- Risks identified are primarily risk of non compliance with Federal requirements.  No discussion of project specific risks.

**Project # 25-08**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| HHSS | NFOCUS Project | | |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The N-FOCUS application provides support and automation for the following HHSS programs:

Aid to Dependent Children/Medicaid (ADC)
Assistance to the Aged; Blind (AABD)
Adult Protective Services (APS)
Child Care (CC)
Children & Family Services/Medicaid (CFS)
Emergency Assistance (EA)
Employment First (EF)
Food Stamp Program (FSP)
Former Ward/Medicaid (FW)
Independent Living/ Medicaid (IL)
Juvenile Court (JC)
Medical (MED)
Refugee Resettlement Program (RR)
Subsidized Adoption - grant only (SA)
Subsidized Adoption/Medical (SA/Med)
Subsidized Guardianship (SG)
Subsidized Guardianship/Medical (SG/Med)
Social Services for Aged & Disabled (SSAD)
Social Services for Children & Families (SSCF)
Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)
Waiver: Adults with Disabilities (AD)
Waiver: Adults with Developmental
Disabilities (ADD)
Waiver: Children with Developmental
Disabilities (CDD)
Waiver: Developmental Disabilities Case
Management (DDCM)
Waiver: Early Intervention (EI)
Waiver: Katie Beckett Plan
Developmental Disabilities (DD)

Included in this project are the updates to the programs that include federal/state mandate or policy changes, necessary technical changes, and changes considered essential to the users of the system. N-FOCUS issues $28 Million dollars in Benefits and Payments monthly. N-FOCUS supports 2,426 users, both internal and external access. N-FOCUS has over 200 thousand Master Cases and over 600 thousand individuals (clients and others) for whom it tracks data.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| Db Cd | Debit Description | N-F Budget FY03 | N-F Budget FY04 | N-F Budget FY05 |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 02 | MVS - R36 PROCESSOR | $ 1,639,152 | $ 1,945,266 | $ 2,144,655 |
| 03 | MVS-DB2 INQUIRY CPU | 371 | 409 | 450 |
| 11 | MVS-LOCAL PRINTING - 1 PART | 5,640 | 5,703 | 5,703 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | MVS-TAPE MOUNTS | 113,792 | 151,028 | 177,749 |
| 13 | MVS-JOB SETUP | 260,582 | 279,813 | 285,409 |
| 14 | MVS-DISK STORAGE | 362,366 | 416,796 | 479,315 |
| 15 | MVS-JOB OUTPUT | 13,566 | 14,566 | 14,857 |
| 32 | MVS-DISPATCH ONLINE VIEW | 484 | 444 | 444 |
| 34 | MVS-CICS | 1,866,287 | 2,215,665 | 2,302,127 |
| 35 | MVS-CICS TEST | 10,577 | 12,744 | 13,119 |
| 45 | PAGE PRINT | 186,092 | 185,185 | 181,481 |
| 46 | WARRANT PRINTING | 31,054 | 30,645 | 30,032 |
| 53 | CMS-R22 PROCESSOR PRIME | 27 | 29 | 28 |
| 109 | MONTHLY SERVER SUPPORT | 271 | 198 | 166 |
| 305 | IMS TRAINING - CLASSES | 1,409 | 1,409 | 1,409 |
| 327 | TAPE CARTRIDGE - 3480 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 397 | SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE | 410,237 | 410,237 | 410,237 |
| Misc. | | 2 | 3 | - |
| | Total | 4,901,918 | 5,670,149 | 6,047,190 |
| | Total Staff Cost | 5,763,378 | 5,846,286 | 5,823,146 |
| 170 | DCS | 210,684 | 213,084 | 213,084 |
| | HHS Budget Cost Only | 1,259,797 | 1,259,796 | 1,259,797 |
| | IMServices - IS & T Grand Total | 12,135,777 | 12,989,315 | 13,343,217 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 12 | 10 | 12.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 21 | 18 | 21.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 15 | 17 | 14 | 15.3 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 9 | 7 | 5 | 7.0 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6.3 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 14 | 19 | 15 | 16.0 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 78 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Each effort is very detailed, but not real difficult to comprehend.
- Explains in detail the reasons for the project and the impact if not done.
- There is minimal technical impact.
- This is basically a known application and project. Most of this information has been provided in other attachments.
- The sponsor knows what they want to do. It appears lack of funding is the primary risk.

Weaknesses
- This is many changes/projects in NFOCUS roled into one proposal. This is good from a "release" perspective, but makes it more difficult to understand from a overall project perspective.
- Appeared to show total NFOCUS budget, rather than the cost of this project.

Reviewer 2:

Strengths
- Mandate issues clear.
- Nice and clear breakdown by function and multi year projections.

Weaknesses
- 1) Alternatives not noted?  2) Scope is large and therefore difficult to "summarize"?
- Undrstand that the base system "in place" - would seem that that the "downstream" implications (even if minimal) should be acknowledged?
- Lot of detail in back of form - could be summarized for major deliverables for the various pieces?
- Understand that major risks already idenitifed/addressed but not clear about any contingencies/strategies that might be needed?


Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Good description of high level goals, objectives and beneficiaries.
- Good detail regarding benefits of individual initiatives and of mandates leading to project(s).

Weaknesses
- Little detail regarding alternative solutions considered.
- Little discussion regarding conformity or compatibility.
- Most of the planning described actions leading to current status.   Only a few described milestones or future activities.
- A few risks were identified, but not in a systematic way.

**Project # 37-01**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Workers Compensation Court | Extended Computer Automation Project –Electronic File System, Electronic Forms Automation, and Electronic Records Management | $326,000 | $24,000 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The court has developed over the last seven years a comprehensive case management system based upon Oracle database technology and an online screen and reporting system developed using Oracle tools. This case management system provides mission-critical information to staff in all areas of the court. (The subsystems are listed in the court's IT Comprehensive Plan.) This "Extended Computer Automation" project is being planned as a long range, ten year effort to implement the court's Strategic Plan as defined in the IT Comprehensive Plan and other mandatory requirements placed on the Court (electronic records management, security, disaster recovery, as examples). In addition the Supreme Court is moving forward with its automation projects, some of which run parallel with strategic plans of the Workers Compensation Court.

This project over it's 10 year life will address Electronic File System, Electronic Forms Automation, Adjudicated Electronic Filing Processes, Electronic Records Management, Security, and Disaster Recovery. The estimated approximate 10 Year Project Cost is: One-Time Hardware, Software, Training $1,250,000 -- On-Going Costs $187,500 = $1,437,500.

During the first two fiscal years of the 10 Year project, the court is planning on addressing the Electronic File System, initial integration of the Electronic File System with the court's Oracle Case Management system, Electronic Forms Automation, and an initial implementation of Electronic Records Management.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Request for FY2003-04 | Request for FY2004-05 | Request for FY2005-06 | Request for FY2006-07 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Contractual Services | | | | | |
| 2.4 Other | $ 126,000.00 | | | | $ 126,000.00 |
| 5. Training | $ 5,000.00 | | | | $ 5,000.00 |
| 6. Travel | $ 5,000.00 | | | | $ 5,000.00 |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | $ 24,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ 96,000.00 |
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | | | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | $ 20,000.00 | | | | $ 20,000.00 |
| 8.2 Software | $ 146,000.00 | | | | $ 146,000.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 326,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ 398,000.00 |
| Cash Funds | $ 326,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | | | $ 350,000.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 326,000.00 | $ 24,000.00 | $ - | $ - | $ 350,000.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 20 | 19 | 23 | 20.7 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 16 | 15 | 16 | 15.7 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8.0 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 7 | 6 | 9 | 7.3 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 16 | 17 | 16 | 16.3 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **80** | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
Weaknesses
- At some point, the project should determine what aspects of the Supreme Court's automated system, especially electronic filing, are applicable to the Workers Compensation Court. To what extent are we building two duplicative systems for electronic filing of court cases?
- There is not enough detail and explanation for the reader to understand the technical impact of this project.
- Another risk is financial -- that costs will greatly exceed estimates. The narrative should include strategies to address each specific risk.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Good base description of what is planned and why.
- Acknowledges the existence of other systems that may need to be interfaced.
- Have identified all the technologies involved.
Weaknesses
- Seemed like the we would need to know if this part of their ten year plan is capable of standing by itself (if they rest of the ten year plan is not achieved, undertaken, or funded).
- The hardware requirements seem a little soft. What is needed is identified but the magnitude is not.
- Need to describe what the RFP is intended to procure and if there is any phasing to the project.
- Seems to me that the interface between the 'file management' software and the Oracle 'File management' would be a large risk.
- It seems to me that 20,000 for hardware, that would cover both a multiprocessor server and optical juke box is optimistic.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Good description of overall goals. Closely tied to agency's comprehensive IT plan.
- Intangible benefits well documented. The agency has worked in collaboration with other state entities, and national organizations, in determining the proposed course of action.
- Risks are well documented and addressed.
Weaknesses
- Tangible benefits and cost savings not well documented.

**Project # 47-01**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| NET | KLNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | $650,000 | |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the existing KLNE-TV transmitter near Lexington, NE. The replacement is necessary for Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) to continue to provide public educational television programming to Lexington, and the south-central part of Nebraska. The current transmitter is nearly 20 years old and approaching the end of it's useful life.  The transmitter uses costly tubes needing periodic replacement. A new solid state transmitter will use transistors, eliminating the costly tube replacements. Parts for the current transmitter are becoming difficult to obtain on a timely basis, and are very costly. As the transmitter ages, the need for replacement parts increases.

There are essentially 3 stages to the DTV conversion. The first is the period of build out. At this point in the process, the new DTV is being installed and tested on a new channel assigned by the FCC. NETC currently uses channel 3 in Lexington for NTSC (analog) transmission. We have been assigned channel 26 for an interim DTV channel. For a period of some years we will have to transmit full power NTSC and interim power DTV simultaneously. This is the second or simulcast phase of the conversion. Whenever the FCC authorizes termination of NTSC transmission, we will have to select a permanent DTV channel and use it. This DTV-only time will be the third stage of the conversion and it will then be complete. For a number of technical reasons, a lower channel assignment is preferred to a higher channel assignment. This means that when we reach the final step we will need to convert the NTSC transmitter to a DTV transmitter to occupy channel 3 and give channel 26 back to the federal government. By occupying channel 3 our electrical costs will be significantly lower than if we were to keep channel 26 instead. This is why we are only operating the interim DTV channel at an interim power and not at full power.

When the NETC eliminates NTSC transmissions in favor of DTV in the Lexington area per FCC regulations, the new transmitter will easily convert to digital. This is expected to occur sometime after 2006. The current transmitter is becoming problematic, and will not convert to digital at all.

The Commission anticipates funding from the federal Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) for 40% of the cost of this equipment. The State's portion is considered by PTFP as matching funds.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Total |
|---|---|---|
| **8. Capital Expenditures** | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | $ 650,000.00 | $ 650,000.00 |
| 8.4 Other | Installation included in hardware cost | $ - |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 650,000.00 | $ 650,000.00 |
| General Funds | $ 390,000.00 | $ 390,000.00 |
| Federal Funds | $ 260,000.00 | $ 260,000.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 650,000.00 | $ 650,000.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 24 | 21 | 23.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18.3 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9.3 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 8 | 9 | 6 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 19 | 18 | 16 | 17.7 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **90** | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

Strengths

- They did an excellent job of explaining the project, describing the outcomes and measurements, and the relationship to the agency IT plan.
- Benefits were well defined and the DTV conversion process was explained adequately.
- The technical impact statement and the issues surrounding reliability, security and scalability were all addressed very well.
- Implementation plan is well defined.  All other issues were addressed well.
- Most of the risks were well defined and discussed with strategies of minimize the risk.
- Appears to be appropriate and well explained.  Bottom line is that the State needs to decide whether we wish to continue to offer this service or not. If we decide to offer services in this area, we really have not choice but to replace the transmitter.

Reviewer 2:

Strengths

- The goals and objectives are pretty much spelled out by the federal mandate.  NETC has done this before so should know the process pretty good by now
- Benefits are meeting the federal mandate and providing better service on the local scale.  This is spelled out in the application but there are really not a lot of choices available in meeting the FCC charge
- Upgrading of the transmitter and potential repairs seem to have been taken into consideration
- The team in charge of implementing this change is experienced and capable.  Other staff development requirements seem to be somewhat minimal.  Support and repair has been taken into consideration.
- Risk is in not meeting the mandate and endangering the broadcast license or in having to continue two feeds and spending a lot more on electric bills.  Two vendors and a federal mandate do not leave a great many options.

Reviewer 3:

Strengths

- Good overview of the project. Obviously, NETC has done this before.
- Good explanation of the technology.
- NETC has a good engineering staff to implement these projects.

Weaknesses

- The only weakness is the lack of estimates for the savings from reduced electricity and maintenance.
- One could question the advisability of using channel 3 rather than 26 in Lexington due to the noise and propagation problems. One Nebraska broadcaster is not planning to use low band channels for HDTV.

**Project # 47-02**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| NET | KMNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | | $650,000 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the existing KMNE-TV transmitter near Bassett, NE. The replacement is necessary for Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) to continue to provide public educational television programming to Bassett, and the north-central part of Nebraska. The current transmitter is nearly 20 years old and approaching the end of it's useful life. The transmitter uses costly tubes needing periodic replacement. A new solid state transmitter will use transistors, eliminating the costly tube replacements. Parts for the current transmitter are becoming difficult to obtain on a timely basis, and are very costly. As the transmitter ages, the need for replacement parts increases.

There are essentially 3 stages to the DTV conversion. The first is the period of build out. At this point in the process, the new DTV is being installed and tested on a new channel assigned by the FCC. NETC currently uses channel 7 in Bassett for NTSC (analog) transmission. We have been assigned channel 15 for an interim DTV channel. For a period of some years we will have to transmit full power NTSC and interim power DTV simultaneously. This is the second or simulcast phase of the conversion. Whenever the FCC authorizes termination of NTSC transmission, we will have to select a permanent DTV channel and use it. This DTV-only time will be the third stage of the conversion and it will then be complete. For a number of technical reasons, a lower channel assignment is preferred to a higher channel assignment. This means that when we reach the final step we will need to convert the NTSC transmitter to a DTV transmitter to occupy channel 7 and give channel 15 back to the federal government. By occupying channel 7 our electrical costs will be significantly lower than if we were to keep channel 15 instead. This is why we are only operating the interim DTV channel at an interim power and not at full power.

When the NETC eliminates NTSC transmissions in favor of DTV in the Bassett area per FCC regulations, the new transmitter will easily convert to digital. This is expected to occur sometime after 2006. The current transmitter is becoming problematic, and will not convert to digital at all.

The Commission anticipates funding from the federal Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) for 40% of the cost of this equipment. The State's portion is considered by PTFP as matching funds.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2) | Total |
|--------|-------------------------------|-------|
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | $ 650,000.00 | $ 650,000.00 |
| 8.4 Other | Installation included in hardware cost | $ - |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 650,000.00 | $ 650,000.00 |
| General Funds | $ 390,000.00 | $ 390,000.00 |
| Federal Funds | $ 260,000.00 | $ 260,000.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 650,000.00 | $ 650,000.00 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14.0 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 24 | 21 | 23.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18.3 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9.3 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 8 | 9 | 6 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 19 | 18 | 16 | 17.7 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 90 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- They did an excellent job of explaining the project, describing the outcomes and measurements, and the relationship to the agency IT plan.
- Benefits were well defined and the DTV conversion process was explained adequately.
- The technical impact statement and the issues surrounding reliability, security and scalability were all addressed very well.
- Implementation plan is well defined. All other issues were addressed well.
- Most of the risks were well defined and discussed with strategies of minimize the risk.
- Appears to be appropriate and well explained. Bottom line is that the State needs to decide whether we wish to continue to offer this service or not. If we decide to offer services in this area, we really have not choice but to replace the transmitter.

Weaknesses
- I did not really understand the comment under risks that talked about "NETC will ask to combine funds from that project and this in order to complete the KLNE project in the FY04-05 biennium." Does this mean that one project is more important than the other?

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- NETC has a track record or having done this type of thing before so has the goals of the project down. The fact that a federal mandate exists to complete this project somehow will limit the options available.
- Again, not doing anything is not an option due to federal mandate. Don't know about the economic return on the investment but to not complete the project would be costly. It is hard to measure the economic impact of a tv channel on a community but the intangible of a Nebraska city having access to NETV is important.
- Application touched on the ability to upgrade if the opportunity is presented and also seems prepared for potential of replacing parts. This system would be compatible with the statewide infrastructure and the federal mandate.
- Everything seems to be in order as it should be since this is not a new process to NETV. The process for making the change and training the staff seems feasible.
- Risks are minimal since this process has been used before. Main risk would seem to be in not complying with federal mandates. The application seems to outline a manner in which the delay of the process could be addressed without endangering the broadcast license.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Good overview of the project. Obviously, NETC has done this before.
- Good explanation of the technology.
- NETC has a good engineering staff to implement these projects.

Weaknesses
- The only weakness is the lack of estimates for the savings from reduced electricity and maintenance.

**Project # 47-03**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| NET | Phone System Replacement / Switch Upgrade | $0 | $198,000 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the telephone system at the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) building.

Telephone services are part of the core of the NETC business infrastructure. The most recent example of this type of service is the "State of Nebraska AMBER Project". This project uses a dedicated phone line to route the State Patrol dispatcher AMBER Alert notifications to NET's on air switcher. Many other essential services such as the Nebraska Video Conferencing Network (NVCN) and the NEB*Sat Help Desk rely on our phone services. Phone and voice mail communications are essential to the organization for internal business processes and inter-departmental communication as well.

The NET Telephone System Project addresses the replacement of an aging Nortel 51C PBX in use at NET, upgrade to or replacement of the Merridian switch, replacement of phone sets and the attendant console. The Nortel 51C platform is no longer sold and while parts are still available, the system will be phased out. Alltel has confirmed this in a letter sent to NET on August 22nd of this year. This system replacement request addresses future options and considerations such as VOIP (voice-over-IP). This will insure NET's investment provides flexibility to take advantage of new telecommunications technology while still addressing current telecomm industry standards.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|  | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2) | Total |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | $ - | | $ 179,903.00 | $ 179,903.00 |
| 8.2 Software | | | | $ - |
| 8.3 Network | | | | $ - |
| 8.4 Other | | | $ 18,097.00 | $ 18,097.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ - | $ - | $ 198,000.00 | $ 198,000.00 |
| General Funds | | | $ 198,000.00 | $ 198,000.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ - | $ - | $ 198,000.00 | $ 198,000.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------------|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 10 | 13 | 12 | 11.7 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 16 | 22 | 22 | 20.0 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 13 | 18 | 17 | 16.0 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 8 | 9 | 7.7 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 6 | 8 | 8 | 7.3 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 13 | 20 | 15 | 16.0 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **79** | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Agency makes a solid case for a replacement telephone system, not necessarily the technology that they have chosen.
- A strong case was made for the technical issues facing NET if they continue with their current voice solution.
- Appears that the agency attempted to get a quote from their current provider to create a budgetary number.

Weaknesses
- There is a statement indicating that they are a subset of the University system but I do not see any input from the University Telecomm Center. Additionally, the customers they mention are not requiring an IP solution, so it is unclear that an IP solution is necessary to supply the needed telephony change. NET also indicates that they are replacing their voice mail system but not with this purchase. Why? How can they be sure that these systems will be compatible?
- Again, the business case is made for a new telephony solution - not necessarily an IP solution. A statement is made that "selecting systems capable of both technologies is not more expensive …" Without any supporting documentation, it is difficult to comprehend that this could be true. There is a statement that "the University has no plans to adopt IP telephony". If this system is a subset of the University, isn't this problematic?
- Is there a requirement on an IP system to change out all analog sets to digital sets? This represents $36,000 of the expenditure. The proposed system may be IP capable, but will it require additional software costs to enable IP extension ports or tie line ports? Will there be additional Teleco charges to make the connection between the Central Office? It is difficult to identify the warranty issues related to this system.
- The implementation schedule appears to be aggressive considering the RFP process that should/would take place. Administration of an IP Telephony system would require additional training that I don't see accounted for in this document. Does NET have the appropriate staff to maintain this type of system and all issues related to Moves, Adds and Changes? Are the current maintenance fees sufficient to cover an expense for maintaining a fairly complex system?
- The weaknesses did not identify any issues related to operation of an IP solution. How are the issues related to E911 resolved? How is the issue of the University infrastructure not considering IP telephony create a barrier? Has NET considered a traditional system that has the ability for future upgrade?
- This project indicates in the financials the need for assistance and expertise from an entity that is in the voice telecommunications business that does not have a vested interest such as a vendor. The cost for this system appears to be on the high side. Without much effort, we were able to identify almost $23,000 in savings on this quote for just the sets. There is not disagreement that this system needs to be replaced. We would encourage the agency to work with the appropriate telecommunications entity to identify needs, functions and the appropriate technology to address these issues.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- The 51C will probably stop being sold in 2003. Nortel apparently does not have a set time period that they will support a product after they quit selling it. It is in NET's best interests to begin evaluating alternatives to replace the 51C.
- Looking at a flexible solution is an excellent plan. While VoIP solutions are readily available they still have some issues to be worked out. It appears the 61C, if chosen, would provide NET the opportunity to either stick with traditional telephony service, or incorporate IP telephony as it becomes more widely accepted as the trend of the future.

- If the 61C is selected there are multiple vendors locally available to provide various levels of support on an ongoing basis.  NET would continue to be able to support programs within both the State and University environments.
- Good, attainable milestones.  Staff will be prepared to support the new system with a little additional training.
- I like the attention that has been given to not wanting to commit NET to a solution that may not fit into the long term picture of the State or UNL's telecom systems.
- I think the budget is well put together and accurate of what the costs will be, and includes the materials and equipment needed.

Weaknesses
- Are there specific features or functionalities that an upgraded system will bring that aren't available on the current system?
- What other alternatives are available.  A large portion of service to other University and State agencies is provided via centrex.  How does this compare to the 36 or 60 month costs of buying, installing and supporting a new PBX?
- What else can the 61C, or Cisco's Call Manager do for NET.  Any specific opportunities to expand or improve services or to increase operating efficiencies?
- At some point in time NET may be required to provide the 911 center with a database, updated in real time, of station locations.  No mention of that potential need is made in this plan in terms of what might be required for ongoing support.
- What other IP solutions did you look into.  Does the fact that they are highly proprietary create any issues in terms of being tied to a particular vendor for all of your needs?  What types of licensing issues will there be as people want to experiment with "soft phones"?

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Clear explanation of project and beneficiaries.
- Current system reaching end of its useful life. Reasonable product research and evaluation. Current platform not sustainable. Integral part of meeting statutory objectives.
- Description of system and the technical elements. Platform will be flexible, scalable and offers variety of features.
- Project team identified including their roles and responsibilities. Time line adequate and achievable. Training and support addressed.
- Identifies risk of extending life of current system. Maintenance agreement focus.
- Budget estimated cost appears to be inclusive of the list of hardware and software.

Weaknesses
- Significant emphasis on IP telephony. No state or federal mandate.
- Strengths and weaknesses of proposal based on analog versus IP configuration.
- Limited information on preliminary plans. Insufficient training prior to cutover.
- Limited discussion of barriers. Tier contract could bind NETV to a system that may not meet expectations.

## Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

**Project # 78-01**

| Agency | Project | FY2003-04 | FY2004-05 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Crime Commission / CJIS | CJIS - Criminal Justice Integration and Automation | $1,020,112 | $790,112 |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In 1995 the Crime Commission created the CJIS Advisory Committee (Criminal Justice Information System) in response to an identified need for a standing body to work on information technology needs and data sharing among state and local agencies. There are 26 standing members of the committee including all major state criminal justice agencies, professional associations and larger jurisdictions. While the Crime Commission is not an operational agency this cooperative project is hosted by the Commission due to its contact and interaction with various parts of the criminal justice system.

CJIS has undertaken strategic planning initiatives as well as significant programs to share data (through a secure Internet based data warehouse), to implement local automation and others. CJIS does not encompass nor supercede other initiatives by state or local agencies. Instead it provides a way to both initiate projects that need a collaborative sponsor as well as a forum for state and local agencies to bring issues on data sharing to the forefront. The efforts of CJIS and the Crime Commission reflect ongoing needs and the budget proposal is the culmination of past initiatives and current priorities. It should be noted that general funds are primarily used for ongoing project management and support in addition to project maintenance. Federal grant funds have provided the bulk of monies for project implementation.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1) | Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2) | Request for FY2005-06 (Year 3) | Request for FY2006-07 (Year 4) | Future | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Personnel Costs | $ 186,000.00 | $ 76,209.00 | $ 76,209.00 | $ 78,000.00 | $ 80,000.00 | $ 80,000.00 | $ 576,418.00 |
| 2. Contractual Services | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Design | $ 3,000,000.00 | $ 500,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 4,700,000.00 |
| 2.2 Programming | $ 3,000,000.00 | $ 400,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 4,600,000.00 |
| 2.3 Project Management | $ 26,369.00 | $ 17,403.00 | $ 67,403.00 | $ 75,500.00 | $ 83,500.00 | $ 83,500.00 | $ 353,675.00 |
| 2.4 Other | | | | | | | $ - |
| 3. Supplies and Materials | $ 5,000.00 | $ 1,000.00 | $ 1,000.00 | $ 1,000.00 | $ 1,000.00 | $ 1,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 |
| 4. Telecommunications | | | | | | | $ - |
| 5. Training | | | | | | | $ - |
| 6. Travel | $ 10,000.00 | $ 12,500.00 | $ 12,500.00 | $ 12,500.00 | $ 12,500.00 | $ 12,500.00 | $ 72,500.00 |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | | | | | | | $ - |
| 8. Capital Expenditures | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 Hardware | $ 50,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 | $ 10,000.00 | $ 100,000.00 |
| 8.2 Software | $ 100,000.00 | $ 23,000.00 | $ 23,000.00 | $ 23,000.00 | $ 23,000.00 | $ 23,000.00 | $ 215,000.00 |
| **TOTAL COSTS** | $ 6,377,369.00 | $ 1,040,112.00 | $ 790,112.00 | $ 800,000.00 | $ 810,000.00 | $ 810,000.00 | $ 10,627,593.00 |
| General Funds | $ 2,073,714.00 | $ 290,112.00 | $ 290,112.00 | $ 300,000.00 | $ 310,000.00 | $ 310,000.00 | $ 3,573,938.00 |
| Cash Funds | $ 250,000.00 | $ 250,000.00 | | $ 500,000.00 | | | $ 1,000,000.00 |
| Federal Funds | $ 4,053,925.00 | $ 500,000.00 | $ 500,000.00 | | $ 500,000.00 | $ 500,000.00 | $ 6,053,925.00 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS** | $ 6,377,639.00 | $ 1,040,112.00 | $ 790,112.00 | $ 800,000.00 | $ 810,000.00 | $ 810,000.00 | $ 10,627,863.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 14 | 14 | 13.7 | 15 |
| IV: Project Justification / Business Case | 20 | 24 | 20 | 21.3 | 25 |
| V: Technical Impact | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18.0 | 20 |
| IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8.3 | 10 |
| VII: Risk Assessment | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9.0 | 10 |
| VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget | 16 | 18 | 20 | 18.0 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **88** | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:
- The score would have been higher if the proposal had focused more on those initiatives to be undertaken with this budget request.

Reviewer 2:
- Score is based on the quality of the planning and review process already in place for CJIS. Lack of detailed information on specific projects in this request is mitigated by documentation and review process used for CJIS projects.
- Federal funds are the primary source for project funding.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Excellent summary of CJIS project history, investment, strategy and scope. and priority This project is clearly and priority for the Crime Commission and important to Nebraska.
- Good justification of project in broad terms.
- CJIS clearly represents progress in data sharing.
- Good summary of stakeholders and milestones
- Risks have been identified
- Budget appears sound assuming general funds, cash funds and federal funds are available.
Weaknesses
- Lack of detail for the major investment categories of planning and programming and clarity of what capabilities for CJIS are current versus planned.
- Weak in projecting the estimate of financial and community safety payback.  How many investigations per year save 45 minutes to 2hours - what is the "effectiveness" increase from access to more data? How many law enforcement agencies are targeted to use CJIS?  How many small police departments.  What new capabilities are enabled?
- It is not clear how the software examples given will be integrated into the CJIS technical architecture nor how broadly they will be implemented in Nebraska.
- It is not clear where the bulk of the FY2003-2004 expenses -  $ 900,000 for design and programming are going.
- Local applications and integration will continue to be challenges for CJIS.