

MEETING AGENDA

Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Tuesday, October 14, 2008
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents: Click the links in the agenda.

or

[All Documents](#) (xx pages)

[All Documents, except the full text of projects](#) (xx pages)

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes* - [September 9, 2008](#)
4. Standards and Guidelines
 - Recommendations to the NITC *
 - [NITC 1-203](#): Project Status Reporting
 - Comments Received (None)
 - [NITC 1-205](#): Enterprise Projects
 - [Comments Received](#) (1)
 - [NITC 5-202](#): Blocking Email Attachments (Revised)
 - Comments Received (None)
 - [NITC 8-301](#): Password Standard (Revised)
 - Comments Received (None)
5. Project Reviews
 - Ongoing Reviews (as needed)
 - Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown and Robin Goracke
 - Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS - James Ohmberger
 - Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System
 - Project Proposals - FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget - Recommendation to the NITC*
 - [Project summary sheets](#) (29 pages)
 - [Full text of the projects](#) (94 pages)
6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)
 - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Horn
 - Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Langer
 - Security Architecture Work Group - Hartman
 - Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group - Winkle
7. Other Business
8. Next Meeting Date - December 9, 2008
9. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Item

(The Technical Panel will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda, but reserves the right to adjust the order of items if necessary and may elect to take action on any of the items listed.)

NITC and Technical Panel websites: <http://nitc.ne.gov/>

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on October 1, 2008. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 10, 2008.

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**
Tuesday, September 9, 2008, 9:00-10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Mike Winkle, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. There were five members present at the time of roll call. A quorum was present. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on August 22, 2008. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on September 5, 2008. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall of the meeting room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 12, 2008 MINUTES

Ms. Decker moved to approve the [August 12, 2008](#) meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Winkle-Yes. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS - ONGOING REVIEWS (as needed)

Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown and Robin Goracke

[\(Handouts\)](#)

Phase II final signoff has been completed on all functional area requirements. Phase II Development continues at Saber's offshore site in India, with 14 of the 15 functional areas completed. The one remaining functional area is Optional Service Credit (OSC). Saber has projected that we will receive the modules for IT testing around mid-October, 2008.

Phase III (Batch) Requirements Validation sign-off has been completed on all functional areas. Phase III (Batch) Development is in progress with 11 of the 16 functional areas completed, 4 are in progress and 1 (OSC) has not been started.

IT staff testing of Phase II and III began on August 27th with two (2) functional areas and continued on September 2nd with four (4) additional functional areas. Again, there are 19 functional areas that are being monitored for the testing activity. The user staff is scheduled to start testing the week of September 22nd.

The testing members will create a defect document for each defect they discover. These will be tracked at a weekly defect meeting and reported to the Steering Committee in the form of statistics. The production servers have been installed. Saber and the NPERS infrastructure support staff are in the process of configuring and testing the production environment this week.

The project end date has not changed and it is within budget.

Drop Plan. Implementation into production occurred on August 29, 2008. There are still a couple of issues with the interface to Ameritas, but these will be corrected before the interface runs at the end of September.

The Quality Assurance team has completed QA Phase III activities. This review identified four (4) high risk findings that, if addressed quickly, could be rectified before there is a significant impact on the project. These identified the need to more thoroughly follow the Project Management Plan, keeping the Requirements Traceability Matrix more current, and keeping the Project Plan more current.

The Office of the CIO Security Team completed the first Security Validation process on August 8, 2008. The risk results indicated the following security issues:

- 100% Application-related Security Issues (60 out of a total of 60 issues).
- Application-related Security Issues can usually be fixed by application developers, as they result from defects in the application code.
- 0% Infrastructure and Platform Security Issues (0 out of a total 60 issues).

Saber is in the process of addressing the issues.

The project has decided to utilize SQL rather than Cognos and has saved the project approximately \$62,000 in Cognos licensing fees. For next month's meeting, Mr. Brown will bring plans for long-range support for the NPRIS project.

Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS - James Ohmberger. No report.

Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System, Ed Hoffman

The project has been in vendor negotiations for past two months. The project negotiator commented that the State of Nebraska achieved in a matter of months what others have taken years to accomplish. Oracle and CedarCrestone have been selected. Both vendors agreed to the fixed priced negotiations with payments associated with milestone completions. The project will have a shared hardware platform located in Lincoln.

Both projects are now moving towards a centralized approach. There will be a two side-by-side implementations due to the academic policy difference between the two entities. There may be a point where differences in policy may need a decision and these will be addressed as they occur. The implementation team will be located at 56th and O Streets. The first joint meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 12.

PROJECT REVIEWS - COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY FUND [GRANT APPLICATIONS](#)

NeHII Proposal

Deb Bass and Chris Henkenius, Bass and Associates; Dr. Harris Frankel, President, NeHII (via phone); and Anne Byers, Office of the CIO

Goal: to create a statewide health information exchange (HIE) for the betterment of patient care in the state. Once implemented, the system would enable physicians statewide to view consolidated patient medical history at the point of care, improving safety and care delivery while reducing duplicate or redundant procedures.

At the last meeting, the Technical Panel found the project technical feasible but had concerns about the financial obligation. NeHII has been meeting with the stakeholders as well as with the NITC eHealth Council. The project has also met with the Governor and he is very interested in seeing the pilot demonstration. The University of Nebraska-Omaha and the Peter Kewitt Institute will be working with the project to provide Level 1 support. The project is in negotiations with the selected vendor, Axolotl.

The project is requesting \$100,000 for the year long pilot project. If successful, Axolotl's estimate for the pilot's framework is approximately \$355,000 a year plus \$107,000 initial set-up fee. Axolotl is requesting a 5-year commitment. The pilot contract can be terminated within the first year if it is not meeting the project's needs. Within three months, five hospitals and over 700 physicians will be using the system. Ms. Byers stated that the eHealth Council and Lieutenant Governor Sheehy realize the financial concern.

Bass Association is currently meeting with medical foundations. Alegent Health and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nebraska have been funding the operation to this point. NeHII has also asked the Governor for \$1 million dollars for the next five years out of the Medicaid budget. Lt. Governor Sheehy recommended that NeHII submit a request similar to the Public Service Commission's licensing fee expenses. The project is also exploring federal grants that would match state dollars. It is anticipated that the project would be self-sufficient by end of third year by means of subscription and usage fees as well as contribution. If state funds are approved, the Technical Panel would be again be involved in a technical review of the project.

Mr. Winkle moved to forward the NeHII proposal to the NITC for consideration noting that the project is technically feasible and the proposed technology is appropriate for the project but that the NITC needs to understand the financial risk associated with the project's completion due to ongoing funding efforts. The NITC should also be aware that additional public requests could come back to both the Technical Panel and the NITC for future approval. Ms. Decker seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Motion carried.

Nebraska Public Policy Center Proposal
Anne Byers, Community I.T. Manager

Goal: The overall goal of the proposed project is to obtain perspectives of Nebraskans about electronic sharing of health information, and in particular, perspectives about legal and policy issues currently under consideration by the NITC, HISPC, e-Health council, and other state policymakers and advisory groups.

Ms. Decker moved that there were no technical aspects of the proposal for the panel to review and to forward the proposal to the NITC for their action. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS - BIENNIAL BUDGET - PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS

Rick Becker, Government I.T. Manager

Mr. Becker reviewed the [Timeline](#) and [Reviewer Scoring Sheet](#) that will be used for this biennium. There were no recommended changes and/or additions.

Panel members did not have any recommendations, changes and/or additions to the "[Three Questions](#)" addressed in the technical review for I.T. budget requests and proposals.

Ms. Horn left the meeting.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - SET FOR 30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Becker reviewed the NITC 1-203: Project Status Reporting and the NITC 1-205: Enterprise Projects Standards. These were required duties of the NITC that were discussed in the Performance Review.

Mr. Winkle moved to post the [NITC 1-203: Project Status Reporting](#) and [NITC 1-205: Enterprise Projects](#) for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, Sydik-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Motion carried.

Discussion - Update on Password Standard Recommendations

Mr. Hartman distributed copies of the revised. The work group recommendation is that items covered under section 1.2 would be handled at the OCIO or SAWG to address. Items in section 1.1 would come before the Technical Panel for waiver approval.

Mr. Winkle moved to post the revised [Password Standard Recommendations](#) for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Sydik seconded. Roll call vote: Sydik-Yes, Decker-Yes, Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Langer-Yes. Motion carried.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group – Horn. Mr. Sydik reported that the office has been receiving questions about the Target lawsuit.

Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Langer. An adhoc group has been assembled to look at content management and is looking at reasonable response to the NROC issue.

Security Architecture Work Group – Hartman. Mr. Hartman presented information in the standards and guidelines portion of the meeting.

Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group – Winkle. Informational meetings have occurred with the Nebraska Department of Education, Rick Golden of the University of Nebraska, and Gordon Roethemeyer, Distance Education Council. Mr. Roethemeyer had provided a list of possible members to serve on the work group. The work group will be meeting soon. Mr. Winkle would like to have a draft of the standard for the October 14 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held at 9:00 a.m. on October 14 , 2008.

Mr. Langer moved to adjourned. Ms. Decker seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO.

NITC 1-203 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document 30-Day Comment Period

Title: Project Status Reporting

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/>.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on October 10, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at <http://nitc.ne.gov/>.

**State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines**

NITC 1-203 (Draft)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Title | Project Status Reporting |
| Category | General Provisions |
| Applicability | Applies only to projects designated by the NITC |

1. Purpose

By statute, the NITC may require progress reports for information technology projects utilizing state appropriated funding. Not all projects will be required to submit progress reports, only those projects specifically designated by the NITC will be subject to these these reporting requirements. The purpose of this policy is to establish the procedures for designating such projects, to establish the format to be used for progress reports, and to assign responsibilities to the Technical Panel.

2. Statutes

2.1 Section 86-516 Commission; duties.

" The Commission shall:

...

(5) Adopt guidelines regarding project planning and management and administrative and

technical review procedures involving state-owned or state-supported technology and infrastructure. Governmental entities, state agencies, and political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions. The commission may monitor the progress of any such project and may require progress reports;" [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516]

2.2 Section 86-529 Enterprise project; commission; duties.

"To implement enterprise projects pursuant to sections 86-525 to 86-530, the commission shall:

- (1) Develop procedures and issue guidelines regarding the review, approval, and monitoring of enterprise projects; and
- (2) Coordinate with the Chief Information Officer to monitor the status of enterprise projects, including a complete accounting of all project costs by fund source." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-529]

3. Projects Required to Submit Status Reports

The NITC will designate which projects are required to submit project status reports. The agency/entity primarily responsible for the project will be notified of such designation.

4. Project Status Report Format

Unless an alternative format is approved by the Technical Panel, Attachment A is the format to be used for project status reports.

5. Technical Panel Responsibilities

The Technical Panel is responsible for all logistical matters relating to project status reports, including determining the frequency and deadlines for submission. The Technical Panel will coordinate with the reporting agency/entity to ensure compliance with this policy.

The Technical Panel will provide updates to the NITC on the status of projects.

[Attachment A: Project Status Form](#)

VERSION DATE: DRAFT - September 5, 2008
HISTORY:
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

Project Status Form

| General Information | | | |
|--|-------|-------|----------------------|
| Project Name | | | Date |
| Sponsoring Agency | | | |
| Contact | Phone | Email | Employer |
| Project Manager | Phone | Email | Employer |
| Key Questions | | | Explanation (if Yes) |
| 1. Has the project scope of work changed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | |
| 2. Will upcoming target dates be missed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | |
| 3. Does the project team have resource constraints? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | |
| 4. Are there problems or concerns that require stakeholder or top management attention? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | |

| Project Metrics | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Measure | Numbers | Percent Complete |
| Tasks Complete | [13 of 54] | [24%] |
| Tasks in Progress | [26 of 54] | [48%] |
| Tasks not Started | [28 of 54] | [52%] |
| Time spent | [18 of 86 weeks] | [21%] |
| Time remaining | [68 of 86 weeks] | [79%] |
| [Project Specific Measure] | | |

Summary Project Status

Based on the color legend below, indicate green, yellow, or red for the reporting periods of each item. Any item classified as red or yellow requires an explanation in the comment boxes that follow this section. Additional priority items can be added to the list for status reporting.

| Select one color in each of the Reporting Period columns to indicate your best assessment of: | Last Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY] | | | This Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY] | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Overall Project Status | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green |
| 2. Schedule | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green |
| 3. Budget (capital, overall project hours) | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green |
| 4. Scope | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green |
| 5. Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green | <input type="checkbox"/> Red | <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow | <input type="checkbox"/> Green |

Color Legend

| | | |
|--|--------|--|
| | Red | Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement. “Probable that item will NOT meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope”. |
| | Yellow | Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning. “Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed”. |
| | Green | Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. “Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality”. |

Product and/or Service Performance

| Performance Standard | Meets | Exceeds | Below | Explanation |
|----------------------|-------|---------|-------|-------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Milestones Planned and Accomplished | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Milestone | Original Date | Revised Date | Actual Date |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Milestones Planned and Not Accomplished | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| For each item listed, provide a corresponding explanation of the effect of this missed item on other target dates and provide the plan to recover from this missed item. | | | |
| Milestone | Original Date | Revised Date | Effect on Other Dates/Plan |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Milestones Planned for Next Period | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| Milestone | Original Date | Revised Date |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Decision Points | | | |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| For each item listed, provide a corresponding explanation of the effect of this item on other target dates, scope or cost and provide the responsible parties name. The responsible party will ensure the decision is made and carried out. | | | |
| Decision Point | Decision Due Date | Deciders Name or Names | Decisions Effect on Project |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Project Issues | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Description | Impact on Project - (H,M,L) | Date Resolution is Needed | Issue Resolution Assigned to | Date Resolved |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Footnote: High, Medium, Low Impact.

High- "project killer" major impact on project time, scope, cost. Issue must be resolved! - **Medium**- impact will moderately effect project time, scope, cost. - **Low**- Issue will not impact project delivery

| Comparison of Budgeted to Actual Expenditures | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Use a chart like the following to show actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate. | | | | |
| Fiscal Year [YYYY] | | | | |
| Budget Item | Actual Costs to Date | Estimate to Complete | Total Estimated Costs | Total Planned Budget |
| Salaries | | | | |
| Contract Services | | | | |
| Hardware | | | | |
| Software | | | | |
| Training | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Other Expenditures* | | | | |
| Total Costs | | | | |
| Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc. | | | | |

| Risks Management | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Major Risk Events | High Medium Low | Risk Mitigation | Mitigation Responsible Party |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Additional Comments / Concerns |
|---------------------------------------|
| |

NITC 1-205 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document 30-Day Comment Period

Title: Enterprise Projects

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/>.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on October 10, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at <http://nitc.ne.gov/>.

**State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines**

NITC 1-205 (Draft)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Title | Enterprise Projects |
| Category | General Provisions |
| Applicability | Applies only to projects designated by the NITC |

1. Purpose

By statute, the NITC "shall determine which proposed information technology projects are enterprise projects." Enterprise projects must comply with certain statutory requirements including the submission of a project plan and compliance with monitoring requirements. The purpose of this policy is to document the procedures regarding the designation, review, approval, and monitoring of enterprise projects.

2. Statutes

Section 86-506 Enterprise project, defined.

"Enterprise project means an endeavor undertaken over a fixed period of time using information technology, which would have a significant effect on a core business function or affects multiple government programs, agencies, or institutions. Enterprise project includes all aspects of planning, design, implementation, project management,

and training relating to the endeavor." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-506]

Section 86-525 Enterprise project; legislative findings.

"In addition to the findings in section 86-513, the Legislature also finds that:

- (1) The effective, efficient, and cost-effective operation of state government requires that information be considered and managed as a strategic resource;
- (2) Information technologies present numerous opportunities to more effectively manage the information necessary for state government operations;
- (3) Information technologies are changing and advancing at a very rapid rate, increasing the computing power available to individual users;
- (4) The commission should have the responsibility to establish goals, guidelines, and priorities for information technology infrastructure; and
- (5) Periodic investments in the information technology infrastructure are required to develop and maintain the foundation for the effective use of information technologies throughout state government." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-525]

Section 86-526 Enterprise project; designation.

"The commission shall determine which proposed information technology projects are enterprise projects. The commission shall create policies and procedures for the designation of such projects. The commission shall evaluate designated enterprise project plans as authorized in section 86-528." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-526]

Section 86-527 Information Technology Infrastructure Fund; created; use; investment.

"The Information Technology Infrastructure Fund is hereby created. The fund shall contain revenue from the special privilege tax as provided in section 77-2602, gifts, grants, and such other money as is appropriated or transferred by the Legislature. The fund shall be used to attain the goals and priorities identified in the statewide technology plan. The fund shall be administered by the office of Chief Information Officer. Expenditures shall be made from the fund to finance the operations of the Information Technology Infrastructure Act in accordance with the appropriations made by the Legislature. Transfers from the fund to the General Fund may be made at the direction of the Legislature. Any money in the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund available for investment shall be invested by the state investment officer pursuant to the Nebraska Capital Expansion Act and the Nebraska State Funds Investment Act." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-527]

Section 86-528 Enterprise project; funding.

"(1) The Legislature may allocate money from the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund for enterprise projects. The Legislature may recognize multiple-year commitments for large projects, subject to available appropriations, including remaining obligations for the century date change project managed by the department.

(2) No contract or expenditure for the implementation of an enterprise project may be initiated unless the commission has approved a project plan. The project plan shall include, but not be limited to, the objectives, scope, and justification of the project; detailed specifications and analyses that guide the project from beginning to conclusion; technical requirements; and project management. The commission may request clarification, require changes, or provide conditional approval of a project plan. In its review, the commission shall determine whether the objectives, scope, timeframe, and budget of the project are consistent with the proposal authorized by the Legislature in its allocation from the fund.

(3) The commission may also evaluate whether the project plan is consistent with the statewide technology plan and the commission's technical standards and guidelines." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-528]

Section 86-529 Enterprise project; commission; duties.

"To implement enterprise projects pursuant to sections 86-525 to 86-530, the commission shall:

- (1) Develop procedures and issue guidelines regarding the review, approval, and monitoring of enterprise projects; and
- (2) Coordinate with the Chief Information Officer to monitor the status of enterprise projects, including a complete accounting of all project costs by fund source." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-529]

Section 86-530 Enterprise project; report.

"The Chief Information Officer shall report annually to the Governor and the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature on the status of enterprise projects." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-530]

3. Enterprise Projects Designation

The NITC will designate which information technology projects are enterprise projects. The designation will be based on the following criteria: 1) the project must meet the definition contained in Neb. Rev. Stat § 86-506; 2) whether or not the project has received an allocation of funding from the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-528; 3) any recommendations from the Technical Panel or other advisory council of the NITC; and 4) such other factors as the NITC deems appropriate, including but not limited to the size, scope, and complexity of the project. An enterprise project designation shall only be made by the NITC at a public meeting and after the agency/entity primarily responsible for the project has had an opportunity to comment on the issue.

4. Requirements for Enterprise Projects

A project which has been designated as an enterprise project must comply with certain statutory responsibilities, including submission of a project plan and submission of periodic status reports. The Technical Panel will coordinate with the agency/entity primarily responsible for an enterprise project to ensure compliance with this policy.

4.1 Project Plan

Each enterprise project shall submit a project plan. The project plan shall include, but not be limited to, the objectives, scope, and justification of the project; detailed specifications and analyses that guide the project from beginning to conclusion; technical requirements; and project management.

4.1.1 Format

Unless an alternative format is approved by the Technical Panel, Attachment B to NITC 1-202 is the format to be used for the project plan.

4.1.2 Review and Approval

The Technical Panel shall review all project plans and provide recommendations to the NITC. The NITC may approve the project plan, request clarification, require changes, or provide conditional approval of a project plan.

4.2 Project Monitoring

Enterprise projects shall provide project status reports as set forth in NITC 1-203.

5. Annual Report

The NITC will assist the Chief Information Officer as requested to prepare an annual report to the Governor and the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature on the status of enterprise projects.

VERSION DATE: DRAFT - September 5, 2008
HISTORY:
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

Becker, Rick

From: randy.cecrle@wcc.ne.gov
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 9:03 AM
To: Becker, Rick
Subject: Comments on Enterprise Projects Draft

http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/20080910/1-205_DRAFT_comment.html

My response is simply, "Its about time!".

Systems that should have been implemented at an enterprise level have not because of a funding model that required government entities with like needs to come together and fund the project.

That philosophy is nice in principle, but a disaster in practicality. That model only works if the timing is right and all the "government entity stars" align themselves to come together and fund the startup of such efforts. If one government entity had the vision to see a need, but others at that level did not, then that entity had to foot the startup costs completely. For that reason government entities have picked solutions that they could afford but were not scalable to an enterprise level. Then when the next entity had a need another solution was created.

Over my 13+ years in state government I have only participated in one collaborative project where more than one entity came together to fund the startup. That project was the current state government enterprise e-fax system.

NWCC in its re-engineering analysis of its systems recognized the need to have electronic fax for both outbound and inbound if it was ever going to meet the goal of being paperless efficiently (i.e. that is not scanning paper). At the same time bio-terrorism was the big issue and funds were available to then HHSS. The two government entities came together along with the OCIO and funded the startup costs for the system and turned it over to the OCIO for management and marketing.

I have also participated in failed efforts, such as back a number of years where there was an attempt to get into enterprise content management (document management, capture, etc.). Now there are a number different document/content management systems in different entities.

I hope that the NITC has the information, wisdom, and vision to now identify the enterprise projects and the will to move them forward.

Randall Cecrle, FLMI
IT Manager / Oracle DBA
Nebraska Workers' Compensation Court
TierOne Center - 1221 'N' Street, Suite 402 PO 98908 Lincoln, NE 68509-8908
Phn: 1-402-471-2976
Fax: 1-402-471-2700

<IT.Manager@wcc.ne.gov>

<Randy.Cecrle@wcc.ne.gov>

<http://www.wcc.ne.gov/>

"Good faith, honesty, and integrity"

NITC 5-202 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document 30-Day Comment Period

Title: Blocking Email Attachments

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/>.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on September 12, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at <http://nitc.ne.gov/>.

**State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines**

NITC 5-202 (Draft)

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Title | Blocking Email Attachments |
| Category | Groupware Architecture |
| Applicability | Applies to all state government agencies, excluding higher education |

1. Purpose

It is important to take steps to protect the state's computing environment against the threat of viruses. Email attachments with certain extensions are often used in virus attacks because of their execution access and the amount of damage they can cause. Therefore, the State of Nebraska prohibits certain attachments from being transmitted through email.

2. Standard

2.1 Removing Prohibited Attachments Before Delivery

The SMTP gateway will remove any prohibited attachments before allowing the email to be delivered. If any of the blocked extensions are detected, the attachment will be deleted and a message stating that the attachment was blocked will be included in the email message.

2.2 List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

Attachment A, entitled "List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked," contains the current listing of attachments which will be blocked by the State of Nebraska.

2.3 Alternative Methods for Sending or Receiving Files

If an individual needs to send or receive a file with one of the blocked extensions, other alternatives for transmitting files should be considered, such as: Secure file transfers (sFTP / FTPS) or Web-based document retrieval.

Attachment A: List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

VERSION DATE: DRAFT - August 6, 2008
HISTORY: Original version adopted on November 13, 2003.
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

| Extension - Description | Internal ¹ | Inbound |
|---|-----------------------|---------|
| ade – Access Project extension (Microsoft) | X | |
| adp – Access Project (Microsoft) | X | |
| app – Executable Application | X | |
| asp – Active Server Page | X | |
| bas – Basic | X | X |
| bat – Batch | X | X |
| cer – Internet Security Certificate File | X | |
| chm – Compiled HTML Help | X | |
| cmd – Command | X | X |
| com – Command, executable | X | X |
| cpl – Control panel applet | X | X |
| crt – Certificate File | X | |
| csh – csh Script | X | |
| exe – Executable program | X | X |
| fxp – FoxPro Compiled Source (Microsoft) | X | |
| gadget – Windows Vista gadget | X | |
| hlp – Windows Help File | X | |
| hta – HTML application | X | X |
| inf – set up | X | X |
| ins – Internet communications settings | X | X |
| isp – Internet communications settings | X | X |
| its – Internet Document Set, Internet Translation | X | |
| js – JScript | X | X |
| jse – JScript encoded file | X | X |
| ksh – UNIX Shell Script | X | |
| Ink – Shortcut | X | X |
| mad – Access Module Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| maf – Access (Microsoft) | X | |
| mag – Access Diagram Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| mam – Access Macro Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| maq – Access Query Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| mar – Access Report Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| mas – Access Stored Procedure (Microsoft) | X | |
| mat – Access Table Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| mau – Executable Media file | X | |
| mav – Access View Shortcut (Microsoft) | X | |
| maw – Access Data Access Page (Microsoft) | X | |
| mda – Access Add-in, MDA Access 2 Workgroup (Microsoft) | X | |
| mdb – Access Application, MBD Access Database (Microsoft) | X | |
| mde – Access MDE Database File (Microsoft) | X | |
| mdt – Access Add-in Data (Microsoft) | X | |
| mdw – Access Workgroup Information (Microsoft) | X | |
| mdz – Access Wizard Template (Microsoft) | X | |
| msc – Microsoft common console document | X | X |
| msi – Install Control file | X | X |
| msp – Windows installer patch | X | X |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| mst – Windows installer transform | X | X |
| ops – Office Profile Settings File | X | |
| pcd – Visual test (Microsoft) | X | |
| pif – Windows program information file | X | X |
| prf – Windows System File | X | |
| prg – Program file | X | |
| pst – MS Exchange Access Book File (Microsoft) | X | |
| reg – Microsoft registry | X | X |
| scf – Windows Explorer Command | X | |
| scr – Screensaver | X | X |
| sct – Windows script component | X | X |
| shb – Document short cut | X | X |
| shs – Shell Script object | X | X |
| test – Test files | | X |
| tmp – Temporary File / Folder | X | |
| url – Internet shortcut | X | X |
| vb – VBScript | X | X |
| vbe – VBScript encoded file | X | X |
| vbs – Visual Basic | X | X |
| vsmacros – Visual Studio .NET Binary-based Macro Project | X | |
| vss – Visio Stencil (Microsoft) | X | |
| vst – Visio Template (Microsoft) | X | |
| vsw – Visio Workspace File (Microsoft) | X | |
| ws – Windows Script File (Microsoft) | X | |
| wsc – Windows Script component | X | X |
| Wsf – Windows Script File | X | |
| wsh – Windows Scripting host settings | X | X |
| wma – Windows Media Audio | | X |
| wmf – Windows Media File | | X |

Note:

1 – Microsoft Outlook strips these attachments when sending to another Exchange user within the State of Nebraska.

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Standards and Guidelines

**Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period**

Title: Password Standard (Revised)

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/>.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on October 10, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at <http://nitc.ne.gov/>.



Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Password Standard

| | |
|----------|------------------------------|
| Category | Security Architecture |
| Title | Password Standard |
| Number | |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Applicability | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies <input type="checkbox"/> All Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excluding higher education institutions Standard <input type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: All Public Entities Guideline Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval of _____. Guideline - Adherence is voluntary. |
|---------------|---|

| | |
|--------|---|
| Status | <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| Dates | Date: Date Adopted by NITC: Other: |

Prepared by: Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission
 Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/>

1.0 Standard

Passwords are a primary means to control access to systems; therefore all users must select, use, and manage passwords to protect against unauthorized discovery or usage.

1.1 Password Construction

The following are the minimum password requirements for State of Nebraska passwords:

- Must contain at least eight (8) characters
 - Must not repeat any character sequentially more than two (2) times
- Must contain at least three (3) of the following four (4):
 - At least one (1) uppercase character
 - At least one (1) lowercase character
 - At least one (1) numeric character
 - At least one (1) symbol
- Must change at least every 90 days
- Can not repeat any of the passwords used during the previous 365 days.

1.2 Non-Expiring Passwords

o Automated System Accounts

Agencies may use non-expiring passwords for automated system accounts. Examples of automated system accounts include those that perform backups or run batch jobs.

o Multi-user Computers

Agencies may use non-expiring passwords on multi-user computers. Examples of multi-user computers include those computers in kiosks or training labs, where users have limited or restricted access to state resources.

o System Equipment/Devices (referred to as devices)

It is common for many devices (e.g. IP Cameras, HVAC Controls) in today's IT environment to utilize login capabilities to protect the device from unauthorized access. While many of these devices make use of a user ID and password in a manner similar to those found while authenticating a user, the distinction to be made is that the User ID is used to authenticate the device itself to the system and not a person.

An agency may request a waiver by submitting the form found in Appendix A. All non-expiring passwords should exceed the character requirements listed in Section 1.1.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5",
Tabs: Not at 1.5"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: (e.g.

Deleted: and

Deleted:)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: after submitting the form found in Appendix A. All non-expiring passwords should exceed the character requirements listed in Section 1.1.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5",
Tabs: Not at 1.5"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", No
bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

Passwords are used to authenticate a unique User ID to a variety of State of Nebraska resources. Some of the more common uses include: user accounts, web accounts, email accounts.

3.0 Applicability

3.1 State Government Agencies

All State agencies, boards, and commissions are required to comply with the standard listed in Section 1.0.

3.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC Technical Panel upon request by an agency.

3.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a "Request for Exemption" to the NITC Technical Panel. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; system limitation, or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the NITC via e-mail or letter (Office of the NITC, 501 S 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68509). The NITC Technical Panel will consider the request and grant or deny the exemption. A denial of an exemption by the NITC Technical Panel may be appealed to the NITC.

4.0 Responsibility

4.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6))

4.2 State Agencies

Each state agency will be responsible for ensuring that any application or system requiring the use of a password adheres to this standard.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 NITC Information Security Policy (<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html>)

5.2 Non-expiring Password Agreement (Appendix A)

Appendix A

Non-Expiring Password Agreement

This agreement describes the agreed upon policy exception and/or level of security provided by the Office of the CIO for the application known as:

To the limits dictated by the State of Nebraska and Federal laws, agency data and system owners are responsible for determining how critical and sensitive information is for their applications to insure integrity, availability, and confidentiality.

Security Classification Levels

The NITC Data Security Standard recognizes four basic levels of security classifications that are associated with varying degrees of known risks. (See NITC Security Officer Handbook for more details). They can be summarized as follows:

HIGHLY RESTRICTED is for the most sensitive information intended strictly for use within your organization and controlled by special rules to specific personnel. It is highly critical and demands the highest possible security.

CONFIDENTIAL is for less sensitive information intended for use within your organization, yet still requires a high level of security. It may be regulated for privacy considerations. (e.g. HIPAA)

INTERNAL USE ONLY is for non-sensitive information intended for use within your organization. The security is controlled, but not highly protected.

UNCLASSIFIED/ PUBLIC is for information that requires minimal security and can be handled in the public domain.

Agency Justification

The undersigned agency representative has been authorized to request a **non-expiring password** for the application and data named above with a **security classification level** of _____ and includes the following criteria as supporting justification:

* * * * *

Office of the CIO Justification

The Office of the CIO recommends **no policy exceptions** with the following justification:

Agency Representative

Date

Office of the CIO Representative

Date



Agency Information Technology Projects
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget

Technical Panel Meeting
October 14, 2008

**NEBRASKA
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
COMMISSION**

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Technical Panel - October 14, 2008**

**FY2009-2011 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Project #)**

| Project # | Agency | Project Title | FY10 | FY11 | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| 09-01 | Secretary of State | Election Night Reporting System | \$ 540,000 | \$ 90,000 | \$ 630,000 |
| 09-02 | Secretary of State | NECVRS Hardware Replacement | \$ 320,000 | | \$ 320,000 |
| 09-03 | Secretary of State | Enterprise Content Management System | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ 350,000 | \$ 2,850,000 |
| 19-01 | Department of Banking | FACTS Migration | \$ 140,000 | \$ 40,000 | \$ 180,000 |
| 23-01 | Department of Labor | Integration of Workforce Development Applications | \$ 1,024,278 | \$ 716,178 | \$ 3,888,990 |
| 27-01 | Department of Roads | Human Resources Document Management System | | | \$ 35,000 |
| 27-02 | Department of Roads | Bridge Management System | | | \$ 35,000 |
| 27-03 | Department of Roads | Accident Records System Rewrite | | | \$ 400,000 |
| 37-01 | Workers' Compensation Court | Courtroom Technology | \$ 225,276 | \$ 15,272 | \$ 240,548 |
| 47-01 | NET | Public Media Project - Phase 2 | \$ 114,000 | | \$ 114,000 |
| 65-01 | Administrative Services | Human Resources Talent | \$ 377,000 | \$ 413,000 | \$ 1,741,000 |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2009-2011

Project #09-01
Page 1 of 2

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 09-01 | Secretary of State | Election Night Reporting System |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

The Secretary of State is the Chief Election Official for the State of Nebraska. As the Chief Election Official there are many functions that occur during an election cycle. One of most important functions is the reporting of election results on election night to the public, media and candidates. The Election Night Reporting (ENR) System is an integral program that allows the Secretary of State to perform these duties. The current ENR System has been in place since 1996. With new technologies and program languages available, we believe that this project could allow us to better report election results to public, media and candidates. We are currently looking at vendors to host this service for our office.

The Election Night Reporting System allows the public and the media the ability to check election results frequently (default = 5 mins). The ENR System was created by volunteers for the State of Nebraska in 1996. The State of Nebraska was one of five states that performed this reporting service to the public at that time. Since 1996, the Secretary of State's Office has made the investment in software upgrades every election cycle to add the functionality needed (e.g. creating comma separated values (.CSV) files for the media to import election night data into their equipment). The investment per election cycle has been between \$15,000 to \$25,000.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Other Operating Costs | | | | | | |
| Personnel Cost | \$0 | | | | | |
| Supplies & Materials | \$0 | | | | | |
| Travel | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$180,000 | | | 90,000 | 90,000 | |
| Total | \$180,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$90,000 | \$90,000 | \$0 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$0 | | | | | |
| Software | \$350,000 | | | 350,000 | | |
| Network | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$100,000 | | | 100,000 | | |
| Total | \$450,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$450,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$630,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$540,000 | \$90,000 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 4 | 15 | 11 | 10.0 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 5 | 23 | 16 | 14.7 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 7 | 17 | 15 | 13.0 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 2 | 8 | 10 | 6.7 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 5 | 9 | 9 | 7.7 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 6 | 17 | 15 | 12.7 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 65 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - I believe the goal of this project is very worthwhile. | -The agency did not provide or address measurements or assessment methods to verify the project outcome, nor provided any data supporting relationship to their technology plan. - No explanation of \$280,000 in other categories - relation to project goals |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Project justification seems to make sense in something the state should do. | - Did not provide any return on investment justification. Did not address other potential solutions. Did not address state or federal mandates. - More detail needed on cost/benefit vs current system |
| Technical Impact | - Relevance is limited to analysis of new vs existing systems. | - Technical elements are not present. Strengths and weaknesses are not evaluated. Does not address compatibility or security issues. - My sense is that the agency thinks the entry of data will be a lot easier with this system than it is with the current system. I just don't have enough information at this point to determine whether or not that's true as interfacing with over 90 counties in Nebraska each having some version of an election reporting manager may be daunting. - Do all counties have ERM systems which can automatically feed this proposed system? |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | - Minimal information provided. Proper analysis could not be made. - Not enough information at this point to give a very good assessment of the implementation plan |
| Risk Assessment | - Assuming an outside vendor may in fact host the system I think the risks have been identified | - Barriers and risks are inadequately identified. - Cost / quality of vendor encryption techniques? |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | - Nearly a third of the budget is undefined in the Other category - Further explanation of \$280,000 "other" costs? |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 09-02 | Secretary of State | NECVRS Hardware Replacement |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

The Help America Vote Act of 2002, Public Law 107-252, 42 U.S.C. 15301-15545 (“HAVA”) following passage by the U.S. Congress was signed into law by the President of the United States George Bush on October 29, 2002. This legislation marked a significant step toward major change in our election systems nationwide. The State of Nebraska successfully implemented the Nebraska Central Voter Registration System (NECVRS) in 2005. This IT Project is for the replacement of server hardware for the NECVRS.

Section 303 of HAVA describes the requirements for a statewide interactive voter registration database. Among the requirements are that the system utilize driver's license numbers and the last four digits of the social security number or in the alternative assign a unique identifier. Other requirements include coordination with other state agency databases and list maintenance procedures as outlined in the National Voter Registration Act. The State of Nebraska received \$18.8 million dollars from the Federal Government to implement all of the changes within HAVA (Voter Outreach and Education, Vote Tabulation Equipment for all 93 counties and a centralized Voter Registration System). \$4.1 million dollars was awarded to Election Systems and Software after a lengthy RFP process in July of 2004 for the Voter Registration System. The server hardware for the NECVRS was purchased in October of 2004 in preparation for all 93 counties' migration. The Nebraska Central Voter Registration System (NECVRS) was completed on November 22, 2005. Server warranties will run out on all 31 servers of the NECVRS on October of 2009.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$320,000 | | | 320,000 | | |
| Software | \$0 | | | | | |
| Network | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$320,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$320,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$320,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$320,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 12 | 5 | 12 | 9.7 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 22 | 15 | 20 | 19.0 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 20 | 5 | 15 | 13.3 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 10 | 3 | 10 | 7.7 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 10 | 0 | 10 | 6.7 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 18 | 5 | 16 | 13.0 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 69 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The goal is rather straightforward and obvious, that being the replacement of 31 servers that were purchased in 2004. Not sure, based on the documentation, if these 31 servers are located in one location or placed around the state. | - Possible use of virtualization in an effort to reduce the number of servers required? - Objective unclear - Have alternatives to replacing all 31 servers been researched? Is server consolidation or virtualization feasible? |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Justification appears sound. | - This is a long-term project that should be budgeted into the biennial budget. It should not be considered a one-time project. - Mandate is clear but approach details are not clear |
| Technical Impact | - In that this is basically a hardware upgrade does not appear to be any technical concerns. - Submitter recognizes need for technology refresh. | - Consideration should be given to using State facilities and using State resources to manage the equipment. - Other approaches to simply replacing existing hardware should be explored |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Implementation should be straightforward | - There is no plan to evaluate deliverables and implementation timelines are not definitive. No on-going support requirements listed. |
| Risk Assessment | - Do not see any significant risks for this project | - Has not taken election risk assessment into consideration by establishing a schedule to avoid these dates. Have not documented repercussions of implementation or lack of implementation and no alternative fallback plan identified. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - Not knowing the size and scope of the server configurations it's hard to state unequivocally that the price quoted is appropriate. | - Changes in software licensing may in fact cause an increase in software licensing costs due to dual or quad core capabilities - After six years, this should be a part of the Agency's budget and not considered a one-time request. Were alternative methods of funding considered? Options to reduce costs should be evaluated including the use of the State's facilities and resources. - Are any federal funds available between now and 2010 to help fund this project? |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 09-03 | Secretary of State | Enterprise Content Management System |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

Quality decision making in state government is dependent on access to its documents and records. The accessibility of electronic records is the cornerstone to open and accountable government. The IT Project Proposal is to establish an Enterprise Content Management (ECM) System for the State of Nebraska. All State Agencies are required to manage their records regardless of form or format according to the State Records Management Act. The adoption of this IT Project Proposal will give all agencies the ability to manage their unstructured electronic records. The creation of an ECM System becomes imperative with the Federal Government and State of Nebraska's adoption of the new Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) worked toward the development of a Unified Collaboration System through the purchase and implementation of Exchange 2007 and Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007. However, the Unified Collaboration System currently lacks a robust ECM System to manage the State's unstructured data (records). ECM Systems aid in organizing records by providing seamless access while managing the records' life-cycle until disposal or transfer to the State Archives for permanent retention. State Agencies will continue to forfeit the benefits of efficient business processes and remain at risk for legal discovery issues and compliance with State of Nebraska records retention laws if this IT Project Proposal is not approved and implemented. ECM Systems provide the business logic required to capture, control, maintain and dispose of electronic records. They provide the end user with the ability to control electronic files as records and associate them to a file code and corresponding disposition authority. DoD 5015.2-STD-certified ERM applications (<http://jitc.fhu.disa.mil/recmgt/register.htm>) accomplish such in a manner that guarantees conformance with record-keeping statutes and regulations. Using ECM applications, Agencies can implement file plans that manage and control dispositions of their records in accordance with State and Federal laws.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Other Operating Costs | | | | | | |
| Personnel Cost | \$300,000 | | | 150,000 | 150,000 | |
| Supplies & Materials | \$0 | | | | | |
| Travel | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$0 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$825,000 | | | 825,000 | | |
| Software | \$1,325,000 | | | 1,325,000 | | |
| Network | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$400,000 | | | 200,000 | 200,000 | |
| Total | \$2,550,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,350,000 | \$200,000 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$2,850,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,500,000 | \$350,000 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 14 | 10 | 12.7 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 16 | 15 | 18.3 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 15 | 15 | 10 | 13.3 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 8 | 8 | 5 | 7.0 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7.3 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 18 | 15 | 13 | 15.3 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 74 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goal indicates a good working relationship with the office of the chief information officer and ensuring a successful implementation - Goals, beneficiaries, outcomes well stated. Measurements well defined. Tech plan relationship is well articulated. - No question an ECM capability is needed and statutory and legal implications are clear. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since this is enterprise wide, costs unknown and vendors not ready, should this project be "portioned" with this request targeting an overall agency assessment of requirements in anticipation of forthcoming solutions? Subsequent phases about implementing? |
| Project Justification / Business Case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The whole issue of records retention this critical and it is good to see that the Secretary of State's office is identifying a solution to deal with unstructured records - Agree that some solution needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback on comparisons was unclear. - Agree that some solution needed. How do Agencies then utilize capabilities? Would OCIO manage offering?, privacy/security concerns, etc.. |
| Technical Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal indicates that the technical elements of this project are still to be determined as a result I reduce the score from 20 to 15. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even though several packages were evaluated, no statement of strengths or weaknesses is provided. - As noted, technical elements largely unknown at this time. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There appear to be a number of unknowns about this project which could obviously impact implementation. While I do not anticipate there will be problems, I think it is still too early to make a judgment call in this area - Without knowing technical implications the implementation are largely unknown and effort also unquantifiable. |
| Risk Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risks have been identified but they do not appear to be barriers at this point. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant financial risk may occur if agencies are not mandated to adopt the system. Significant resources for training and adoption at other agencies may be required. - Risks seem very high with an enterprise solution and legal/statutory implications. Have a concern that a reader could be left with conclusion that a solution is "out front" of the overall requirements? |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial analysis does include personnel, hardware, software and I'm assuming the other category is the anticipated implementation cost - Since this is an enterprise solution, should agencies also help fund this effort? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growth rate regarding storage is unclear. Comparisons with other states who have adopted similar technologies would be helpful. - Assume project costs represent "framework" infrastructure but not agency document population and use. Hard to quantify but could be very large? Can include comments to clarify what's included in costs? |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 19-01 | Department of Banking | FACTS Migration |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

The Department's Financial Agency Centralized Tracking System (FACTS) is the application, licensing and data storage system. FACTS is written in Microsoft Visual Basic 6 (VB6). As of March 2008, Microsoft no longer supports VB6. Utilizing the CIO's office expertise when determining the timing of an upgrade, the Department was told the current application will work provided the Department does not modify existing code, does not change the operating system and does not add new code. This project is to migrate the unsupported existing system from Microsoft Visual Basic 6.

Currently tracking 47,431 financially related entities, institutions, licensees or offerings and exemptions; FACTS serves as the reporting, billing, enforcement tracking and resource allocation source of information. Since the original in-house design and implementation in 2002, enhancements of the program have improved searches, enlarged the databases to provide more relevant information, enabled electronic retrieval of examinations and audits and coordinated exportation of key data fields to better inform the public of financial activities. Web enabling the FACTS system would bring significant efficiencies to the department as national vendors work with licensees and then make their data available to the department.

The responsibilities of the Department have significantly increased since FACTS was written in 2002. For instance, during the past 5 years, the Department supervised bank assets have increased 50% to the current level of \$20 billion; the securities division licensed more than 79,000 regulated entities, individuals and activities.

Currently the integration of the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System (NMLS) data has not been integrated completely due to the potential consequence of placing new code in the mission critical application.

The current financial regulatory environment requires enhanced information collection and reporting; however, the current system can no longer be reliably modified. With the assistance of the CIO office; a consultant was hired to determine the upgrade path and a Request for Information was issued to evaluate the cost of migrating the current VB6 system to Visual Basic.net (VB.net). The Department is also considering contracting with a third-party vendor who would create and maintain the system.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|----------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Design | \$0 | | | | | |
| Programming | \$173,400 | | | 135,000 | 38,400 | |
| Project Management | \$0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$173,400 | \$0 | \$0 | \$135,000 | \$38,400 | \$0 |
| Training | | | | | | |
| Technical Staff | \$6,600 | | | 5,000 | 1,600 | |
| End-user Staff | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$6,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$1,600 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$180,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$140,000 | \$40,000 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 11 | 12 | 12.3 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 23 | 16 | 20 | 19.7 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 19 | 15 | 15 | 16.3 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 8 | 5 | 7 | 6.7 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 9 | 7 | 8 | 8.0 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 18 | 13 | 16 | 15.7 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 79 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seems a very prudent thing to do to migrate from an operating system environment that is no longer supported to one that is. - Ability to make future upgrades and enhancements when required; Increased Security; Centralization of information; Web Access. All positive objectives. - In light of the current financial turbulence, it seems very appropriate that a project of this type be carried out. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would have thought I would have seen either other state agency personnel, business partners or customers included on the steering committee. It appears only Banking and Finance employees are on the committee? |
| Project Justification / Business Case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project seems to make a lot of sense and I agree that doing nothing would result in the eventual decay and the quality of information available. - Temporary Staff will no longer need to be employed to reenter data (was not directly stated but assumed); Expense of VPN tokens no longer required; reliable system built utilizing best practices. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sure why the strengths/weaknesses of the Pearson Vue solution were not included in this section. It was briefly addressed in the Financial Analysis Section but did not include details. |
| Technical Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The argument for being able to use current technology allowing the department to move forward with a reliable environment makes all the sense in the world. - Intend to conform with NITC standards and guidelines; proposing to replace prior to current system failing; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is stated that the current IT staff will need to be trained in VB.net but it is not clear if the cost of the VB.net licenses are included in this proposal; I was unable to determine where the physical infrastructure would reside that supports this system. i.e. 501 Building? - Little detail shown on reliability, security area. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project team appears to represent Agency IT area well. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough information to score above eight. It does appear however that the agency has a plan to address the implementation. - The indication is there will be two proposals. Unclear about the number "two". I would think involvement from IT individuals other than internal to Banking and Finance would be beneficial. I saw no mention of experience. No deliverables. - I would suggest based on possible barriers in RISK ASSESSMENT portion to add division head representation to project team to minimize possibilities of division heads not taking ownership of this project. Major milestones and deliverables not shown. |
| Risk Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good grasp of the risks from what I've read. - Acknowledgement that loss of financial information is a risk. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A project manager should be assigned that has no ties to the Department of Banking and Finance so the risk of division heads not taking ownership is negated. An IT Security individual will need to be involved. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Financial Analysis and Budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The programming estimate is based on several quotes received on a recent RFI. - Wide variety of vendors with various references. Budget estimates would appear to match up with several of the vendors from the RFI. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sure what's included in the quotes they provided. I cannot tell what's included is it just programmer time? Are there software license costs? Hardware costs? As a result it is hard to make a real firm judgment in this area at this time. - Ongoing maintenance costs unknown and no estimate projected. No hardware costs projected. No ongoing staff costs projected. - Appear to be significant differences on vendor estimates shown and what the feature differences might be as they relate to price differentials. |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|---------------------|---|
| 23-01 | Department of Labor | Integration of Workforce Development Applications |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

NWD-DOL currently has business applications operating on three different technical platforms that have reached their end of life. We are considering a technical solution that will integrate seven business applications, facilitate the enrollment and tracking of participant education and employment activities and reporting on federally mandated performance measures. It will enhance job posting / searching capabilities through the use of a web search engine with 'spidering' capabilities that intelligently traverses multiple sites to find job matches. Initial project estimated costs are \$3.1- \$3.8M. This project will go through the competitive procurement process of an RFP. Federal funds will be utilized for this project.

The Integrated Workforce Systems Project is in very preliminary stages, and this Executive Summary is being provided at the very highest level. A detailed proposal for NITC review and scoring purposes is still in the developmental process. Costs for the current infrastructure, applications, and maintenance of the applications are estimated. Preliminary cost comparisons for a vendor hosted solution and an internal hosted solution are estimated. Initial project costs are estimated at \$3.1- \$3.8M. This project will go through the competitive procurement process of an RFP. Federal funds will be utilized for this project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Design | \$0 | | | | | |
| Programming | \$0 | | | | | |
| Project Management | \$0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | \$149,500 | | | 149,500 | | |
| Other | \$48,500 | | | 48,500 | | |
| Total | \$198,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$198,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Training | | | | | | |
| Technical Staff | \$9,000 | | | 9,000 | | |
| End-user Staff | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$0 | | | | | |
| Software | \$3,580,890 | | | 716,178 | 716,178 | 2,148,534 |
| Network | \$98,500 | | | 98,500 | | |
| Other | \$2,600 | | | 2,600 | | |
| Total | \$3,681,990 | \$0 | \$0 | \$817,278 | \$716,178 | \$2,148,534 |
| Total Request | \$3,888,990 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,024,278 | \$716,178 | \$2,148,534 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 10 | 14 | 8 | 10.7 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 0 | 20 | 14 | 11.3 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 13 | 15 | 14 | 14.0 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6.3 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5.7 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 15 | 10 | 13 | 12.7 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 61 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The concept of integrating major workforce applications into an efficient system is laudable. - I believe the project is laudable and makes a lot of sense. - In the summary, it appears that the idea/concept is to look into consolidating disparate systems which certainly has validity. Options listed for solution delivery indicate open approach. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project is in the "definition" phase and doesn't have clear goals and objectives set. - A question? - Should this project be for funding feasibility phase with the outcome a "directional" recommendation for consolidation of systems? Also it was not clear to me if mandates are part of overall rationale for project? |
| Project Justification / Business Case | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The justification consists of one sentence and states that this is in the development stage. No benefits were stated. - Not enough information at this point to make a judgment call although I did rate it fairly high - As noted, no cost/business case noted yet. Would help to clarify what the implications of mandates and how they are/are not linked to project proposal. This will have a bearing on how the project is prioritized by NITC. |
| Technical Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency recognizes the need to replace end of life equipment and systems with newer and more efficient methods. However, the project is in an initial planning stage and the description of what they are needing to do is adequate. - Early stage as acknowledged by Author. Considerations for leveraging existing infrastructure if possible and plans to develop costing scenarios among current and proposed solutions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Again a lot of unknowns at this stage of the proposal. I'm also concerned that there is no funding identified for hardware, which I find rather puzzling at this point, unless of course this is to be outsourced which may be a possibility |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project is in initial planning stage and the description of steps to take are adequate. - Too early in formulation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Again not a lot of information to make a judgment call. - Early in planning. While the "bullets" reference assumed guidelines for an RFP and would have budget/project management oversight, nothing included on any high-level thoughts/approach on how the system would be implemented. |
| Risk Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project is in an initial planning stage and the description is adequate. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One high risk is the staffing issue identified - and the agency priority for funding of the project. - Not enough information to make a valid assessment. - Though early in planning, would expect some assessment of overall project risk as it relates to goal of consolidation of disparate applications/processes. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning stage budget is estimated reasonably. - Too early in planning. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough information to make a valid assessment. - As planning evolves would expect to see more. |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| 27-01 | Department of Roads | Human Resources Document Management System |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

NDOR Human Resources maintains 1,000s personnel files and records on all employees, currently or previously, employed with the agency. These records are currently maintained through paper and file cabinets/lektriever. While alternatives are being considered on how to move NDOR Human Resources to a paperless division, more immediate solutions can be addressed toward the elimination of paper personnel files.

Through the use of current NDOR resources, such as Falcon, all current paper files can be scanned and transferred to electronic files, making the files more secure, confidential, and accurate with less loss of paper. Efficiency of Human Resources employees will increase due to the reduction in handling of paper, searching for forms, paperwork and files. All personnel files will be easily accessible by Human Resources employees, and in some cases department supervisors and managers. This system will also automate the archival and retention capabilities of the documents.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed. This project will be completed in FY09.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Contractual Services Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Design | \$0 | | | | |
| Programming | \$5,000 | 5,000 | | | |
| Project Management | \$0 | | | | |
| Data Conversion | \$0 | | | | |
| Other | \$25,000 | 25,000 | | | |
| Total | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$5,000 | 5,000 | | | |
| Software | \$0 | | | | |
| Network | \$0 | | | | |
| Other | \$0 | | | | |
| Total | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | | 11 | 14 | 12.5 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | | 16 | 19 | 17.5 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | | 15 | 15 | 15.0 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | 6 | 10 | 8.0 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | | 6 | 9 | 7.5 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | 15 | 18 | 16.5 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 77 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - Clear, measurable goals. | - Consider what you can do to promote adoption of the new capability once it has been established. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Possible savings are identified | - Justification is very general, without identifying much specific or detailed benefit. - The business case lacks specifics. Consider identifying how much HR time will be saved and how the time saved will be reallocated. Can the savings in paper, cabinets, filing time and travel be estimated? |
| Technical Impact | - Uses existing technology, with no apparent major expansion. - Employs an existing, proven technical platform (Falcon). | - Little detail is provided about the current technology environment. - More analysis should be devoted to the network bandwidth requirements. I am not familiar with the agency's network but I know that employees are stationed in all areas of the State. Scanned images can require a good deal of bandwidth -- will the response time be acceptable in all locations? |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - The preliminary plan and the underlying project management processes are sound. | - Only a very high level of information is provided. |
| Risk Assessment | - A relatively small direct expenditure is required. Learning from this project may benefit the enterprise TMS if that project advances. | - Unclear why this project could not wait until a decision is reached about the Talent Management System from Administrative Services. - Consider if all costs are identified. For example, to what extent (if any) will the savings in HR filing be offset by the scanning and metadata tagging process? How much risk is there that remote staff will not use the system? To what extent may network bandwidth be an issue in some locations? |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - A relatively small direct expenditure is required since the project builds on existing facilities. | - \$25,000 of the \$35,000 total is marked "Other", without much explanation of the expenditure. - The proposal does not appear to address the cost of scanning and indexing the existing paper records. |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 27-02 | Department of Roads | Bridge Management System |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

The purpose of this project is to develop a one-stop shop for Bridge related information, similar to the Pavement Optimization Program (POP). With the completion of this project, customers will be able to access bridge related information through a point and click environment. Information such as Posting Summary sheets, bridge photos, bridge plans; Inspection Reports, etc. will have a direct link from an opening screen. The opening screen will sit on the user's desktop as an icon and when opened the user will have the option to go directly to the bridge information of their choosing. The opening screen will have an arrangement of radio buttons which the user can click-on to retrieve the information they want to view. It is anticipated that the primary users of this new application will be the District Engineers, Division Heads, and Division personnel from Bridge, Roadway Design, Construction, and Planning and Project Development. It is estimated that the initial version could be completed within six months of the start of the project. As users become aware of and begin to use this new application subsequent versions will be enhanced to meet the needs of the users. This new application will greatly enhance the bridge decision-making process and improve the flow of bridge information throughout the Department.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Design | \$0 | | | | | |
| Programming | \$10,000 | | 10,000 | | | |
| Project Management | \$0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$25,000 | | 25,000 | | | |
| Total | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 12 | 14 | 13.0 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 18 | 16 | 18 | 17.3 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 12 | 15 | 18 | 15.0 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 8 | 10 | 8.0 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 3 | 7 | 6 | 5.3 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 10 | 10 | 16 | 12.0 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 71 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency has described an efficiency project for the Department that is based on a current success for POP. - POP application already exists and can be used as a pattern for new application. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no mention of the agency technology plan and how this fits into it. Additionally, they clearly state that there is not requirement for this project. - Plan assumes that new application requirements will be the same as POP. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project benefits related to the efficiency of the worker and the saving of physical space. - The concept is good and will bring all the information together and make available through a single interface. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No actual documentation on ROI or other benefits. - With no mandate to create this system, becoming and staying a priority could delay the project. |
| Technical Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POP system already exists and the technology can be supported with existing hardware and software. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sure if they are planning to do this work themselves or with an outside contractor. There is no indication that there are costs associated with their side of any of this work. - Technical solution depends on the POP system the similarity of the data and requirements. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General listing of roles and timelines. - The department already is familiar with FALCON software and the POP application | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roles and timelines are not detailed by people who have any experience or specific steps that will be accomplished and by whom. - The requirements and scope are not defined and the scope could exceed the POP application. |
| Risk Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development will be completed in-house and the model for this application already exists. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The risks were not clearly identified. What is the risk of not doing this? - No deadlines to complete have been created, are all stakeholders in agreement on priorities? - What are the risks associated with doing the project? |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The budget of \$35,000 is for programming and other without any clear indication of exactly how it will be spent and how the numbers were determined. - Hard to determine if funding is adequate. |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 27-03 | Department of Roads | Accident Records System Rewrite |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

The Highway Safety document imaging/workflow "CUSTOM CODE" (Accident Records System (ARS)) will be totally rewritten to simplify the routes and make the process more efficient. The core off-the-shelf systems including WorkDesk™ and the Imaging and Archive Server software will remain as-is. The project will result in a time savings for employees using the system, resulting in quicker entry of crash data and the availability of data for analysis purposes, and a major reduction in the cost of printers, paper, and toner. We will also be applying for some federal grants that would allow us to recover some of the cost to the State.

This project is one of the goals in our Director's Long Range Transportation Plan. The goal to improve safety includes the need to fully develop an automated crash (accident) reporting system so that law enforcement at all levels and other parties can use this technology when they are ready.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation in fiscal year 2009 therefore no additional funds are needed. This project will most likely fall into fiscal year 2010 in which case we will need to move any remaining funds from 2009 to 2010.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual services – Account 4419
 Design - \$50,000
 Programming - \$300,000
 Other - \$50,000

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 11 | 11 | 14 | 12.0 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 20 | 15 | 16 | 17.0 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 12 | 13 | 18 | 14.3 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 6 | 9 | 7.0 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.3 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 10 | 12 | 12 | 11.3 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 66 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The agency is planning to rewrite the web piece of this application and "re-use" the work flow (although it is difficult to tell whether the costs include the new version of WorkDesk Software they mention). They do have a strong set of goals and cost avoidance that they are attempting to achieve. | - I don't see this tied to their technology plan. It is unclear what they are proposing, a bid for service, their own staff rewrite, etc. Costs are for contractual services only - no internal staffing costs. Most of the justification is to replace printers without any documentation about the amount of printing this takes. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | - The design for the application already exist, this is an upgrade in software and process. | - The proposal assumes that the current problems can be overcome with newer technology and improved routing. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - There is a strong partnership list of additional users. - Software upgrades are needed and the opportunity to introduce web based solution exist. | - The benefits focus on printer replacement without much, if any, emphasis on what will be achieved by analysis, etc. - The justification of reduced printing may not be possible current processes may not be improved to gain desired efficiencies - Other solutions should be researched and evaluated for a project of this size. |
| Technical Impact | - The Agency is familiar with the software and hardware to be used in this application. | - Not sure if they are planning to do this work with existing staff or outside staff. Budget does not show any break down of costs and narrative doesn't indicate how they plan to accomplish this work. - Source code may not be available creating additional programming. The introduction of web based solutions may break existing processes and require upgrades and changes to the technical environment. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - General listing of roles and timelines. - Project team and sponsors are well defined and familiar with the current solution. | - Roles and timelines are not detailed by people who have any experience or specific steps that will be accomplished and by whom. - Timeframes for steps to be taken may not be realistic; the scope could change thus impacting both time and money. |
| Risk Assessment | | - The risks were not clearly identified and the ones that were identified appear unclear. It also appears that there are some legislative barriers to doing this project that may need changes? - The number and types of risks identified do not seem to address the main threats given the potential scope and complexity of this project. - The risks listed are related to not doing the project. What are the risks of doing the project? |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | - The budget of \$350,000 is for design and programming without any clear indication of exactly how it will be spent and how the numbers were determined. - Based on information in the plan there is no way to know if the budget is adequate. - Seems very expensive. Over two man years at \$75/hr |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2009-2011

Project #37-01
Page 1 of 2

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 37-01 | Workers' Compensation Court | Courtroom Technology |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

The court is currently looking for alternative space for the judges and staff now located on the 12th and 13th floors of the State Capitol building, with a projected move-in date of July 1, 2009. The upcoming move will require an additional appropriation to cover costs for basic technology equipment needed at the new facility.

In conjunction with the move the court will be equipping four new Lincoln courtrooms with document presentation, audio, video, and video conferencing technology.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Contractual Services Total | | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Design | \$0 | | | | | |
| Programming | \$0 | | | | | |
| Project Management | \$0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$19,091 | | | 19,091 | | |
| Total | \$19,091 | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,091 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Operating Costs | | | | | | |
| Personnel Cost | \$0 | | | | | |
| Supplies & Materials | \$0 | | | | | |
| Travel | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$30,544 | | | 15,272 | 15,272 | |
| Total | \$30,544 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,272 | \$15,272 | \$0 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$190,913 | | | 190,913 | | |
| Software | \$0 | | | | | |
| Network | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$190,913 | \$0 | \$0 | \$190,913 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$240,548 | \$0 | \$0 | \$225,276 | \$15,272 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 14 | 10 | 11 | 11.7 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 22 | 16 | 19 | 19.0 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 17 | 15 | 17 | 16.3 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 9 | 6 | 7 | 7.3 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 9 | 5 | 6 | 6.7 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 18 | 13 | 16 | 15.7 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 77 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project objectives are thoroughly explained and aligned with agency responsibilities and goals. - Agency recognizes the need to modernize the courtroom. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficulty understanding the correlation between the Judge's moving out of the Capitol and establishing four new courtrooms. - Clear description, but limited details on stated goals. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tangible benefits are present. Other solutions evaluated and compared. Justification is present regarding State mandate. - Recognize the need for using technology in the courtroom and potential travel savings. - Good technical description of need for the project. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project fits well into modernization of the Capitol and modernization of courtrooms, but partnerships for deploying the technology are not well defined. Agency needs to work with those entities deploying the equipment in the Capitol. - Very little explanation of what business issues are addressed by this project. |
| Technical Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project implementation and replacement strategy is good. Hardware and communications are reliable. Statement of strengths and conformity with NITC standards are present. - Expands current projects in progress. - Following advice of respected bodies like National Center for State Courts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No weaknesses are apparent. Security statement is somewhat vague. - In the State's best interests, this should not be a stand alone project and should be implemented under the same video project that is currently under way in the Capitol and within other State agencies. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All elements are adequately addressed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Team does not show a partnership with any existing video project deployments. Clear timelines and deliverables not defined. - Not particularly detailed. Would be good to know, at a detailed level, what commitments NET will need to meet in this project. |
| Risk Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risks are clearly defined. Strategies to minimize risk are present. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Security statement is vague. - Lack of identified partnerships could heighten risk factor. Should be required to use existing State resources for planning and deployment so it fits in with the overall State video deployments. - Perhaps too quick to dismiss any chance of significant risk |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost seems high for four courtrooms. Partnerships need to be explored to identify need vs. want and that overall inclusion in the State's overall video deployments. |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2009-2011

Project #47-01
Page 1 of 3

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| 47-01 | Nebraska Education Telecommunication Commission | Public Media Project - Phase 2 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

To serve Nebraskans by keeping pace with today’s rapidly evolving technology, NET is requesting \$114,000 in capital funds and \$60,000 in annual operating funds to implement Phase 2 of the Public Media Project by adding software and storage components that will complement the communications technology redesign at the Capitol and NET, and allow greater public access to Legislative and Judiciary proceedings and communications from the Executive branch. The same investment will allow NET to create a repository for video content produced by educational and non-profit organizations within the state.

In increasing numbers, Nebraskans are expanding their use of new media “spaces” to access information important to them as citizens and as individuals. New media venues such as Cable Video on Demand, Internet Video and Audio on Demand, Podcasting, Vodcasting, and mobile platforms such as cell phones and PDA’s are becoming as important to Nebraskans as traditional broadcast and cable. To reach Nebraskans on all current and emerging media platforms, it is necessary to increase public access to the live media funded by Phase 1 of the Public Media project by extending the content availability through proven new media and internet technologies. This proposal provides those capabilities through cost-efficient applications that will streamline routine production and distribution tasks including capture, logging, editing, transcoding, asset management, archiving and content administration.

The engine driving the archive is a digital rights management system (DRM) coupled with digital media publishing software, hard drive storage, and a web content management system (WCMS) which will optimize the State of Nebraska’s investment in content, and more effectively distribute information important to Nebraska’s civically and culturally-engaged individuals and organizations.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Design | \$11,000 | | | 11,000 | | |
| Programming | \$0 | | | | | |
| Project Management | \$0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$5,000 | | | 5,000 | | |
| Total | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2009-2011

Project #47-01
Page 2 of 3

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------|------------|
| Training | | | | | | |
| Technical Staff | \$3,500 | | | 3,500 | | |
| End-user Staff | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Operating Costs | | | | | | |
| Personnel Cost | \$0 | | | | | |
| Supplies & Materials | \$3,500 | | | 3,500 | | |
| Travel | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$3,500 | | | 3,500 | | |
| Total | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$55,000 | | | 55,000 | | |
| Software | \$22,000 | | | 22,000 | | |
| Network | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$10,500 | | | 10,500 | | |
| Total | \$87,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$87,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Request | \$114,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$114,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 15 | 12 | 10 | 12.3 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 24 | 20 | 16 | 20.0 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 19 | 16 | 15 | 16.7 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 9 | 8 | 10 | 9.0 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 10 | 8 | 10 | 9.3 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 19 | 19 | 18 | 18.7 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 86 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The goals, objectives and outcomes part of this proposal are well stated and well thought out. - Enhancement of service already being provided. | - Relationship to Phase 1 not clearly defined |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Justification for this project is also well thought out and it is clear that the agency has a firm understanding of what is necessary to be successful. - Recognize public demand for content and are enhancing the system to provide it. Also allows them to further fulfill their statutory requirements. | - Proposal states Thousands of hours of content have been created, but first year goal of project is 150 hours as the intended target. Also fee based access should be explored further to fund the project costs. |
| Technical Impact | - Clear that the agency is well aware of the technical requirements necessary to make this a successful project. - Have considered interoperability with not only their own, but with the State's video systems. Are leveraging current equipment and infrastructure to enhance capabilities. | - Relationship to phase 1 of project |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Agency recognizes this is a multiyear project, and the qualifications of the project manager are quite impressive. - Timeline and milestones reasonable. | |
| Risk Assessment | - Very good grasp of the potential risks giving me the confidence that that they are not going into | |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | this project with their eyes closed. - Describe risks of doing it as well as of not doing it. | |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - Financial requirements for project of this type seemed to be well thought out and quite reasonable. - Appears to be a low dollar amount for what will be accomplished. Leveraging existing equipment and resources as much as possible. | - Relationship to phase 1 of ongoing project |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|-----------|---|--|
| 65-01 | Administrative Services – State Personnel | Human Resources Talent Management System |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
 [Full text of all proposals are posted here: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>]

A Talent Management System is a Human Resources Software as a Service (SaaS) product composed of six elements which roughly correspond with the stages of the employee "life cycle." Those stages are recruiting and hiring a new employee, getting the new employee on-board, training, evaluating performance, offering a career path for promotion or lateral skill acquisition, and finally compensating the employee based on performance. The components of the software system are interconnected with each other and interfaces with NIS for better data gathering and reporting.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Capital Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Hardware | \$0 | | | | | |
| Software | \$1,741,000 | | 538,000 | 377,000 | 413,000 | 413,000 |
| Network | \$0 | | | | | |
| Other | \$0 | | | | | |
| Total | \$1,741,000 | \$0 | \$538,000 | \$377,000 | \$413,000 | \$413,000 |
| Total Request | \$1,741,000 | \$0 | \$538,000 | \$377,000 | \$413,000 | \$413,000 |

▼ **Funding**

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY09 Appr/Reappr. | FY10 Request | FY11 Request | Future Add Request |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| General Fund | \$197,000 | | 120,000 | 37,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Cash Fund | \$0 | | | | | |
| Federal Fund | \$0 | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | \$1,216,000 | | 170,000 | 260,000 | 393,000 | 393,000 |
| Other Fund | \$110,000 | | 30,000 | 80,000 | | |
| Total Funding | \$1,523,000 | \$0 | \$320,000 | \$377,000 | \$413,000 | \$413,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | | 11 | 14 | 12.5 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | | 20 | 18 | 19.0 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | | 15 | 1 | 8.0 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | 6 | 7 | 6.5 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | | 7 | 1 | 4.0 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | 12 | 10 | 11.0 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 61 | 100 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|--|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal includes a detailed list of goals, objectives and outcomes. - The description in the project proposal was very good. | |
| Project Justification / Business Case | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternatives to this approach have been reviewed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal includes many features but does not spell out the benefits of achieving the goals, objectives and outcomes. Consider describing scenarios that contrast current practice to the proposed future procedures. Include specific tangible and intangible benefits. For example, describe the savings that will result from supporting electronic personnel files. |
| Technical Impact | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed system is described as a "Software as a Service" solution - no real discussion of the underlying technical details related to the provider. - The proposal fails to account for the technical issues inherent in a SaaS deployment model. These include security, disaster backup, customization, upgrades, scalability, maintenance windows and auditability. These and related business issues like end of contract transition procedures, standards, support levels, training and pricing can be addressed in a good RFP. The statement that "there is no reliance on IT developers and IT technical staff to maintain the TMS" is simply incorrect. The difference is that the staff work for the SaaS provider and not the State; such skills are still required. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussions with stakeholders have been ongoing and efforts have been underway to build acceptance. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very little detail about how the project would be staffed. Training and support decisions apparently ceded to the vendor. - The implementation plan envisions a phased (by functionality) statewide implementation. Consider an approach that takes advantage of a key benefit of the SaaS subscription model by implementing the entire set of functionality on an agency by agency basis. SaaS implementations can be structured in this way to reduce risk and cost. |
| Risk Assessment | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Response seems limited to discussion of a few rather technical details. - This large scale SaaS implementation would be a first for State government. There are many business, technical and contractual issues that need to be addressed. Security, for example, is an area of critical importance for HR records. Consider budgeting for a consultant who has experience and expertise in establishing and managing SaaS implementation contracts. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The request for \$1,741,000 appears to apply only to the subscription cost of the SaaS deployment. Consider including estimates of the interface costs, the costs to digitize paper records, digital storage and the personnel costs for ongoing administration of the system. It is unclear if there has yet been an analysis of the lifecycle costs of the SaaS approach compared to other software deployment models. An agency by agency approach to implementation (if adopted) should result in smaller expenditures in the early years. This is one way to address the funding shortfall. The project is in an initial planning phase. Consider including contingency funds |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---------|-----------|---|
| | | since this is the first large scale SaaS deployment in State government and there will probably be a surprise or two. |

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

| Technical Panel Checklist | Project meets? | | | Technical Panel Comment |
|---|----------------|----|-----|-------------------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A | |
| 1. The project is technically feasible? | | | | |
| 2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project? | | | | |
| 3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? | | | | |