

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

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

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

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 The current system is outdated (Oracle 7.4.3).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

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimated costs for the HHSS Laboratory LIMS

Expenditures for new hardware, software and services. Also includes expenditures for ongoing support and maintenance

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

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

PROJECT SCORE

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

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good description of goals/objectives - Complete project definition with reasonable measurement criteria. - The goals and objectives are strong, but it does read like a sales brochure.... A little more detail instead of the generalized statements would have been better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal info about linkage to agency technology plan - found it as a reviewer, without assistance within the project proposal - Would like to see some quantity assigned to 'more testing', 'shorter time period', 'reduce data entry'. - Expected outcomes - could have been stronger. If there were that many goals and objectives, at a minimum, there should have been a reference to the goals and objectives. Question 2 - measurement and assessment methods - instructions ask for the methods that will be used. The statement of staff will determine when each phase is complete is not an answer. Of course staff will be used, but what criteria are they going to use. The methods are either not listed or are in vague terms. I would expect a project of this complexity to provide more of a methodology to the acceptance of each of the components of work. While I see this as a weakness, I also believe it is a detail that can be corrected and documented in the RFP and contract for the acquisition of the software. Question 3 - I don't understand how a project of this magnitude is not part of the agency technology plan.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good description of justification, although almost entirely in terms of intangible benefits, with little or no mention of tangible benefits. - Good business case. - Reading the entire proposal, the benefits of the new system will be very valuable, just not completely stated in this section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only the "do nothing" option was mentioned - this may be because a RFP will be used to identify the solution, and thus comparative options weren't really known - Only considering a 'do nothing' alternative may have been too narrow of a focus. - Question 4 - it would seem the goals and objectives would again be tangible benefits to the project, not referenced in this question. Question 5 - While it is briefly mentioned, it should have been more clearly stated here that one option considered was the upgrading of the existing system, while it is not a viable option, it would seem it was thought about. If going to a manual system, as a result of the current system not functioning, will only increase the lab operation by 2 FTEs and maybe require a little more time for samples. I think the result would have a much larger impact that is noted for doing nothing. Question 6 - is not accreditation for the federal programs an important aspect of this process, it may not be a mandate, but should have been mentioned again....
5: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reasonably good comments regarding enhancements - although similar or duplicative of the comments offered in the business justification. - Question 7 - the enhancements are clearly covered and discussed. Some technical discussion. (see weaknesses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very little technical detail provided in project proposal. - I would like to know how the system will provide for future enhancements and migration to avoid a total reimplementation in the future. - Question 7 - The technical discussion was weak and confusing. The answer states this system will function on an independent network, yet in question 8, it states the system will use present network and internet protocol. The answers seem to conflict each other. Also, there was no discussion of strengths and weaknesses in this question.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pretty good overview of general schedule and milestones or phases that will be monitored and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doesn't speak much at all to the experience and qualifications of the team from HHSS that will be

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

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

- Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.

NITC COMMENTS

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