

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2009-2011

Project #37-01
Page 1 of 6

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	- Project objectives are thoroughly explained and aligned with agency responsibilities and goals. - Agency recognizes the need to modernize the courtroom.	- 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	- 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.	- 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	- 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.	- 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	- All elements are adequately addressed.	- 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	- Risks are clearly defined. Strategies to minimize risk are present.	- 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		- 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				Technical Panel Comment
	Yes	No	Unknown	
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?	✓			

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 2 (Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.)

APPENDIX: AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

[Note: The agency response refers to an equipment/cost proposal from NET. That document is included with the full text of this project posted at: <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html>.]

**STATE OF NEBRASKA
WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT**

STATE CAPITOL BUILDING • P.O. Box 98908 • LINCOLN, NE 68509-8908 • (800) 599-5155 • (402) 471-6468 • <http://www.wcc.ne.gov/>

Date: October 12, 2009

Following is the response from NWCC to reviewers' comments to NITC Project Proposal # 37-01 – Courtroom Technology.

A number of the comments in the sections are similar and were likely made by the same reviewer. These will be addressed together in the first response.

Reviewer Comments

“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.”

“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.”

“Project Team does not show a partnership with any existing video project deployments.”

“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.”

“Partnerships need to be explored to identify need vs. want and that overall inclusion in the State's overall video deployments.”

NWCC Response

It is important to understand that the goals of this project are different from those involved in the video project currently underway at the Capitol. The court does not intend to record and broadcast its proceedings at this time, which is the purpose of the Capitol video project, and is not requesting recording and broadcasting equipment as part of this proposal. Rather, this request is for basic technology required for a modern, electronic court environment, including document presentation, audio, and video conferencing equipment. Therefore, NWCC's participation in the Capitol video project is not appropriate at this time.

Nevertheless, it should also be noted that Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET), which is performing the video work at the Capitol, also provided the

equipment/cost estimates upon which this request is based. NET will either install or coordinate the installation of the equipment requested in this proposal. The underlying Crestron control equipment requested will also position the court to add recording and broadcasting equipment at a future date. Therefore, while the court is not participating in the Capitol video project at this time, the experience gained by NET and others in that project will benefit the court in its future recording and broadcasting efforts.

Lastly, it is our understanding that the attached NET equipment/cost proposal, upon which this request is based, did not reach the reviewer before he or she scored the project and submitted comments.

Reviewer Comments

Clear description, but limited details on stated goals.

NWCC Response

The information provided in the proposal focused on measurable outcomes of the technology being implemented in the courtrooms. Details were provided in the attachment NET equipment/cost proposal document, which we understand was not available to the reviewer.

Reviewer Comments

Difficulty understanding the correlation between the Judge's moving out of the Capitol and establishing four new courtrooms.

NWCC Response

As explained in the proposal, four of the court's seven judges are currently located on the 12th and 13th floor of the Capitol, along with the Clerk of the Court and adjudication support staff. Only one small courtroom and one make-shift courtroom constructed of cubical walls are currently available for all four judges, each of whom conduct trials, appeals, and motion hearings on a regular basis. Therefore, the RFP for the court's new facility includes four courtrooms, and this project is requesting the basic technology needed for these courtrooms.

Reviewer Comments

Very little explanation of what business issues are addressed by this project.

NWCC Response

Please see the response to the previous comment. By way of further explanation, there are no microphones or other audio equipment in either of the two existing courtrooms, and existing evidence presentation equipment consists solely of analog televisions and VCR/DVD players. Therefore, equipment to meet these basic courtroom needs is requested in this proposal. Clear and understandable communication in a court of law is critical, and the requested technology will insure adequate communications during hearings.

In addition to basic audio and evidence presentation equipment, video conferencing technology is also being requested. As a court of statewide jurisdiction, NWCC holds trials and review (appellate) hearings across the state. In order to promptly serve our constituents and avoid unnecessary travel costs, the court uses video conferencing for review hearings in western Nebraska. This request will equip one of the new courtrooms with video conferencing equipment, and thereby avoid the need to use other state facilities and the inefficiencies involved. Having video conferencing facilities readily available in a courtroom will also permit the court to make use of this technology for other types of hearings when permitted in the future.

Reviewer Comments

Security statement is somewhat vague.

NWCC Response

All NITC security standards and guidelines will be reviewed for applicability during the design and implementation. Security for audio/visual equipment will be addressed largely through physical security as described in the RFP for the new facility.

Reviewer Comment

Not particularly detailed (Preliminary Plan for Implementation). Would be good to know, at a detailed level, what commitments NET will need to meet in this project.

NWCC Response

The implementation schedule is dependant upon the construction/build-out schedule of the facility and cannot be addressed fully until after a bid is awarded. The general timeframes have been discussed with NET and are far enough in the future that NET was not overly concerned about their ability to participate.

Reviewer Comments

Perhaps too quick to dismiss any chance of significant risk.

NWCC Response

Without knowing what types of risk the reviewer is referring to it is difficult to respond to this comment.

Reviewer Comments

Cost seems high for four courtrooms.

NWCC Response

The court received cost estimates from the Nebraska Supreme Court, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), and Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET). All estimates were in equivalent ranges. The request is based on the attached NET equipment/cost proposal.