

# MEETING AGENDA

**State Government Council  
of the  
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Thursday, October 9, 2008  
1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.  
Executive Building - Lower Level Conference Room  
521 S 14th Street  
Lincoln, Nebraska

## AGENDA

Meeting Documents: Click the links in the agenda  
or [click here](#) for all documents. (xx Pages)

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes\* - [August 14, 2008](#)
4. Standards and Guidelines
  - Recommendations to the Technical Panel and the NITC\*
    - [NITC 1-203](#): Project Status Reporting
    - [NITC 1-205](#): Enterprise Projects
5. Project Proposals - FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget - Recommendation to the NITC\*
  - [NITC Tiers](#)
  - [Project summary sheets](#) (meeting document - 29 pages)
  - [Full text of the projects](#) (additional information - 94 pages)
6. Shared Services
  - Consider new shared services work group for Document Management
7. Other Business
8. Agency Reports
9. Next Meeting Date - November 13, 2008
10. Adjourn

\* Denotes Action Item

(The Council 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.)

Meeting notice was posted to the [NITC website](#) and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on October 1, 2008. The agenda posted to the NITC website on October 3, 2008.

**State Government Council  
of the  
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Thursday, August 14, 2008, 1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.  
Executive Building - Lower Level Conference Room  
521 S 14th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

**PROPOSED MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Brenda Decker, Chief Information Officer, Chair  
Bob Beecham, NDE Support Services  
Dennis Burling, Department of Environmental Quality  
Randy Cecrle, Workers' Compensation Court  
Tom Conroy, OCIO-Enterprise Computing Services  
Josh Daws, Secretary of State's Office  
Bill Miller, State Court Administrator's Office  
Mike Overton, Crime Commission  
Terry Pell, State Patrol  
Steve Rathje, Department of Natural Resources  
Jayne Scofield, OCIO-Network Services  
Len Sloup, Department of Revenue  
Rod Wagner, Library Commission  
Bill Wehling, Department of Roads  
George Wells, Department of Correctional Services

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mike Calvert, Legislative Fiscal Office; Carlos Castillo, Department of Administrative Services; Pat Flanagan, Private Sector; Dorest Harvey, Private Sector; Lauren Hill, Governor's Policy Research Office; Jeanette Lee, Department of Banking; Butch Lecuona, Department of Labor; Beverly Neth, Department of Motor Vehicles; Jim Ohmberger, Health and Human Services; and Gerry Oligmueller, Budget Office.

**ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION**

Ms. Decker called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. There were 12 voting members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC Website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on July 2, 2008. The agenda posted to the NITC Website on August 10, 2008. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was located on the front table.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES\* - MAY 8, 2008**

Mr. Conroy moved to approve the [May 8, 2008](#) minutes with a correction to a misspelled name. Mr. Miller seconded. Roll call voted: Overton-Abstain, Burling-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Decker-Yes, Sloup-Yes, Daws-Yes, Rathje-Yes, Cecrle-Yes, Scofield-Yes, Wagner-Yes, Miller-Yes, and Wehling-Yes. Results: Yes-11, No-0, Abstain-1. Motion carried.

Mr. Pell arrived at the meeting.

**STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - RECOMMENDATION TO THE TECHNICAL PANEL AND THE NITC\* - [NITC 5-202](#): Blocking Email Attachments (Revised)**

Mr. Beecham arrived at the meeting.

Steve Hartman indicated that the document included a revised list of attachments which are being blocked by the email system, including a separate listing of those blocked internally. Also, the document is now a standard rather than a guideline.

**Mr. Conroy moved to recommend approval of [NITC 5-202: Blocking Email Attachments \(Revised\)](#). Mr. Miller seconded. Roll call vote: Beecham-Yes, Overton-Yes, Burling-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Decker-Yes, Sloup-Yes, Daws-Yes, Rathje-Yes, Cecrle-Abstain, Pell-Yes, Scofield-Yes, Wagner-Yes, Miller-Yes, and Wehling-Yes. Results: Yes-13, No-0, Abstain-1. Motion carried.**

## **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - DISCUSSION**

### **Project Status Reporting - [Example](#) AND Enterprise Projects - [Statutes](#)**

Mr. Wells arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Becker stated that LB 823, passed during the last legislative session, provides for the NITC to identify "enterprise projects" and requires the NITC to monitor the progress of these projects. The NITC is required to adopt policies to carry out this responsibility. The agenda item today is for members to have input on these topics prior to the drafting of the policies. Members can make suggestions at today's meeting or email Mr. Becker with recommendations. Draft policies will eventually be posted for a 30-day comment period.

With respect to identifying enterprise projects, at this point, the recommendation is to first determine if a project meets the statutory definition. Then have the advisory councils make a recommendation to the NITC as to which projects should be designated as enterprise projects. For project status reporting, the form linked to the agenda was developed for use by the Retirement System project. They have been using it for several months and have indicated that the form is very useful to them. Unless there are recommended changes, this would be the form used for project reporting.

Members questioned whether or not existing projects could be designated as enterprise projects and the types of projects that would be considered. Mr. Becker stated that, as an example, during the last biennial budget review, the NITC asked for some agencies to voluntarily provide project updates. The projects were all large scale, including the University and State College System's SIS projects; Health and Human Services's MMIS and LIMS projects; and the Retirement System project.

Members were asked to send any suggestions to Mr. Becker.

### **SHARED SERVICES - Email - [Draft Records Retention Policy for Disaster Recovery Back-ups](#)**

Mr. Becker stated that the document linked to the agenda was draft language for a records retention series for the disaster recovery data from the enterprise email system. The OCIO worked with the Records Management Division on the draft language. This retention series would be added to Schedule 124, which is the general records retention schedule covering all agencies. Schedule 124 is being used because any potential records contained in the disaster recovery data are agency records not OCIO records. The purpose of the document is to provide a clear retention period for this data, and provide for erasing it after the specified period of time. The data is maintained for disaster recovery purposes only. After discussion today, the Records Management Division will provide the draft to their agency records management contacts for further input prior to publishing the schedule.

Mr. Cecrle asked how long a deleted item would remain in the disaster recovery data. Stan Schmidt stated that after an email is deleted and the user's recycle bin is emptied, the data would remain in a "dumpster" for 14 days which would in turn be part of the disaster recovery data for an additional 14 days for a total of about 28 days. Mr. Burling recommended striking the word "only" and recommended not

using the term "back-up." Members discussed the need to have addition records retention series for other disaster recovery related data.

### **SHARED SERVICES – Active Directory**

Ms. Decker stated that since the council began discussing shared services several years ago, Active Directory has been on the list of potential shared services. In order to move this item forward, there will be a shared services work group meeting to discuss Active Directory issues. The meeting is scheduled for September 10 at 10:00 a.m. in the Executive Building, Lower Level. Ms. Scofield will be sending out a meeting invitation to the council mailing list.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Hartman reminded members that pursuant to the Data Security Standard (NITC 8-102), by October 31, agencies are required to submit a letter signed by the agency director indicating that an inventory of agency data has been performed, the data classified, and appropriate safeguards to protect the data have been taken. The form that needs to be submitted is attached to the standard. If any agency needs assistance, contact Mr. Hartman.

### **AGENCY REPORTS**

*Workers' Compensation Court.* Mr. Ceclre provided an update on an RFP for managed file transfers.

### **NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the State Government Council will be held on September 11, 2008, 1:30 p.m. The location will be announced at a later date.

**Mr. Miller moved to adjourn. Mr. Conroy seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO/NITC.

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

**Product and/or Service Performance**

Performance Standard	Meets	Exceeds	Below	Explanation

<b>Milestones Planned and Accomplished</b>			
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date	Actual Date

<b>Milestones Planned and Not Accomplished</b>			
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

<b>Milestones Planned for Next Period</b>		
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date

<b>Decision Points</b>			
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.				

<b>Risks Management</b>			
Major Risk Events	High Medium Low	Risk Mitigation	Mitigation Responsible Party

<b>Additional Comments / Concerns</b>

# 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](mailto: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)  
-----

<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
Mandate	Required by law, regulation, or other authority.
Tier 1	Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency and/or the state.
Tier 2	Recommended. High strategic importance to the agency and/or the state.
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.
Tier 4	Insufficient information to proceed with a recommendation for funding.



Agency Information Technology Projects  
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget

State Government Council Meeting  
October 9, 2008

**NEBRASKA  
INFORMATION  
TECHNOLOGY  
COMMISSION**

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission  
State Government Council - October 9, 2008**

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

<b>Project #</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>	<b>Total</b>
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
<b>Other Operating Costs</b>						
Personnel Cost	\$0					
Supplies & Materials	\$0					
Travel	\$0					
Other	\$180,000			90,000	90,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$180,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>						
Hardware	\$0					
Software	\$350,000			350,000		
Network	\$0					
Other	\$100,000			100,000		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$630,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$540,000</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>65</b>	<b>100</b>

**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
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>						
Hardware	\$320,000			320,000		
Software	\$0					
Network	\$0					
Other	\$0					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$320,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$320,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$320,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$320,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>

**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
<b>Other Operating Costs</b>						
Personnel Cost	\$300,000			150,000	150,000	
Supplies & Materials	\$0					
Travel	\$0					
Other	\$0					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>						
Hardware	\$825,000			825,000		
Software	\$1,325,000			1,325,000		
Network	\$0					
Other	\$400,000			200,000	200,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,550,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,350,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$2,850,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>74</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The goal indicates a good working relationship with the office of the chief information officer and ensuring a successful implementation</li> <li>- Goals, beneficiaries, outcomes well stated. Measurements well defined. Tech plan relationship is well articulated.</li> <li>- No question an ECM capability is needed and statutory and legal implications are clear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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?</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Agree that some solution needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feedback on comparisons was unclear.</li> <li>- Agree that some solution needed. How do Agencies then utilize capabilities? Would OCIO manage offering?, privacy/security concerns, etc..</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Even though several packages were evaluated, no statement of strengths or weaknesses is provided.</li> <li>- As noted, technical elements largely unknown at this time.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Without knowing technical implications the implementation are largely unknown and effort also unquantifiable.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Risks have been identified but they do not appear to be barriers at this point.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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?</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial analysis does include personnel, hardware, software and I'm assuming the other category is the anticipated implementation cost</li> <li>- Since this is an enterprise solution, should agencies also help fund this effort?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Growth rate regarding storage is unclear. Comparisons with other states who have adopted similar technologies would be helpful.</li> <li>- 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?</li> </ul>

**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					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$173,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$135,000</b>	<b>\$38,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Training</b>						
Technical Staff	\$6,600			5,000	1,600	
End-user Staff	\$0					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,600</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$1,600</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$180,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$140,000</b>	<b>\$40,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seems a very prudent thing to do to migrate from an operating system environment that is no longer supported to one that is.</li> <li>- Ability to make future upgrades and enhancements when required; Increased Security; Centralization of information; Web Access. All positive objectives.</li> <li>- In light of the current financial turbulence, it seems very appropriate that a project of this type be carried out.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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?</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Intend to conform with NITC standards and guidelines; proposing to replace prior to current system failing;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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?</li> <li>- Little detail shown on reliability, security area.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project team appears to represent Agency IT area well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough information to score above eight. It does appear however that the agency has a plan to address the implementation.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good grasp of the risks from what I've read.</li> <li>- Acknowledgement that loss of financial information is a risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The programming estimate is based on several quotes received on a recent RFI.</li> <li>- Wide variety of vendors with various references. Budget estimates would appear to match up with several of the vendors from the RFI.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Ongoing maintenance costs unknown and no estimate projected. No hardware costs projected. No ongoing staff costs projected.</li> <li>- Appear to be significant differences on vendor estimates shown and what the feature differences might be as they relate to price differentials.</li> </ul>

**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		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$198,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$198,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Training</b>						
Technical Staff	\$9,000			9,000		
End-user Staff	\$0					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>						
Hardware	\$0					
Software	\$3,580,890			716,178	716,178	2,148,534
Network	\$98,500			98,500		
Other	\$2,600			2,600		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,681,990</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$817,278</b>	<b>\$716,178</b>	<b>\$2,148,534</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$3,888,990</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,024,278</b>	<b>\$716,178</b>	<b>\$2,148,534</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The concept of integrating major workforce applications into an efficient system is laudable.</li> <li>- I believe the project is laudable and makes a lot of sense.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project is in the "definition" phase and doesn't have clear goals and objectives set.</li> <li>- 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?</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The justification consists of one sentence and states that this is in the development stage. No benefits were stated.</li> <li>- Not enough information at this point to make a judgment call although I did rate it fairly high</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Early stage as acknowledged by Author. Considerations for leveraging existing infrastructure if possible and plans to develop costing scenarios among current and proposed solutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project is in initial planning stage and the description of steps to take are adequate.</li> <li>- Too early in formulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Again not a lot of information to make a judgment call.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project is in an initial planning stage and the description is adequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One high risk is the staffing issue identified - and the agency priority for funding of the project.</li> <li>- Not enough information to make a valid assessment.</li> <li>- Though early in planning, would expect some assessment of overall project risk as it relates to goal of consolidation of disparate applications/processes.</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning stage budget is estimated reasonably.</li> <li>- Too early in planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough information to make a valid assessment.</li> <li>- As planning evolves would expect to see more.</li> </ul>

**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			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Capital Expenditures					
Hardware	\$5,000	5,000			
Software	\$0				
Network	\$0				
Other	\$0				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>

**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
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The agency has described an efficiency project for the Department that is based on a current success for POP.</li> <li>- POP application already exists and can be used as a pattern for new application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Plan assumes that new application requirements will be the same as POP.</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project benefits related to the efficiency of the worker and the saving of physical space.</li> <li>- The concept is good and will bring all the information together and make available through a single interface.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No actual documentation on ROI or other benefits.</li> <li>- With no mandate to create this system, becoming and staying a priority could delay the project.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- POP system already exists and the technology can be supported with existing hardware and software.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Technical solution depends on the POP system the similarity of the data and requirements.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General listing of roles and timelines.</li> <li>- The department already is familiar with FALCON software and the POP application</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roles and timelines are not detailed by people who have any experience or specific steps that will be accomplished and by whom.</li> <li>- The requirements and scope are not defined and the scope could exceed the POP application.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development will be completed in-house and the model for this application already exists.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The risks were not clearly identified. What is the risk of not doing this?</li> <li>- No deadlines to complete have been created, are all stakeholders in agreement on priorities?</li> <li>- What are the risks associated with doing the project?</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Hard to determine if funding is adequate.</li> </ul>

**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
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66</b>	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.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

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		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,091</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$19,091</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Operating Costs</b>						
Personnel Cost	\$0					
Supplies & Materials	\$0					
Travel	\$0					
Other	\$30,544			15,272	15,272	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,544</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$15,272</b>	<b>\$15,272</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>						
Hardware	\$190,913			190,913		
Software	\$0					
Network	\$0					
Other	\$0					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$190,913</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$190,913</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$240,548</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$225,276</b>	<b>\$15,272</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project objectives are thoroughly explained and aligned with agency responsibilities and goals.</li> <li>- Agency recognizes the need to modernize the courtroom.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficulty understanding the correlation between the Judge's moving out of the Capitol and establishing four new courtrooms.</li> <li>- Clear description, but limited details on stated goals.</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tangible benefits are present. Other solutions evaluated and compared. Justification is present regarding State mandate.</li> <li>- Recognize the need for using technology in the courtroom and potential travel savings.</li> <li>- Good technical description of need for the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Very little explanation of what business issues are addressed by this project.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project implementation and replacement strategy is good. Hardware and communications are reliable. Statement of strengths and conformity with NITC standards are present.</li> <li>- Expands current projects in progress.</li> <li>- Following advice of respected bodies like National Center for State Courts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No weaknesses are apparent. Security statement is somewhat vague.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All elements are adequately addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Team does not show a partnership with any existing video project deployments. Clear timelines and deliverables not defined.</li> <li>- Not particularly detailed. Would be good to know, at a detailed level, what commitments NET will need to meet in this project.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Risks are clearly defined. Strategies to minimize risk are present.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Security statement is vague.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Perhaps too quick to dismiss any chance of significant risk</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>

**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		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$16,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$16,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION**

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
Biennial Budget FY2009-2011

Project #47-01  
Page 2 of 3

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

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>

**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
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>						
Hardware	\$0					
Software	\$1,741,000		538,000	377,000	413,000	413,000
Network	\$0					
Other	\$0					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,741,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$538,000</b>	<b>\$377,000</b>	<b>\$413,000</b>	<b>\$413,000</b>
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>\$1,741,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$538,000</b>	<b>\$377,000</b>	<b>\$413,000</b>	<b>\$413,000</b>

▼ **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		
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>\$1,523,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$320,000</b>	<b>\$377,000</b>	<b>\$413,000</b>	<b>\$413,000</b>

**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
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal includes a detailed list of goals, objectives and outcomes.</li> <li>- The description in the project proposal was very good.</li> </ul>	
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternatives to this approach have been reviewed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed system is described as a "Software as a Service" solution - no real discussion of the underlying technical details related to the provider.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions with stakeholders have been ongoing and efforts have been underway to build acceptance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Very little detail about how the project would be staffed. Training and support decisions apparently ceded to the vendor.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Response seems limited to discussion of a few rather technical details.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> </ul>

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?				