# State Government Council Meeting Agenda

State Government Council

Thursday, October 9, 2014 at 1:30PM

Executive Building – Lower Level Conference Room

521 S 14th Street

Lincoln, NE

**Meeting Documents**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1:30PM | 1. | Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information | Chair |
| | 2. | Public Comment | |
| | 3. | Approval of Minutes* - September 11, 2014 | |
| 1:40PM | 4. | Project Proposals - 2015-2017 Biennial Budget - Recommendations to the NITC* | Chair |
| | | a. NITC Tiers | |
| | | b. Project summary sheets | |
| | | c. Full text of the project proposals** | |
| 2:10PM | 5. | Agency Reports and Other Business | Members |
| | | a. OCIO Annual Report** | |
| 2:15PM | 6. | Adjourn | Chair |

* Denotes Action Item

** Not included in the "Meeting Documents" link

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 the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on September 16, 2014. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 8, 2014. Nebraska Open Meetings Act

Thursday, September 11, 2014 at 1:30PM
Executive Building - Lower Level Conference Room
521 S 14th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
**MINUTES**


**MEMBERS PRESENT:**
Brenda Decker, Chief Information Officer, Chair
Beverlee Bornemeier, OCIO-Enterprise Computing Services
Dennis Burling, Department of Environmental Quality
Colleen Byelick, Secretary of State
Keith Dey, Department of Motor Vehicles
Rex Gittins, Department of Natural Resources
Dorest Harvey, Private Sector
Eric Henrichsen, Department of Health and Human Services
Annie King, OCIO-Network Services
Pam Kunzman, Nebraska State Patrol
Kelly Lammers, Department of Banking
Glenn Morton, Workers' Compensation Court
Jennifer Rasmussen, State Court Administrator's Office
Mike Overton, Crime Commission
Bob Shanahan, Department of Correctional Services
Terry Slone, Department of Labor
Len Sloup, Department of Revenue
Bill Wehling, Department of Roads

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mike Calvert, Legislative Fiscal Office; Brent Gaswick, Department of Education; Lauren Kintner, Policy Research Office; Pat Flanagan, Private Sector; Gerry Oligmueller, Administrative Services/Budget; and Rod Wagner, Library Commission

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

The Chair, Brenda Decker, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. There were 16 voting members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on August 5, 2014. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on September 7, 2014. Nebraska Open Meetings Act was located on the podium in the back of the room.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**APPROVAL OF MAY 21, 2014 MINUTES***

**Mr. Henrichsen moved to approve the May 21, 2014 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Shanahan seconded. Roll call vote: Burling-Yes, Bornemeier-Yes, Decker-Yes, Overton-Yes, Byelick-Yes, Gittins-Abstained, Slone- Abstained, Lammers- Abstained, Morton- Abstained, Dey-Yes, Henrichsen-Yes, Kunzman-Yes, King-Yes, Shanahan-Yes, Rasmussen-Yes, and Wehling-Yes. Results: Yes-12, No-0, Abstained-4. Motion carried.**

Dorest Harvey arrived at the meeting.

**STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE NITC**

**NITC 7-104: Web Domain Name Standard (Amendment)***

Purpose: The purpose of this standard is to provide for consistent domain names for state government websites.

No comments were received during the 30-day comment period. The amendment change allows options for more domain names and requires that requests for other domains must come through the Office of the CIO for review and approval. The domain standard has a deadline of December 31, 2014. If the deadline cannot be met, there is a waiver process.

**Mr. Dey moved to recommend approval of NITC 7-104: Web Domain Name Standard (Amendment). Mr. Harvey seconded. Roll call vote: Burling-Yes, Bornemeier-Yes, Decker-Yes, Overton-Yes, Byelick-Yes, Gittins-Yes, Harvey-Yes, Slone-Yes, Lammers-Yes, Morton-Yes, Dey-Yes, Henrichsen-Yes, Kunzman-Yes, King-Yes, Shanahan-Yes, Rasmussen-Yes, and Wehling-Yes. Results: Yes-17, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.**

**INFORMATIONAL REPORTS AND UPDATES**

**Open Data Workgroup (Colleen Byelick).** The work group recommended that if similar open data legislation were to be considered or reintroduced that the work group could offer to provide feedback if needed.

**GIS Council**
**Nathan Watermeier, GIS Coordinator**

The Council's role is to develop strategies, standards and policies as it related to the creation and use of geospatial data and geographic information system technologies for Nebraska. The council also develops standards and guidelines. The council has established work groups. A survey of stakeholders was conducted to gather information about GIS efforts and data that is available. From this survey, the GIS Council developed a strategic plan. NeSDI is one of the strategic initiatives. NeSDI is the infrastructure layer that is behind our mapping needs for roads, addresses, etc. Enhancements to NebraskaMAP are another initiative of the strategic plan. An enterprise license is available for an addresses database, including geo-codes. The OCIO piloted a small project with the Nebraska State Patrol. It has proven very beneficial in the preparedness, during the Nebraska tornados. The data is hosted on the OCIO SAN. The data was easily accessible to NEMA in this situation. The OCIO is moving forward with a fee structure for enterprise efforts. Six agencies have come forward to participate in the license. If any members were interested, they were asked to contact Mr. Watermeier.

**OCIO Open Systems - VPN Solution and Two-Factor Authentication**
**Annie King, OCIO Network Services, Open Systems IT Manager**

The OCIO's Open Systems team is nearing completion of a proof of concept. The network team, the State Information Security Officer, and several agencies have been assisting with this effort. Requirements were gathered from the Security Architecture Workgroup (SAW). RSA SecureID has been chosen for the following reasons:
- It can be hosted on premise;
- There are more options for tokens, both hardware and software tokens;
- It allows for Risk Based Authentication (RBA); and
- It is customizable.

This will be offered as a shared service. The OCIO is currently working on rates and will be reaching out to agencies with additional information. The costs are "tier-based," so the more users there are; the less expensive it will be for users. Ms. King answered questions from the council members.

**OCIO Network Services – Network Configuration Change Review**
**Jim Sheets, OCIO Network Services, Specialized Services Manager**

Federal requirements stipulate that requests for network configuration changes must have an approval process. The current process, which is for firewalls, switches and routers only, has changed to the following:

Change requests are made via the state's OCIO helpdesk and recorded in the helpdesks ticket management system. Steps are as indicated:

1. A request is made using the Network Change Request Form found on the OCIO Help Desk website: https://ciohelpdesk.nebraska.gov/user. Requester is verified against the list of approved requestors.
2. Ticket is created and assigned to the appropriate Network Support team member for initial review.
3. Assignee calls back to verify data and requests any addition information. Gather as much information for the Network Change Request Review panel discussion as possible.
4. The Network Change Request Review panel meets to discuss requests with State Information Security Officer (SISO). All panel members and SISO have a chance to voice concerns.
5. Relevant Network Support team members begin design and implementation of request.
6. The assignee will then: verify configuration, document and then close ticket. Documentation will include but is not limited to resolution in ticket and listing subnets in IPAM, updating Wiki, Solarwinds and other relevant systems.

The Network Change Request Review panel meets every Thursday to review, approve or deny requests. If there is an emergency, there is an escalation process.

Council members requested a way to be able to see the requests they have submitted. Mr. Sheets will be meeting with the Help Desk team about this request.

## AGENCY REPORTS AND OTHER BUSINESS

Department of Revenue, Len Sloup. Mr. Sloup publicly acknowledged and commended Jack Hardy. Mr. Hardy worked with the Department of Revenue but has now transferred over to the Public Employees Retirement Systems.

Nebraska.gov, Brent Hoffman. GovDelivery has been a partner and is offering a service called PageWatch. Agencies can post announcements on their sites. Persons can select websites and they will receive an email when there are changes or new postings to the website. PageWatch is on the Microsoft safe list for safe images. Several larger agencies are on board. Smaller agencies may have a tiered pricing option available.

Budget Review Timeline, Rick Becker. Mr. Becker discussed the information technology project proposal review process and timeline for the upcoming biennial budget process.

Ms. Decker announced that Bob Shanahan is retiring in a few days. He was thanked for his contributions on the State Government Council.

## ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the State Government Council will be held on October 9, 2014.

**Mr. Harvey moved to adjourn. Mr. Dey seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.

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

| Category | Description |
| --- | --- |
| 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
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

State Government Council Meeting
October 9, 2014

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

| Project # | Agency | Project Title | FY16 | FY17 | Total* | Score |
|-----------|--------|---------------|------|------|--------|-------|
| 09-01 | SECRETARY OF STATE | Business Services Filing System | $ 40,000 | $ 840,000 | $ 2,630,000 | 79 |
| 09-02 | SECRETARY OF STATE | Collection Agency Online Renewal Application | $ 65,955 | | $ 65,955 | 94 |
| 18-01 | DEPT OF AGRICULTURE | Paperless Inspection Project | $ 30,000 | $ 30,000 | $ 260,000 | 78 |
| 24-01 | DEPT OF MOTOR VEHICLES | Nebraska Systems Update and Modification (NSUM) | $ 583,775 | $ 583,775 | $ 2,606,228 | 75 |
| 40-01 | MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY LICENSING | Replacement Software Program | | | | 37 |
| 41-01 | REAL ESTATE COMMISSION | Licensee Database | $ 635,774 | $ 85,774 | $ 796,075 | 78 |
| 81-01 | COMM FOR BLIND & VISUALLY IMPAIRED | AWARE Client Data Tracking System Procurement | | | $ 371,500 | 79 |

*Total may include prior year or future planned costs in addition to biennial budget request amounts.

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 09-01 | SECRETARY OF STATE | Business Services Filing System |

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

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing custom software utilized by the Business Services Division of the Secretary of State's Office.

The existing business services software is used to file and generate a variety of documents within the Secretary of State's Office. These documents include all corporate filings and filings made pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), revised article 9. The software is also utilized to file federal and state tax liens, farm product security filings, trade names and trademarks, and a variety of other statutory filings. The software also interacts with an image library, online filing services, and an accounts receivable system.

The existing business services software is 15 years old and is extremely difficult to modify and support. It was written in Visual Basic (VB6) which was released in mid-1998 and has been unsupported by Microsoft since April 2008. The company that initially developed our filing system stopped providing ongoing support, maintenance and enhancements in 2011. Programming and technical support is nearly extinct. The OCIO's office does not have programmers to support this system. We are at the mercy of a part-time contracted programmer who assists us outside of regular business hours 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM due to having other full time employment. This makes communications, updates, enhancements and support very difficult and costly. Having minimal support often makes it difficult to meet statutory changes for business processes. Replacement software is needed at this time in order to prevent system failure and to continue to provide the level of service currently expected by the business community.

## FUNDING SUMMARY

### IT Project Costs

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Design | $0 | | | | | |
| Programming | $180,000 | | | 40,000 | 140,000 | |
| Project Management | $0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $180,000 | $0 | $0 | $40,000 | $140,000 | $0 |
| **Capital Expenditures** | | | | | | |
| Hardware | $0 | | | | | |
| Software | $2,000,000 | | | | 700,000 | 1,300,000 |
| Network | $130,000 | | | | | 130,000 |
| Other | $320,000 | | | | | 320,000 |
| Total | $2,450,000 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $700,000 | $1,750,000 |
| **Total Request** | $2,630,000 | $0 | $0 | $40,000 | $840,000 | $1,750,000 |

### ▼ Funding

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Cash Fund | $2,630,000 | | | 40,000 | 840,000 | 1,750,000 |
| Federal Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Other Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| **Total Funding** | $2,630,000 | $0 | $0 | $40,000 | $840,000 | $1,750,000 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 15 | 12 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 25 | 19 | 25 | 23 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 5 | 16 | 20 | 14 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 5 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 2 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 5 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 79 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - Goals appear to be logical, realistic and straight forward<br>- Good project, desire to integrate all aspects of the process.<br>- Well written and easy to understand. This project has a significant profile and has the potential to impact the public and the State in a very positive manner. It is far reaching in the customer base it serves. The information is critical to both the public and the State. | - The project appears to be headed in the same direction as the existing. If a solution is picked using similar software that could become outdated like the existing process. With 3 years to develop, existing items within the office may no longer be useable. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Potential revenue, from filings is estimated to be 10 Million per year per the report<br>- Well written and the metrics provided are valuable in determining the size and scope of this project. | - Unsure what benefits are new to the proposed system versus what may already exist. The document sounds like all of these benefits are new and will be achieved with the project, yet filings were completed and fees collected. (configured by non-IT staff, yet changes to the application would quite likely require programming/application changes, confusing statements) |
| Technical Impact | | - I did not get the sense that the Agency knows if a solution is actually available. While they know what they want - is there an off the shelf solution or are we looking at creating something?<br>- Numerous vendors and applications available, yet only one mentioned in the prior section for justification. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | - Based on what I read, I think the Agency needs to do a lot more research. Is there a solution or do they need to build one. |
| Risk Assessment | | - While the project is well intended there are just not enough facts to assign a level of risk to the project. When they have a vendor in mind or a more definitive solution they should re-submit. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | | - From what I read these budget numbers cannot be justified. |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 09-02 | SECRETARY OF STATE | Collection Agency Online Renewal Application |

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

The Secretary of State's Office is requesting funding to develop an online renewal application for collection agency licenses. The online renewal application will allow collection agencies to renew their license online, update relevant contact information with the State and submit the required renewal documentation. Most licensed collection agencies are not physically located in Nebraska and desire the ability to communicate with the State licensing office electronically.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

IT Project Costs

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Design | $0 | | | | | |
| Programming | $40,275 | | | 40,275 | | |
| Project Management | $25,680 | | | 25,680 | | |
| Data Conversion | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $65,955 | $0 | $0 | $65,955 | $0 | $0 |
| Total Request | $65,955 | $0 | $0 | $65,955 | $0 | $0 |

▼Funding

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Cash Fund | $65,955 | | | 65,955 | | |
| Federal Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Other Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Total Funding | $65,955 | $0 | $0 | $65,955 | $0 | $0 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 15 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 25 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 20 | 16 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 10 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 10 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| TOTAL | | | | 94 | 100 |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The goals are well expressed and make sense.<br>- Well written, easy to understand and all points addressed. | |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - The project justification is sound and reasonable.<br>- Well written, easy to understand and all points addressed. | |
| Technical Impact | - Use of Nebraska.Gov makes very good sense from a technical perspective.<br>- A good approach to the development of this | |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| | project. | |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Implementation plan looks to be solid. | |
| Risk Assessment | - Plan to minimize risks looks appropriate. | |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - Financial proposal appears appropriate. | |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 18-01 | DEPT OF AGRICULTURE | Paperless Inspection Project |

## SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

Phase II of the paperless inspection project.

## FUNDING SUMMARY

**IT Project Costs**

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Design | $0 | | | | | |
| Programming | $260,000 | 0 | 200,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | |
| Project Management | $0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $260,000 | $0 | $200,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $0 |
| **Total Request** | $260,000 | $0 | $200,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $0 |

**▼Funding**

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund | $260,000 | | 200,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | |
| Cash Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Federal Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Other Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| **Total Funding** | $260,000 | $0 | $200,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $0 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 12 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 19 | 23 | 20 | 21 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 16 | 19 | 15 | 17 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 6 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 19 | 18 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 78 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - Phase I must have gone well enough that Dept. of Ag is ready to make enhancements.<br>- Had to look at the phase I document to understand the phase II work. When reviewed together, the project was easier to evaluate and understand. Without the phase I information, the scores would have been much lower.<br>- A very worthy project but I felt the narrative for this project shown on the 2015-2017 request to be lacking in detail and substance. A link to the 2013-2015 request would be essential to understand the scope of this project. As a result | - Could have been a bit more description on what these enhancements are to be as well as new ones being developed that were not a priority during Phase I. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| | my scoring is based on a review of both request documents.  In the Executive Summary for 2013-2015 it was cited as a 'one time biennium cost' which would appear to raise a question of why the 2015-2017 request is made.  I also think it would be appropriate to provide the status on the development of this project.  My understanding is that the Department would be the recipient of most of the efficiencies as opposed to the public. | |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - If the project justification provided in the FY 14/15 budget submission is still valid, this continues to be a good use of technology for Agriculture. | - It would have been beneficial for the Dept of Ag to provide more information about what has been accomplished on this project through the funding provided in FY 14/15.  No indication if this is a result of a state or federal mandate although in the last submission there is a statement that alludes to good cooperation between state and federal. |
| Technical Impact | - If the technical impact provided in the FY 14/15 budget submission is still valid, this continues to be a good use of technology for Agriculture. They are using the solution required by the NITC. | - It would have been beneficial for the Dept of Ag to provide more information about what has been accomplished on this project through the funding provided in FY 14/15. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | - It is hard to determine if the preliminary plan is adequate as no detail has been provided on what has been accomplished to date.<br>- Current status of the project would be very helpful in determination.  I found that the various phases were not very well defined nor was the expected completion date, as 2013-2015 request indicated full implementation by January 2015. |
| Risk Assessment | - If the risk justification provided in the FY 14/15 budget submission is still valid, this continues to be a good use of technology for Agriculture. | - It would appear that the risks are minimal but due to lack of detail regarding the status of Phase I, it is difficult to determine.<br>- I did not find that risks were enumerated in either request. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - It would appear that projects were not completed in Phase I, causing the $200,000 re-appropriation. That in addition to the $60,000 they are requesting, appears to be reasonable. | - It would appear that the funding is adequate, but due to lack of detail regarding the status of Phase I, it is difficult to determine.<br>- The narrative is confusing. |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 24-01 | DEPT OF MOTOR VEHICLES | Nebraska Systems Update and Modification (NSUM) |

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

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is beginning the process of developing a single DMV system that will, over time, host all DMV services. The system will be 'customer centric' and be designed to provide a single, fully integrated access point for all customers to conduct business with the DMV.

This project will be approached from the view point of the customer's needs and expectations. Applications and technologies will be built to support redefined and modernized business processes. Although the entire project will span several budget periods, this project phase will focus on the preliminary events required for the recreation of the DMV Vehicle, Title and Registration (VTR) business processes, applications and technologies.

In 2014 LB 905 was passed by the Nebraska Legislature and states; "There is included in the appropriation to this program for FY2014-15 $271,128 Cash Funds to identify a replacement vehicle title and registration system, associated costs, and financing options."

"The VTR system, now over 20 years old, no longer meets the evolving business requirements of stakeholders and expectations of Nebraska residents. Implementation of a new VTR system should be considered. Revenues to support a new VTR system may be derived from a variety of sources. … The DMV should move immediately to collaboratively develop a funding model that is supported by key stakeholders. Upon approval, the DMV should create a project structure, conduct a business process analysis, and further refine the analysis with a concept of operations and system requirements. With that information, the DMV and its stakeholders will be positioned to evaluate how it will approach VTR system replacement. …. Upon determination of a direction, a project plan will be further developed and the contracting/tasking of VTR system development and implementation will be undertaken. Based on the experience of other states, VTR system implementation projects typically have taken between 4 to 10 years from initial planning through implementation of the production system." (1)

(1) Excerpts from: "2013 DMV VTR Business Case" - Prepared for the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles by Nancy Shank, PhD, MBA, Associate Director, University of Nebraska Public Policy Center.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

IT Project Costs

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Design | $0 | | | | | |
| Programming | $0 | | | | | |
| Project Management | $1,677,806 | 127,500 | | 383,000 | 385,848 | 781,458 |
| Data Conversion | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $1,677,806 | $127,500 | $0 | $383,000 | $385,848 | $781,458 |

| Other Operating Costs | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personnnel Cost | $875,032 | 132,418 | | 180,530 | 184,592 | 377,492 |
| Supplies & Materials | $8,500 | 2,500 | | 3,500 | 2,500 | |
| Travel | $44,890 | 8,710 | | 16,745 | 10,835 | 8,600 |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $928,422 | $143,628 | $0 | $200,775 | $197,927 | $386,092 |
| **Total Request** | $2,606,228 | $271,128 | $0 | $583,775 | $583,775 | $1,167,550 |

▼ Funding

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Cash Fund | $2,606,228 | 271,128 | | 583,775 | 583,775 | 1,167,550 |
| Federal Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Other Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| **Total Funding** | $2,606,228 | $271,128 | $0 | $583,775 | $583,775 | $1,167,550 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 12 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 25 | 15 | 25 | 22 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 15 | 13 | 15 | 14 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 10 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 8 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 15 | 5 | 15 | 12 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 75 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - Planning approach appears sound.<br>- The Business Case document was a comprehensive look at the issues with the current system.  It articulates all users of the information and a nice review of what other state are doing as well as emerging trends.<br>- The DMV VTR business case is well written. | - Measurable efficiencies and ROI could use more definition.<br>- Neither the Project Proposal Report nor the Business Case document clearly articulated the goals and problems to be resolved.  IT Project Proposal did not list beneficiaries, outcomes or assessments.  It was focused on the tasks needed to get to the project plan stage, not why the project is needed. It is implied through the faults of the current system.  While this project is in the early planning stage, and "how" it is to be accomplished is not yet determined, the project will have better success if it the organization clearly articulates what they want to accomplish and what problems they intend to solve.  That will also give them a better assessment tool to measure success.<br>- A broader "green field" approach with more collaboration of stakeholders should be considered. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Preparation of the business case document demonstrates a thoughtful and thorough approach to the project.<br>- Identifies that older technology is expensive to maintain and is not adaptable to our changing business needs.<br>- Clearly, although there is no mandate, an alternative to the existing DMV VTR system is required. | - While this is in the initial phase of the project and there are still many questions, the proposal does not articulate the customer centric reasons to justify the project.<br>- (As the project evolves provision should be made to consider new alternatives approaches.) |
| Technical Impact | - Compliance with state systems, standards and management practices is a notable strength.<br>- The project will conform to NITC standards and utilize OCIO facilities and resources.<br>- Good approach by designing with guidance from the OCIO - and looking at what some other states are doing in this area. | - Technical impact difficult to assess in this stage of the process.<br>- Vague in approach; however, that will be determined as part of the initial phase of the project.<br>- More research should be done to determine current "state of the art" alternative approaches being considered in other similar collaborative efforts. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - Inclusive of stakeholders. Governance model seems very reasonable.<br>- Input from user/stakeholder team that includes private industry is a positive element.  Additional staff approved prior to the project, more resources.<br>- Good overall implementation timeframe and related objectives - need to ensure commitment of stakeholders as project evolves. | - No description of project team roles.  Who is the project champion?  Executive sponsor?<br>- More detail needed - (as an example) - footnote comment #26 from the 2013 AAMVA conference. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Risk Assessment | - Scoring for this stage only: funding solution is project's largest risk.<br>- They have studied other projects and know some of the pitfalls. They plan to utilize outside resources.<br>- This area is a significant revenue generator for the state, and the current system is outdated and unsustainable. | - No solution for their largest and most immediate obstacle - funding.<br>- Conversion to a new system will be complex and must be done with minimum impact to the state revenue streams. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - No request for general funds. Seeks authorization for cash funds.<br>- Year 1 is exploration. It is good that they are taking the time to explore and plan before jumping in to the project. They have funding for the exploration.<br>- Some budget estimates from the experience of other states for "similar projects" were considered. | - Cash fund model is one of the deliverables, in form of future legislation. Lack of detail regarding our project management estimates.<br>- The Business Case document suggests the project will cost $13-50 Million and take from 4 to 10 years to complete; however, the budget is less than $3 million over a 4 year period. Based on the Business Case document and research, this seems inadequate and not sustainable. Consider allowing more time and more money to complete the project.<br>- More detailed budget planning needs to be done to identify project financing options - with active participation of all project stakeholders. |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 40-01 | MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY LICENSING | Replacement Software Program |

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

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

Effective January, 2015, the software program "FOXPRO", that Agency 40 uses to license all of our members, will no longer be supported.

This agency, along with other agencies, are in the planning stage of how to go about replacing FOXPRO with a new software program.

## FUNDING SUMMARY

[No information provided.]

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Review er 1 | Review er 2 | Review er 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 11 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 15 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 0 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 20 |
| | | | **TOTAL** | **37** | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The agency is aware of the need to replace an old software program that is no longer supported. They are also cognizant of the need for something that is user friendly.<br>- Awareness that their existing licensing software needs to be replaced due to the end of support effective 01-01-2015.<br>- Rationale for project pretty straight forward - application vendor support expiring. Since vendor support expires January 2015 will need to be addressed in some fashion but also too early in the process to have all the information at submission. Minimum Score only reflects fact that information not available and not relative importance. | - The agency does not describe in a clear manner what the goals are that the new system will need to address. Is there a need for self service? Is there a need for reporting to another agency or partner? Are they looking for a website with a database behind it or a fully functioning application?<br>- No separate IT Plan was submitted. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - The agency states clearly that they are attempting to serve the licensees and the car buying public in a timely manner.<br>- Acknowledgement that in order to continue to provide services to the Auto industry a replacement app is required and needs to be as good or better than their current application and that it needs to serve their customers in a timely manner. | - There is no detail behind why the agency needs to provide this software program. Is it a legislative mandate? Something that tracks information for the agency and the state and is required (and by who)? Or is this a nice to have item?<br>- Unknown as to whether other solutions have been considered. |
| Technical Impact | - It is a known requirement that the licensing software application needs to be replaced. | - The agency does not address any technical elements.<br>- Currently, no proposed replacement. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | | - Agency states this is not applicable.<br>- No implementation plan presented. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Risk Assessment | | - The agency states that this is not applicable.<br>- No replacement plan proposed. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - The Motor Vehicle Industry Licensing Board did participate in a meeting held at the Office of the CIO with other Licensing agencies, to discuss common interests in a replacement licensing software product. | - There are no costs addressed, nor does the agency address how they would support a new system financially.<br>- No estimated dollars included. |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 41-01 | REAL ESTATE COMMISSION | Licensee Database |

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

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

The Nebraska Real Estate Commission is seeking funding for the replacement of the current real estate license database, which was acquired in 1998. The licensee database keeps general contact information on licensees, tracks the relationship between designated brokers (licensees with authority to operate independently) and affiliated licensees (licensees with authority to act as a licensee only under the supervision of the designated broker. In addition, the database tracks and records payments for license applications, renewals and transfers. The database also generates reports and licensee lists, as well as recording and tracking disciplinary matters and generating form letters with the appropriate licensee information inserted (late renewal notices, etc.).

## FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Design | $0 | | | | | |
| Programming | $43,000 | | 13,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | |
| Project Management | $0 | | | | | |
| Data Conversion | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $43,000 | $0 | $13,000 | $15,000 | $15,000 | $0 |
| **Telecommunications** | | | | | | |
| Data | $31,500 | | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | |
| Video | $0 | | | | | |
| Voice | $0 | | | | | |
| Wireless | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $31,500 | $0 | $10,500 | $10,500 | $10,500 | $0 |
| **Other Operating Costs** | | | | | | |
| Personnnel Cost | $157,055 | | 43,527 | 56,764 | 56,764 | |
| Supplies & Materials | $0 | | | | | |
| Travel | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $157,055 | $0 | $43,527 | $56,764 | $56,764 | $0 |
| **Capital Expenditures** | | | | | | |
| Hardware | $14,020 | | 7,000 | 3,510 | 3,510 | |
| Software | $550,500 | | 500 | 550,000 | | |
| Network | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $564,520 | $0 | $7,500 | $553,510 | $3,510 | $0 |
| **Total Request** | $796,075 | $0 | $74,527 | $635,774 | $85,774 | $0 |

▼Funding

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Cash Fund | $796,075 | | 74,527 | 635,774 | 85,774 | |
| Federal Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Other Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| **Total Funding** | $796,075 | $0 | $74,527 | $635,774 | $85,774 | $0 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | **Mean** | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 13 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 19 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 15 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 7 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 16 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 20 |
| | | | | **TOTAL** **78** | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The agency has clearly defined the overall goals of the project and the types of issues they are attempting to overcome.  They also address the need to interface with other items such as payment systems and web based filing.<br>- Well described goals and need for a replacement of their 1998 licensing system.  Replacement is required due to discontinued support of Sybase.<br>- Rationale for project pretty straight forward - need to upgrade old system (1998) to enable greater access, self-service direction, overall flexibility & functionality and ongoing support.  Goals cover the key points even though selection not yet known. Need to replace existing system (16 years old?) should carry higher priority when fully vetted. | - The agency could have made a stronger case about what success looks like.  For example, is the intent to have the system take an online application and move it through an automated workflow that steps the agency through each of the steps it takes to obtain a license? If given the opportunity to dream - what would the system be?<br>- Several interfaces desired. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - Agency has issued an RFI to at least find out what the potential replacement options are.<br>- An RFI for a potential replacement licensing system was issued in 2013. Three responses were received.<br>- Rationale for upgrade clear in ability to eliminate the need for specialized support by OCIO, simplify ongoing support, enhanced reporting capabilities and reducing costs longer term. | - It is an old system that needs to be replaced - but what is the business case?  Is it costing you too much money to support it?  When is the payback of a new system?  What does the agency do if it is not replaced?  What happens to the agency if this system dies?<br>- Two of the three responses indicated a replacement cost of a system to be approximately $550,000.<br>- Should make a stronger case upfront in narrative of the fact the Sybase/SAP support has/will go away and support critical moving forward? |
| Technical Impact | - The technical impact of no longer having support for the system is large and well described.  The point of the audit finding is strong support.<br>- A new system would provide the opportunity to acquire a system that would meet state standards - including an audit finding deficiency of only one level of login/security.  Potentially could provide better reporting capability to the public.<br>- Good points made toward identifying impact/risks to the business operation and to conform to. Score assigned recognizing unknowns. | - Does the system meet any NITC standards? Not understanding the business of the agency, what is so important about disciplinary information?  This would make the technical impact of a non-supported system stronger.<br>- Did not address hardware or networking requirements.<br>- Would some verbiage on selection options to include consideration for an SaaS model? |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - The agency understands the need for an RFP - but may need to include more than the internal agency IT staff and the Director in the process.<br>- If funding is approved, would draft an RFP per State Purchasing guidelines for the replacement product. | - Your plan for how quickly the plan may be implemented is a bit aggressive.  Additionally, since this will be an Enterprise project as defined by the NITC, the agency needs to also add the NITC process to their plan.<br>- No other details given as relates to this section. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| | - Rated 7 only because intent to RFP/select and information not available. As noted earlier might help to identify what options for delivery would be considered from vendors in an RFP? | |
| Risk Assessment | - They pledge to do a thorough assessment of any proposed replacement system and to follow policies and guidelines of the Office of the CIO.<br>- High level risks well defined but since solution not fully known at submission made a 7. Definitive risks would likely change or new risks ID'd once defined/assessed at selection? | - Not sure the agency understands the risks of this project. What if the requirements are not clearly defined and the product does not address the main issues the agency is attempting to resolve? With a small IT staff, there is a risk that the provider chosen does not have the skills to pull the project off - and that is not known until the end of the project. Is the agency willing to change their business process to meet the needs of the solution chosen?<br>- Acknowledgement of risk but no actual description of that risk. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - Agency seems to have a plan on how they can fund this project, assuming that they don't lose licensees in the process. Also it is unclear whether this is a one-time hike or a forever hike and paying this bill over time.<br>- Have included dollar amounts for the IT expenditures.<br>- Understand acquisition costs not fully known yet. Inclusion of commentary on fees to support overall funding reflect "foresight" for any subsequent Appropriations discussions. Again score reflects know aspects of project at submission. | - Fee increase required in order to fund this purchase. |

| Project # | Agency | Project Title |
|---|---|---|
| 81-01 | COMM FOR BLIND & VISUALLY IMPAIRED | AWARE Client Data Tracking System Procurement |

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

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html ]

AWARE (Accessible Web Activity Reporting Environment), produced by Alliance Enterprises, is used by over 31 State Rehab Agencies to manage grants from U.S. Department of Education's Rehabilitation Services Administration.

Strengths:
Financial component can be linked to the Edge system to track obligations and payments for case services
Required changes to federal reporting requirements are added through semiannual software upgrades
Continuity of Operations can be assured as developments and modifications are developed by the vendor
Nonvisual accessibility is maintained through close partnerships between vendor and software manufacturers
Current case management system is heavily customized and updates are costly and time-consuming; it is not feasible to add financial component.

AWARE is a product of Alliance Enterprises of Lacey, WA. It is designed to specifically meet the reporting needs of Vocational Rehabilitation agencies that report to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), which is part of the Department of Education. The system is used by 31 states and other agencies to manage grants awarded to them by the RSA. The AWARE system has a financial component that creates obligations for products and services procured for clients as a part of their case services. It is our goal to utilize this component in conjunction with data exchange with the Edge system to track obligations and payments for case services. To meet our current case management needs, we are utilizing a system that was given to us by the state of Iowa, which we have heavily customized. Although the system currently performs effectively, a change to the AWARE (Accessible Web Activity Reporting Environment) would benefit us in the future from a continuity of operations standpoint, as well as ensuring that modifications to the system necessitated by changes in federal reporting requirements are not as costly or time-consuming to implement. In addition, upgrades to the system can be insured to be accessible to our blind staff as Alliance Enterprises works closely with manufacturers of screen access technology, operating systems, and backend database and related software.

## FUNDING SUMMARY

(Images from the Budget Request and Reporting System.)

**IT Project Costs**

| Contractual Services | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Design | $0 | | | | | |
| Programming | $100,000 | | 100,000 | | | |
| Project Management | $103,000 | | 103,000 | | | |
| Data Conversion | $50,000 | | 50,000 | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $253,000 | $0 | $253,000 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| **Training** | | | | | | |
| Technical Staff | $6,871 | | 6,871 | | | |
| End-user Staff | $11,353 | | 11,353 | | | |
| Total | $18,224 | $0 | $18,224 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| **Capital Expenditures** | | | | | | |
| Hardware | $0 | | | | | |
| Software | $100,276 | | 100,276 | | | |
| Network | $0 | | | | | |
| Other | $0 | | | | | |
| Total | $100,276 | $0 | $100,276 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| **Total Request** | $371,500 | $0 | $371,500 | $0 | $0 | $0 |

### ▼ Funding

| | Total | Prior Exp | FY15 Appr/Reappr | FY16 Request | FY17 Request | Future Add Request |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Cash Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Federal Fund | $371,500 | | 371,500 | | | |
| Revolving Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Other Fund | $0 | | | | | |
| Total Funding | $371,500 | $0 | $371,500 | $0 | $0 | $0 |

## PROJECT SCORE

| Section | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean | Maximum Possible |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | 15 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 15 |
| Project Justification / Business Case | 25 | 18 | 22 | 22 | 25 |
| Technical Impact | 18 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 20 |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Risk Assessment | 10 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 10 |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | 13 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 20 |
| | | | TOTAL | 79 | 100 |

## REVIEWER COMMENTS

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes | - The goals are to update software that will allow the agency to fulfill federal guidelines.<br>- Want to utilize a system that is easy to maintain and not be heavily customized; want to produce more accurate data.<br>- Goals are clear. | - Start date listed at 09-01-2014 although many decisions have not been made; indication of being a sole source acquisition.<br>- Very Brief. Didn't see how they would measure the effectiveness of the solution. Outcomes are vague. |
| Project Justification / Business Case | - CFVI has significant issues in terms of accessibility. They did a good job of assessing what software could fit their requirements that is accessible. It is a part of fulfilling federal reporting requirements and has been used by other VR agencies.<br>- Indicate they need to stay current with federal reporting requirements. (Do not specifically state it is a federal mandate.) Would provide capability of several staff knowing how to utilize the system in lieu of one or two analysts.<br>- I thought this was very clear on the benefits and review of other solutions. | - Only one other case management system was explored.<br>- They mentioned linking this to the Payroll and Financial Center, but nothing about working with DAS. Is the assumption that they will be able to interface with no problems? |
| Technical Impact | - The proposal clearly discusses how the project enhances the current technology and the software, hardware, and communication requirements.<br>- Indicate they are working with the Office of the CIO and the vendor to determine the best hosting solution. The system is used by 31 other states.<br>- They are aware of the options available to them for implementing the system. They know the standards that must be followed. | - There could have been a clearer description of reliability, security and scalability.<br>- Current system will need to go through a data conversion process. An interface may be required to the State's mainframe.<br>- Too many questions as to how this should be implemented. Based on my experience, there will be a cost difference between hosting it internally and externally. Is the cost based on the most expensive option? I would have liked to see a breakdown of the development that is required. |
| Preliminary Plan for Implementation | - The implementation plan is clear. The project team is outlined and the strategies to minimize risk seem appropriate.<br>- Milestones, deliverables, dates and Project Team are stated. Have acknowledged considerable training will be required.<br>- Good description of training and on-going | - Timeline seems aggressive since the system has yet to be purchased.<br>- Since and interface with the Payroll and Financial Center will be required, I expected to see someone from DAS as part of the team. This isn't part of the timeline either. |

| Section | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| | support. | |
| Risk Assessment | - A good description of possible barriers and of strategies to address problems.<br>- They have identified possible barriers and risks and did identify strategies to help minimize risks. A part of that is to leave the old system in place for a number of years.<br>- Identified a number of strategies that could be used to minimize risks. | - They indicate the system will be supported by NCBVI staff, the vendor and the OCIO.  The type and amount of that support is not fully defined.<br>- I don't see how the strategies are related to the risks defined.  Identified risks should have strategies that explain how to minimize the risk and what will be done if the risk occurs. |
| Financial Analysis and Budget | - Funding is appears to be 100 per cent federally funded. | - Budget doesn't really explain where the numbers are coming from although the project is still in the initial planning stages.<br>- There were no hardware or networking costs identified.  Since the hosting solution has not yet been determined was not sure if the need for hardware and networking had yet been decided as well.<br>- It's reasonable but since there are two options and they haven't decided which way to go, I'm concerned that it may cost more or they may sacrifice something in order to stay within budget. |