

# Nebraska Information Technology Commission

FY2001-03 Biennial Budget  
Agency Information Technology Projects

## **State Government Projects**

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission  
State Government Council  
FY2001-03 Information Technology Project Proposals**

|    | Project # | Agency                                | Project Title   | FY2002     | FY2003     | Score |
|----|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|------------|------------|-------|
| 1  | 05-01     | Supreme Court                         | Administrative Office - Currency  | \$ 176,000 | \$ 10,500  | 27    |
| 2  | 05-02     | Supreme Court                         | Courthouse Access to Court Information  | \$ 22,500  | \$ 67,000  | 35    |
| 3  | 05-03     | Supreme Court                         | Productivity Enhancements   | \$ 723,000 | \$ 100,000 | 32    |
| 4  | 05-04     | Supreme Court                         | Payment of Traffic Tickets by Internet  | \$ 20,000  | \$ 30,000  | 42    |
| 5  | 05-05     | Supreme Court                         | Move Training and Documentation Online  | \$ 31,000  | \$ 41,000  | 38    |
| 6  | 05-06     | Probation Administration              | Client/Server Web Enabled Project   | \$ 220,000 |            | 39    |
| 7  | 09-01     | Secretary of State                    | County Website Project  | \$ 130,725 | \$ 49,400  | 39    |
| 8  | 21-01     | Fire Marshal                          | LCD Projectors  | \$ 18,500  |            | 38    |
| 9  | 21-02     | Fire Marshal                          | Web Based Applications  | \$ 301,970 | \$ 8,286   | 40    |
| 10 | 27-01     | Dept. of Roads                        | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR GIS Strategic Plan'                 | \$ 450,000 | \$ 450,000 | 12    |
| 11 | 27-02     | Dept. of Roads                        | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR Document Management Strategic Plan' | \$ 500,000 | \$ 500,000 | 8     |
| 12 | 27-03     | Dept. of Roads                        | WITHDRAWN   |            |            |       |
| 13 | 27-04     | Dept. of Roads                        | WITHDRAWN   |            |            |       |
| 14 | 27-05     | Dept. of Roads                        | Implement a Capital Facilities Management System  | \$ 150,000 | \$ 15,000  | 6     |
| 15 | 27-06     | Dept. of Roads                        | Upgrade the Department's Equipment Management System  | \$ 710,000 | \$ 60,000  | 7     |
| 16 | 27-07     | Dept. of Roads                        | Upgrade the Department's Highway Maintenance Management System                                |            | \$ 760,000 | 7     |
| 17 | 27-08     | Dept. of Roads                        | WITHDRAWN   |            |            |       |
| 18 | 27-09     | Dept. of Roads                        | WITHDRAWN   |            |            |       |
| 19 | 27-10     | Dept. of Roads                        | Preparation for Migrating to PC/WEB Application Development                                   | \$ 200,000 |            | 23    |
| 20 | 34-01     | Library Commission                    | Nebraska's e-Library: Content   | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | 29    |
| 21 | 34-02     | Library Commission                    | Nebraska's e-Library: Infrastructure  | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 | 26    |
| 22 | 34-03     | Library Commission                    | Nebraska's e-Library: Training  | \$ 50,000  | \$ 50,000  | 34    |
| 23 | 37-01     | Workers' Comp. Court                  | E-Files   | \$ 4,158   |            | 26    |
| 24 | 37-02     | Workers' Comp. Court                  | Network Switch from Token Ring to Ethernet  | \$ 18,900  |            | 39    |
| 25 | 37-03     | Workers' Comp. Court                  | Internet Enabling Court Data  | \$ 33,000  |            | 34    |
| 26 | 37-04     | Workers' Comp. Court                  | Lotus Notes Mail Server Backup  | \$ 28,680  |            | 44    |
| 27 | 37-05     | Workers' Comp. Court                  | Server Protection   | \$ 17,280  |            | 47    |
| 28 | 82-01     | Deaf & Hard of Hearing, Commission on | Telehealth Services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing People                                       | \$ 9,500   | \$ 9,500   | 17    |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 05-01**

| Agency        | Project               | FY2002    | FY2003   |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Administrative Office | \$176,500 | \$10,500 |

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

New Divisional Printer. The current printer for the division is configured for both Windows NT and Novell Netware which makes it difficult to fix problems. It is frequently unavailable as Probation prints out copies of their database. The new printer will be faster, and the existing printer can be devoted to Probation print jobs.

Automated Fax functions. Incorporate the ability to send and receive faxes directly from the desktop. The current dedicated Fax machine currently requires more time than sending U.S. mail to prepare the material to be sent as well as a cover sheet, then instructions to the receptionist to deliver the fax. It will streamline the process of distributing Faxed material and will allow its display on-screen without printing.

Replace network file server. The use of this machine continues to grow. The current server has been upgraded as far as the architecture will allow. It will be necessary to replace this machine to provide adequate service to the court.

Remote LAN access. This will allow judges, law clerks, and administrative staff to remotely access information from their homes or from the road. It will improve communication with staff members, for example, who are attending meetings. It will also improve service for appellate court judges whose offices are not in Lincoln.

More laptop computers. The two existing lap top computers are in constant use; staff who need the computers are not able to find them.

Upgrade operating systems. Windows 95 is our current desktop operating system and must be upgraded.

Help desk software for LAN support staff. This will allow the technical staff to record calls for assistance, problems, and solutions. That information will also allow the staff to spot problem-prone hardware or software or find areas where users could benefit from more training.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|  | FY2001 | FY2002 |
|--|--------|--------|
| New printer for division   | 13,000 |        |
| Automated fax receipt & distribution   | 7,500  |        |
| Replace network file server  | 45,000 |        |
| Create secure remote LAN access for<br>Appellate judges & admin staff, consultant<br>to do interviews, determine needs and<br>formulate plan | 20,000 |        |
| Buy three more laptop computers  | 7,500  |        |
| Upgrade desktop operating system software<br>120 copies at \$150 each  | 18,000 |        |
| Select & buy help desk software  | 10,000 |        |
| Replace Token Ring with Ethernet   |        |        |
| Re-wire Supreme Court space  |        |        |
| Retain consultant to plan new network  | 5,000  | 0      |
| Evaluate security of new network   | 5,000  | 2,500  |
| New Cable - 100 users @ \$150 each   | 15,000 | 2,500  |
| New switches, repeaters, routers, etc.   | 25,000 | 5,000  |
| Ethernet adapters where needed   | 5,000  | 500    |

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 4          | 9          | 2          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5          | 9          | 5          | 6.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 0          | 8          | 2          | 3.3       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 2          | 10         | 6          | 6.0       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 1          | 6          | 2          | 3.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 2          | 4          | 3          | 3.0       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>27</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:

- As this project is a collection of several separate projects it is somewhat difficult to rate them as some are straight forward and some need some explanation.

Reviewer 3:

- There was insufficient information to evaluate many aspects of the proposed project.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 05-02**

| Agency        | Project                                | FY2002   | FY2003   |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Courthouse Access to Court Information | \$22,500 | \$67,000 |

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

Public access terminals now allow members of the public to access court information at the courthouse. Many people do not know how to use these terminals and ask court employees for information. We wish to explore the use of other technologies to provide information to the public and reduce the staff time needed. There are two efforts - the first is display of court schedules on a large monitor in public areas so parties to cases and other interested people will know which courtroom is scheduled at what time. The second effort is to develop touch-screen kiosks as are now used in Lancaster County. These will provide access to more specific and detailed information.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

Improve Public Access to JUSTICE

|  | FY2001 | FY2002 |
|--|--------|--------|
| Display court schedules on Monitor in Public Area            |        |        |
| - Develop and test concept in 2000 FY                        | 0      | 0      |
| - Wiring and hardware for additional installations (5@2,000) | 10,000 | 2,000  |
| Touch-screen kiosk for courthouse                            |        |        |
| - Kiosks will use Internet access                            | 0      | 0      |
| - Develop touch-screen implementation (outside vendor?)      | 7,500  | 0      |
| - Demonstrate and pilot touch-screen implementation          | 5,000  | 0      |
| - Acquire hardware and build or buy kiosk stand (10 @ 4000)  | 0      | 40,000 |
| - Install LAN adapter on AS/400 (10 @ 2000)                  | 0      | 20,000 |
| - Install LAN wiring   |        | 5,000  |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 8          | 9          | 8          | 8.3       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7          | 7          | 8          | 7.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 6          | 3          | 4.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 6          | 10         | 7          | 7.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 4          | 4          | 4          | 4.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 2          | 3          | 2.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>35</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- My concerns about the constraints and outcomes are related to the fact that with the exception of the City of Lincoln, the scope of this project only pertains to court information. The constraints increase when an application such as this is put into a public area such as is being discussed here. Once the public sees how easy it is to get court information, the next question is why can't I see other info on the same media? I didn't see this as a constraint or an outcome.
- Economic impacts were somewhat vague in my mind. There is no attempt made to estimate the number or amount of time that would be saved through this project. I am not sure that the proposal is superior to other alternatives when there were not a lot of alternatives given. However, it is definitely superior to not doing anything.
- This area [Section VI: Implementation] was a little vague. There was no timeline or milestone or deliverables identified. The stakeholder acceptance has not been gotten. It was stated that the project will get formal approval before proceeding.
- The needs of the users are vague, therefore it is unclear that the users' needs have been met or will be met. The issue of wiring in these facilities is another area that I believe has been under estimated in terms of technically achieving this project. Is the technology appropriate? That depends on whether the scope is truly just this application or preparing for future applications. If it is future applications, I do not believe the technology necessarily appropriate.

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

- The risk area of this proposal was weak and possibly that is justifiable. However, there were no strategies to minimize the risks and one risk identified was that the customers may become dependent on them and the court will be unable to respond in a timely way with the technology. I did not understand that risk at all.
- I have no reason to doubt the budget except possibly the figures to do wiring. Without specifics of courthouses and/or facilities, these numbers appear a little low.

Reviewer 2:

- On-going operational costs are not addressed.

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 05-03**

| Agency        | Project                   | FY2002    | FY2003    |
|---------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Supreme Court | Productivity Enhancements | \$723,000 | \$100,000 |

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

The Court plans up to seven projects to enhance the productivity of judges, court employees, attorneys, organizations which use court information, and organizations which send money to the court. These projects have a common thread - the court data, now stored in 184 databases on 93 separate computers, does not allow easy access for any of these productivity enhancements. We must explore each of these proposed projects to determine where the court data must be located to allow the productivity enhancements to be completed. That analysis requires that we lump these projects together.

The following is a short summary of each proposed productivity enhancement.

1. Judges' workflow. The work of judges can benefit greatly from automation. In Douglas County, for example, 5-part paper forms are printed for the use of the judge during each scheduled court hearing. The judge fills out the information by hand; the form is then 'burst' into separate sheets which are distributed to interested parties while the original is sent to the court clerk. Clerical staff in each office types the information into computer systems including JUSTICE. We propose having the judge enter the information on screen and automatically disseminating it to other computer systems and printing needed documents in the courtroom. This eliminates buying and printing the forms, 'bursting' and distributing them, and retyping information. Judges must also be able to use the system to manage cases - to know when an event has not been completed on time, to send reminders, to prepare orders, schedule hearings, and perform other tasks which need not be listed here.
2. Remote access by non-court users. Attorneys, news media, title companies, credit bureaus, pre-employment screening agencies, investigators, banks, recruiters, and many others now come to the courthouse to access court records. Many courts have a public-access terminal for use of these people, but some small courts must interrupt their work to answer questions. New users interrupt the court staff to get instructions. We must define the information which will be publicly available for each case type and make it readily available in a clear, easy-to-read format.
3. Some commercial users, including title companies, credit bureaus, and those which provide pre-employment screening now hire staff to go to each court and collect information about specific cases. These companies have offered to pay for data which is delivered to them in a standard format. This is very similar to interfaces now built into JUSTICE. It is critical to determine what information is needed, when and where it will be collected, and how it will be delivered. Our investigation should provide an estimate of the amount of money which could be collected by Nebraska. We have been advised at least one other state almost immediately recovered the cost of creating a similar system.
4. Electronic filing by lawyers. Courts handling large, complex cases initiated electronic filing and were quite successful in creating a usable record and reducing the time and cost of processing the work. Other courts have implemented projects and demonstrated remarkable cost savings. Attorneys now generate pleadings on computers. It is now printed and taken or mailed to the court clerk. The court clerk retypes the information on the pleadings into the court automation system and places the documents in the case file folder. With electronic filing, the attorney submits the case in standard format via the Internet. The court computer system receives the pleadings which can be displayed on a computer screen or printed, and completes the summary information now typed into the court case management system (JUSTICE).
5. The case file is thus electronic. It can be accessed by anyone who can access the court system. Agencies can thus eliminate the costly and time-consuming step of photocopying the court file. Attorneys, title companies, or other users who must look at original documents can do so from their offices, eliminating trips to the courthouse. Judges looking for a specific word or passage can electronically search the documents rather than reading the entire file.
6. The current court files are paper. Not every attorney or party will be equipped to use electronic filing. Paper filings must be accepted to provide universal access to the courts. The courts must have a way to incorporate these paper filings in the electronic record. Remote electronic access will be meaningless if only a portion of the case file is available.
7. Electronic business with others. Very busy courts, such as the civil division in the Douglas county court, have thousands of cases filed by a few law firms. Many garnishments are sent to large employers each day, while executions are levied on many bank accounts at large banks. We wish to explore the possibility of automating garnishments and executions with these organizations. It may be possible to save considerable time and money for those organizations as well as for the courts.
8. The initial exploration of each of these initiatives must be followed by an examination of where the data must be located and how it may be accessed. This is the common theme in all these applications.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

| JUSTICE Productivity Enhancements  | FY 2001 | FY2002  |
|--|---------|---------|
| 2.1 Judges' workflow management  |         |         |
| Contract with consultant to determine needs, produce requirements document | 100,000 |         |
| Internet Teleconferencing Ability  | 3,000   |         |
| 2.2 Remote access by non-court users                                       |         |         |
| Contract with consultant to determine needs, produce requirements document | 100,000 |         |
| 2.3 Move data to users who subscribe                                       |         |         |
| 2.4 Electronic filing by lawyers   |         |         |
| Contract with consultant to determine needs, produce requirements document | 50,000  |         |
| 2.5 Electronic storage and retrieval of paper court file                   |         |         |
| update requirements study - may be part of above effort                    | 10,000  |         |
| Previous Douglas County proposal cost likely very close                    | 400,000 |         |
| 2.6 Remote access to electronic court file                                 |         |         |
| 2.7 Electronic business with others  |         | 100,000 |
| 2.8 Consolidated work for items 2.1 through 2.7                            |         |         |
| 2.8.1 Consolidate database or create data warehouse                        | 0       |         |
| - Database redesign  | 15,000  |         |
| - Programming  | 25,000  |         |
| 2.8.2 Communication changes  | 0       |         |
| 2.8.3 Train and mentor programmers in new languages, concepts, etc.        | 20,000  |         |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 10         | 10         | 8          | 9.3       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7          | 7          | 7          | 7.0       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 4          | 5          | 2          | 3.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 5          | 9          | 4          | 6.0       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 3          | 4          | 4          | 3.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 3          | 2          | 2.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>32</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- The Court has given good descriptive justification for the project, But given the level of expenditure and multiplicity of projects, I believe the Project Proposal needs to go beyond the rationale descriptions and include additional "specific evidence" to gain the funding that it deserves. The Federal System and several states systems (Colorado as an example) have already implemented changes similar to those proposed. Referencing those implementations and experiences may help gain support for the project. Additional "hard" estimates particularly on the revenue side may be beneficial.
- While there is not a Federal Mandate, the Federal Court System will be mandating Electronic Filings beginning January, 2001. Their clients are the Court's clients and I believe they will be expecting similar levels of service and functionality as soon as they have adjusted to the Federal System changes.
- There is no indication in the discussion that there are Project Sponsor(s) or that critical stakeholders (such as local courts, large attorney firms, etc.) have indicated their support for the project.
- Disk storage and System processing needs will grow as new "electronic files" are created and the expansion of use by external entities. These and possibly other issues should probably be discussed. Privacy has been a critical issue in Court circles dealing with these issues and should possibly be discussed further.
- The following relate to the Financial Analysis and Budget
  - After discussions with other sources about projects that have used consultants to perform Requirements Analysis, the defined consulting costs seem to be reasonable. There does look like there are missing dollars for the consulting under 2.6 Remote access to electronic court file and 2.7 Electronic business with others.
  - In section 2.5 Electronic Storage and Retrieval, I was not able to determine the purpose of the \$400,000. The description related to a previous Douglas County proposal cost. I assume the cost is for the actual hardware, software, and implementation of the production system. Inclusion of the proposal would have been useful or a clearer explanation should be provided. I am not able to judge whether the Database redesign and programming are reasonable given the level of information provided and the degree of data centralization. I also did not see any initial costs for new development software. In the proposed productivity



**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

enhancement on page 3, "#5. The current court files are paper" it was stated that not all papers will be able to be filed electronically, but yet will need to be stored electronically to make the system work. This implies the use of scanning technology. I am not able to determine whether these costs are included in the budget.

- There also was not any ongoing operations or replacement costs projected. Given the growth of the data as more is stored each year, this possibly should be projected or at least acknowledged.

Reviewer 3:

- Assumptions may be overly optimistic. Outcomes are minimally defined, compared to detail provided for other questions. Otherwise, needs, scope and objectives are well-documented.
- Entire cost/benefit section is founded on assumption - though logical - rather than documented research.
- Implementation plans are weak. Project very dependent on unknown solutions from consultant.
- Very little information provided [regarding Section VII - Technical Impact].
- Consultancy costs would, by themselves, be graded higher. Unsubstantiated costs for other components weakened confidence [in the Financial Analysis and Budget].

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 05-04**

| Agency        | Project                                | FY2002   | FY2003   |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Payment of Traffic Tickets by Internet | \$20,000 | \$30,000 |

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

The number of U.S. households with access to the Internet is increasing rapidly and now numbers in the tens of millions. Those people are doing more and more business on the Internet. We may be able to increase the collection of traffic tickets by making it easier for people who receive a ticket which does not require a court appearance to enter a plea of guilty and make payment via the Internet. This will eliminate manual processing of tickets, reducing the need for staff and reducing the cost of processing.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|   |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| 4.2 Pay Traffic Tickets by Internet                 | FY2001 | FY2002 |
| - Retain Consultant -Define & document requirements | 20,000 |        |
| - Prepare scope document                            |        |        |
| - Prepare work plan                                 |        |        |
| - Estimate cost                                     |        |        |
| - Implement changes if cost justified               |        | 30,000 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 10         | 8          | 10         | 9.3       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8          | 9          | 8          | 8.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 7          | 9          | 5          | 7.0       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 7          | 9          | 9          | 8.3       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 4          | 7          | 5          | 5.3       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 5          | 3          | 4.0       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>42</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- It is unclear by the information submitted if this project will only pay to determine the system to be bought, or if it includes the eventual system purchase also. I inferred the system purchase is included.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 05-05**

| Agency        | Project                                | FY2002   | FY2003   |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Move Training and Documentation Online | \$31,000 | \$41,000 |

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

Providing training in a classroom for Nebraska court employees is time-consuming and expensive. A classroom must be equipped with computer terminals and related training equipment. The trainers and students must drive to the site, normally requiring overtime and an overnight stay. Costs therefore include mileage, lodging, food, etc. Court employees can access training when it is needed to perform a new task or when time allows to review or cover new material.

Documentation is closely related to training. Copying and distributing documentation is very expensive, and the material is out of date very quickly. Bringing the documentation up to date and providing on-line access would allow any court employee to review the printed description of the system at any time and assure that person has the most up-to-date version available.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|   | FY2001 | FY2002 |
|---|--------|--------|
| 1.1.3 Provide training on-line                |        |        |
| Determine Requirements                        | 7,500  | 0      |
| Investigate possible solutions                | 2,000  | 0      |
| Hardware for demonstration project            | 5,000  |        |
| Consultant to set up demo project             | 5,000  |        |
| Analyze cost/benefit                          |        | 4,000  |
| Develop work plan                             |        | 2,000  |
| Contract to move curriculum online            |        | 20,000 |
| 1.1.4 Move documentation Online               |        |        |
| Review & update current documentation         |        |        |
| Move documentation on-line                    |        |        |
| - Determine project requirements              | 6,500  |        |
| - Produce Demonstration Project               | 5,000  |        |
| - Estimate costs                              |        |        |
| - Hire contractor & do work if cost justified |        | 15,000 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 9          | 9          | 10         | 9.3       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8          | 9          | 8          | 8.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 6          | 6          | 5.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 3          | 9          | 9          | 7.0       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 4          | 4          | 4          | 4.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 4          | 3          | 3.3       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>38</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- A number of already existing alternatives not addressed. It doesn't appear as if there was any communication with DOC or NETC on options.
- Since no specific technology is defined in this project, a clear evaluation can not be made.
- Since NET has done a fair number of these sorts of projects I understand what it takes. The total amount is not a bad guess, but how it is distributed is probably not a realistic assessment.

Reviewer 2:

- Having also reviewed the Productivity Enhancements Project, the assumption that "the clerks' offices will continue to process cases in much the same way as they do now" seems to be incompatible with the changes that would occur in the Productivity Enhancements Project.

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

- General Comments: Given the breath of responsibility of the Supreme Court with the majority of the Court systems in Nebraska, the Supreme Court has a critical need to improve the way they perform training and manage and distribute documentation. Both online training and online documentation are mature methods of accomplishing training and documentation goals. It seems from the justifications that the Court has a broken system that needs to be addressed. The ultimate beneficiaries of this project are the plaintiff's and defendants who are provided better service by Court staff that are adequately training and have access to current systems and procedures documentation.
- The stakeholders' analysis seems to be clear and the stakeholders clearly defined. I could not find a reference to Project Sponsor, such as the Supreme Court Presiding Judge or the Court Administrator.
- I gave this project a significant impact if not implemented. Given the current inability of the Supreme Court to keep up with training and documentation needs, the problems are going to grow even greater with the introduction of the changes outlined in Productivity Enhancements Project. Successful implementation of this project may have a major bearing on the successful implementation of the Productivity Enhancements Project.
- I could not determine from the projected budget whether production hardware and software costs are accounted for. Also, the costs for the demonstration hardware may be low. Costs for the demonstration software are not included and would be assumed to be zero during the evaluation. This may not be necessarily true. These comments are based upon the current experience with Lotus Notes Research and Testing project planning efforts.
- Also, Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes, 4. Significant Constraints discussed the constraint of having text-only terminals in remote court locations which will reduce solution options unless graphics-capable terminals (PC's) are placed in these locations. I do not see any budgeted dollars for the graphical capable terminals.
- Also, I do not know if there may be additional communications costs associated with this project to provide reasonable response times to a centralized repository of training and documentation.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 05-06**

| Agency                                   | Project                           | FY2002    | FY2003 |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| Supreme Court - Probation Administration | Client/Server Web Enabled Project | \$220,000 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

The Office of Probation Administration in partnership with McCallie and Associates, Inc. developed in 1993 a custom designed database entitled the Nebraska Probation Management Information System (NPMIS 1.0). Several modifications were made to the program and NPMIS 2.0 came to fruition in July 1997. As the Criminal Justice System continues to change to meet the demands of the time, NPMIS has also had to change to support the functionality of the probation system. Therefore NPMIS was again modified in June 2000 and NPMIS 3.0 was published. NPMIS 3.0 is a full-featured relational database program that:

- ▶ Provides invaluable offender demographics and related court information to field staff supervising offenders, thereby enhancing caseload management and tracking of offenders.
- ▶ Provides timely staff workload figures for supervisory personnel within a field office which they use frequently to adjust the allocation of workload amongst staff.
- ▶ Allows field offices to have at their disposal a statistical database from which they have the ability to generate numerous queries/reports.
- ▶ Allows Probation Administration to have at its disposal a central repository of data from which a number of statistical reports can be generated. These reports are essential in identifying ongoing system needs not to mention program development and evaluation. Additionally, NPMIS is invaluable in providing system data for our required Biennial Report and other report requests from state/federal governments and the general public.
- ▶ Assists Probation Administration in calculating field staff workload measurements that are critical in determining respective staff allocations, budgetary requests for additional staff, and the system's overall capacity to deliver required services.
- ▶ Provides for a central repository of offender data which is shared with the Nebraska Criminal Justice Information Server (NCJIS) which then becomes available to other criminal justice users to track offenders.

Ongoing program changes within the Nebraska Probation System and other criminal justice entities during the next two years, along with our obligation to refresh the data within the CJIS server, will necessitate NPMIS being again elevated to a higher level of functionality. The Nebraska Probation System in partnership with McCallie & Associates of Bellevue and Analysis International Incorporated of Omaha have designed the architecture to develop and implement a client/server platform that will support the functioning of NPMIS. The proposed architecture is a Windows NT-based web server platform utilizing Microsoft's Internet Information Server, Secure Socket Layer (SSL) data encryption, and a Microsoft SQL-Server database for the probation repository. This architecture would allow probation districts to directly enter data, query data, and generate reports from Probation Administration's central server housed in the State Capitol using a web browser via the Internet. Additionally, this architecture allows Probation Administration to develop and publish a web page that would enhance public access to non-protected data and open an avenue of training for probation personnel.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

From the project proposal:

Probation Administration received an unsolicited Request for A Proposal from Analysis Internal Inc. of Omaha, Nebraska advising that their costs to complete this project would be \$220,000.00.

This writer has had experience in assisting with developing the Request For a Proposal for the CJIS server and the Juvenile Accountability and Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) in Omaha. In both instances, the proposals were similar to the architectural design which we have developed for Probation Administration. Several vendors responded to the CJIS Advisory Committee and the JAIBG Committee with similar proposed costs as that provided to Probation Administration by Analysis International, Inc.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 10         | 9          | 7          | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 10         | 8          | 4          | 7.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 7          | 5          | 5.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 9          | 9          | 8          | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 6          | 6          | 4          | 5.3       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 4          | 3          | 3.3       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>39</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:

- Economic impact on the local offices is not discussed. While some of the cost savings are not quantified they are described generally and measurement of staff time savings may be balanced with supporting a new infrastructure.
- The timeline seems aggressive but interaction with other agencies, RFP review and purchasing guidelines would seem to easily alter it. It does not discuss the local aspect.
- There are statements and assumptions that local offices will have an ISP but it is not discussed in detail and does not address dial-up or direct connection issues that could affect the connectivity.
- Funding for the entire project is to come from separate sources. A single unsolicited estimate for this component may be reduced through an RFP.

Reviewer 3:

- A requirements definition should be one of the first outcomes.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 09-01**

| Agency             | Project                | FY2002    | FY2003   |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Secretary of State | County Website Project | \$130,725 | \$49,400 |

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

The Secretary of State's Office is requesting funding to increase online access to county governments by following the model used by Nebrask@ Online for state agencies. The requested funding would provide for development, hosting and maintenance of websites for county government. The Secretary of State's Office will partner with Nebrask@ Online to provide website development and hosting for the counties. Nebrask@ Online will also provide training so that counties can maintain and update their sites.

This project will allow counties, particularly those without the means or expertise to develop their own sites, to develop a web presence and provide information and services online. Possible applications include access to agendas and notices, e-mail for county personnel, and interactive applications for such things as marriage licenses and land records and various permits and licenses. The Secretary of State's Office believes that this project will provide additional access to service for citizens and allow counties to provide those services more efficiently.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|  |                |                   |
|--|----------------|-------------------|
| • 2 web design & training specialists            |                |                   |
| • Annual Salary \$30,000 each over 15 months     | \$75,000       |                   |
| • Benefits                                       | 20,000         |                   |
| • Equipment                                      |                |                   |
| • 1 work stations @ \$5,000 each                 | 5,000          |                   |
| • Web server & software                          | 20,000         |                   |
| • Travel & Training                              |                |                   |
| • Quarterly regional meetings (5), 6 locations   |                |                   |
| • Accommodations (training rooms, etc.) x 5      | 1,250          |                   |
| • Mileage (1000 miles @ 0.32) x 5                | 1,600          |                   |
| • Lodging & Per Diem (\$200 per location) x 5    | 6,000          |                   |
| • Training Materials (75 manuals @ \$5 each) x 5 | 1,875          |                   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     | <b>130,725</b> | <b>(One time)</b> |
| • One web design and training specialist         | 30,000         |                   |
| • Benefits for above                             | 8,400          |                   |
| • Ongoing Travel and Training                    | 11,000         |                   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     | <b>49,400</b>  | <b>(ongoing)</b>  |

Funding would be from the Uniform Commercial Code Cash fund which has historically derived part of its revenue from county services.

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 10         | 5          | 9          | 8.0       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9          | 4          | 7          | 6.7       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 10         | 5          | 4          | 6.3       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 10         | 7          | 9          | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 8          | 4          | 5          | 5.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 2          | 4          | 3.3       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>39</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:

- It is not clear whether the scope includes developing applications, or just training and assistance with basic web sites.
- Future support costs may be low. Staff turnover, changes in technology, and new applications will require on-going training requirements.

Reviewer 3:

- Minimal cost/benefit analysis done in advance. Minimal description of impact on existing practices.
- Very little implementation detail provided. No documentation of Nebraska OnLine's resource capacity to deal with all counties. No documentation of counties' level of acceptance of project.



NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 21-01**

| Agency       | Project        | FY2002   | FY2003 |
|--------------|----------------|----------|--------|
| Fire Marshal | LCD Projectors | \$18,500 |        |

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

The Training Division conducts classes throughout the state for emergency responders and related professionals. The Training Division staff have developed or updated training curriculum to produce more student involvement and informative graphics by using Microsoft PowerPoint and other simulation software. Other methods of producing a sense of virtual reality has been accomplished with digital pictures, which is incorporated into certain specialized training classes. The LCD projectors need the capability of projecting clean and clear pictures for these classes, and therefore the resolution of the projectors becomes very important to a quality course presentation. These new projectors will have the resolution compression capability to work with the computers that are of a 1024x768 resolution.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|                    |          |
|--------------------|----------|
| Projectors         | FY2002   |
|                    | \$18,500 |
| TOTAL COSTS        | \$18,500 |
| <br>               |          |
| General Fund Total | \$18,500 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 5          | 6          | 7          | 6.0       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 10         | 6          | 7          | 7.7       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 10         | 10         | 10         | 10.0      | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 0          | 10         | 10         | 6.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 8          | 8          | 5.3       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 1          | 4          | 3          | 2.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>38</b> | 53               |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- It is unclear from the proposal whether the project is only for the purchase of LCD panels or if Power Point is also to be purchased under the project. The number of LCD panels is not specified.
- The proposal does not specify how many LCD panels are to be purchased. No equipment list was provided. The entire \$18,5000 was listed under "other".

Reviewer 2:

- The narrative provides little detail concerning the scope and projected outcomes.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 21-02**

| Agency       | Project                | FY2002    | FY2003  |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Fire Marshal | Web Based Applications | \$301,970 | \$8,286 |

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

Many divisions of the Fire Marshal agency are lacking technological capabilities to perform efficiency in today's environment. Many of our computer applications were written for the Windows 3.11 environment that run on stand-alone PCs to carry out our daily tasks. Data is entered into these databases on each PC and then reentered into a "master" database. These applications no longer meet our growing needs or those of our customers. They are also cumbersome to use and maintain. In an effort to improve the agency's efficiency and reduce costs, we plan to replace the current system with new web-based applications and databases, redesign our web site to make it more user friendly and provide Internet dial-up accounts to all employees outside the Lincoln office.

Web-based applications will allow for the data to be entered once into a single database and will also allow for real-time access to the data. Employees, other agencies and the public will have access to pertinent data. They will be able to search for the information they need without waiting for someone else to do it for them. Current databases are on either the mainframe (with limited employee access) or stand-alone PCs. In today's technology environment it does not make sense to develop new applications that are not web-based.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|                                | Estimated<br>Prior<br>Expended | Request for<br>FY2002 (Year 1) | Request for<br>FY2003 (Year 2) | (Year 3)    | (Year 4)    | Future      | Total         |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. Personnel Costs (a)         |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 2. Contractual Services        |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             |               |
| 2.1 Design                     |                                | \$ 65,500.00                   |                                |             |             |             | \$ 65,500.00  |
| 2.2 Programming                |                                | \$ 220,184.00                  |                                |             |             |             | \$ 220,184.00 |
| 2.3 Project Management         |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 2.4 Other                      |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 3. Supplies and Materials      |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 4. Telecommunications          |                                | \$ 2,886.00                    | \$ 2,886.00                    | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 14,430.00  |
| 5. Training                    |                                | \$ 8,000.00                    |                                |             |             |             | \$ 8,000.00   |
| 6. Travel                      |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 7. Other Operating Costs       |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 8. Capital Expenditures<br>(b) |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             |               |
| 8.1 Hardware                   |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 8.2 Software                   |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| 8.3 Network                    |                                | \$ 5,400.00                    | \$ 5,400.00                    | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 27,000.00  |
| 8.4 Other                      |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| <b>TOTAL COSTS</b>             | \$ 0.00                        | \$ 301,970.00                  | \$ 8,286.00                    | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 335,114.00 |
| General Funds                  |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| Cash Funds                     |                                | \$ 301,970.00                  | \$ 8,286.00                    | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 335,114.00 |
| Federal Funds                  |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| Revolving Funds                |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| Other Funds                    |                                |                                |                                |             |             |             | \$ 0.00       |
| <b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>             | \$ 0.00                        | \$ 301,970.00                  | \$ 8,286.00                    | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 335,114.00 |

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 9          | 9          | 8          | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8          | 10         | 6          | 8.0       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 7          | 9          | 7.0       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 8          | 10         | 10         | 9.3       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 4          | 5          | 3          | 4.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 4          | 2          | 3.0       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>40</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- It is not clear what alternative technology platforms were considered beyond Notes and client/server. While a mainframe deployment may make sense due to the limited agency support resources, Windows NT/2000 should also be evaluated as the server for the application.
- The proposal assumes deployment on the IMServices mainframe but no provision is made in the budget for ongoing costs of mainframe services. The project should also have a checkpoint after design but before programming to determine if the project should continue.

Reviewer 2:

**Scope and Projected Outcomes:**

- 1.The needs and beneficiaries of this possible project are well defined. The agency has clearly shown that not only State Fire Marshal staff, but the general public, and other state agencies will also benefit from this project.
- 2.The agency has shown successfully that communication in several areas will be improved, but there is only limited information regarding other expected outcomes of this project.
- 3.Tracking of expenditures is appropriate for determining the overall cost savings of this proposed project. The agencies' plan to seek feedback will aid in determining overall effectiveness of the proposed project.
- 4.The constraints this agency has defined are clearly stated and typical of state agencies.
- 5.The agency has done an excellent job clearly defining project assumptions.

**Project Justification / Business Case**

- 1.The cost savings for the agency will not be fully realized until a cost/benefit analysis is completed; however, the savings provided by automation should be realized with the reduction of duplicate efforts and savings of postage and materials.
- 2.The ability to electronically access information will greatly improve customer service
- 3.The agency has clearly stated the positive impact this project will provide.
- 4.The agency has worked with a vendor unsuccessfully and as a result has researched alternatives and has chosen the most cost effective and efficient means by which to automate their business.
- 5.The reviewer's score is based upon the agencies' statement "The proposed project complies with the Governor's mandate for agencies to become more efficient and to participate in the growing surge toward e-government."

**Implementation**

- 1.The reviewer assumes, possibly incorrectly, that the SFM is serving as both sponsor and stakeholder of this project but this is unaddressed in the documentation.
- 2.The agency have clearly stated the project team roles and responsibilities in the documentation.
- 3.Milestones and deliverables are clearly defined by the agency.
- 4.The agencies plan is vague. The reviewer assumes a typo in the sentence "IMServices may be involved in the development to an extent." The reviewer also assumes the word "development" should be replaced with "training".
- 5.The agency clearly has experience in determining maintenance and ongoing support requirements.

**Technical Impact**

In the opinion of this reviewer, the agency should review the following sentence from paragraph 3 page 9 of 11 with IMServices to determine accuracy: "IMServices already has the staffing available for the hardware and software support which is included in the processing costs". The "software support" phrase in this sentence may have been taken out of context by the agency.

**Risk Assessment**

- 2.Specific risks are identified, and the agency has deemed that all risks identified are prioritized equally high.
- 3.Strategies are present but somewhat unclear to the reviewer.
- 4.The opinion of this reviewer is that category 4. "How significant is the impact if the project is not completed as proposed?" could be confusing. It appears to this reviewer that the agency was identifying the impact against the business processes if the project is not completed as proposed, as opposed to the actual risk factors of not completing the project as proposed.

**Financial Analysis and Budget**

The opinion of this reviewer is that the budget is reasonable but that more accurate numbers should be obtained after further detailed analysis.

Reviewer 3:

- Estimate of on-going operational costs does not include any amount for application support or computer use.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 27-01**

| Agency              | Project   | FY2002    | FY2003    |
|---------------------|---|-----------|-----------|
| Department of Roads | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR GIS Strategic Plan' | \$450,000 | \$450,000 |

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

In Fiscal Year 2000-2001 the Nebraska Department of Roads contracted with GEO Decisions, a division of Gannett Fleming, Inc. to provide a GIS Strategic Plan. This project will accomplish the following:

- ⊙ educate department employees about GIS and how it could be used to benefit the department,
- ⊙ assess the possible uses of GIS within the department and recommend a prioritized list of projects the department should accomplish over the next several fiscal years and the funding level, and
- ⊙ review the department's current GIS infrastructure, support and development organization and make recommendations on possible improvements.

Because the department does not know for sure what projects will be recommended as high priority, we are budgeting 'contingency money' in anticipation that several of the top priority projects will be undertaken in the FY-2002 / FY-2003 time frame. This money could be used for consultant services, hardware/software procurement, etc. depending on the selected project requirements.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

*Estimate of One-time costs (Note: this estimate is per fiscal year)*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Application Definition .....          | \$75,000.00          |
| Application Analysis and Design ..... | \$175,000.00         |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition.....  | \$100,000.00         |
| Testing.....                          | \$50,000.00          |
| Training.....                         | \$25,000.00          |
| Implementation .....                  | \$25,000.00          |
| <b>Total One-time Costs .....</b>     | <b>\$450,000.00</b>  |

*Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade.....  | \$10,000.00          |
| Hardware Maintenance .....            | \$5,000.00           |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) ..... | \$15,000.00          |
| Maintenance & Support .....           | \$5,000.00           |
| <b>Total On-going Costs .....</b>     | <b>\$35,000.00</b>   |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 3          | 1          | 4          | 2.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 0          | 0          | 7          | 2.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 0          | 0          | 8          | 2.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 0          | 0          | 7          | 2.3       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 0          | 4          | 2.3       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>12</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- There is insufficient information to evaluate the proposal.

Reviewer 2:

- Virtually no information provided beyond general project objectives.
- Level of support, documentation and effort within proposal provides no confidence in numbers presented.

Reviewer 3:

- This IT Project Proposal from NDOR does a minimal job of addressing the questions raised in the Project Proposal Form. However, much of this is understandable given the reality of the mismatch of state's IT Project Proposal Form submission timeline and the current NDOR GIS Strategic Planning timeline. NDOR is currently involved in an extensive, agency-wide GIS strategic planning effort, the results of which will determine the ultimate focus of this IT Project Proposal. Because this strategic planning process is not completed, it would be difficult to provide very specific responses to many of the questions in the Project Proposal Form. NDOR is investing a considerable amount of resources to secure the services of GIS planning consultants to develop a multi-year GIS development plan for its agency. This reviewer has been involved, to a limited extent, in this planning process and has been impressed with the scope of the outreach, needs assessment, and prioritization conducted as part of that process. As part of this GIS strategic planning process, specific needs, constraints, objectives and tasks will be outlined. Based on this reviewer's experience with this specific IT planning effort, it is expected that the results will ultimately address the concerns for which this IT Project Proposal Form was designed and I would urge NITC support for this project.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 27-02**

| Agency              | Project   | FY2002    | FY2003    |
|---------------------|---|-----------|-----------|
| Department of Roads | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR Document Management Strategic Plan' | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |

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

In Fiscal Year 2000-2001 the Nebraska Department of Roads contracted with Sterling Software, a subsidiary of Computer Associates, to provide a Document Management Strategic Plan for the department. This project will accomplish the following:

- ⊙ educate department employees about Document Management and how it could be used to the benefit of the department,
- ⊙ assess the possible uses of Document Imaging, Workflow, and Management within the department and recommend a prioritized list of projects the department should accomplish over the next several fiscal years and an estimate of the funding required to accomplish each project, and
- ⊙ review the department's current Document Management infrastructure, support and development organization and make recommendations on possible improvements.

Because the department does not know for sure what projects will be recommended as high priority, we are budgeting 'contingency money' in anticipation that several of the top priority projects will be undertaken in the FY-2002 / FY-2003 time frame. This money could be used for consultant services, hardware/software procurement, etc. depending on the selected project requirements.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

*Estimate of One-time costs (Note: this estimate is per fiscal year)*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Application Definition.....           | \$100,000.00         |
| Application Analysis and Design ..... | \$200,000.00         |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition.....  | \$100,000.00         |
| Testing.....                          | \$50,000.00          |
| Training.....                         | \$25,000.00          |
| Implementation .....                  | \$25,000.00          |
| <b>Total One-time Costs.....</b>      | <b>\$500,000.00</b>  |

*Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade.....  | \$10,000.00          |
| Hardware Maintenance .....            | \$5,000.00           |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) ..... | \$15,000.00          |
| Maintenance & Support .....           | \$5,000.00           |
| <b>Total On-going Costs.....</b>      | <b>\$35,000.00</b>   |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean     | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 8          | 3          | 1          | 4.0      | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5          | 0          | 1          | 2.0      | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0      | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0      | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 3          | 1          | 2.3      | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>8</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:

- There is insufficient information to evaluate the proposal.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 27-05**

| Agency              | Project  | FY2002    | FY2003   |
|---------------------|--|-----------|----------|
| Department of Roads | Implement a Capital Facilities Management System | \$150,000 | \$15,000 |

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

This project is to determine the requirements of a capital facilities system. This includes but is not limited to building/yard inventory, building floor plans, building equipment inventory, maintenance work request and work tracking, and facilities maintenance/replacement planning.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

*Estimate of One-time costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Application Definition.....           | \$15,000.00          |
| Application Analysis and Design ..... | \$10,000.00          |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition.....  | \$100,000.00         |
| Testing.....                          | \$10,000.00          |
| Training.....                         | \$10,000.00          |
| Implementation .....                  | \$5,000.00           |
| <b>Total One-time Costs.....</b>      | <b>\$150,000.00</b>  |

*Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                       | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|--|----------------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade.....   | \$10,000.00          |
| Hardware Maintenance .....             | \$0.00               |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) .....  | \$0.00               |
| <b>Maintenance &amp; Support .....</b> | <b>\$5,000.00</b>    |
| <b>Total On-going Costs.....</b>       | <b>\$15,000.00</b>   |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean     | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 3          | 1          | 2          | 2.0      | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 3          | 2          | 0          | 1.7      | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0.3      | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0.3      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0      | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 1          | 1          | 3          | 1.7      | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>6</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- Since the specific technology is unknown until after a study is done, the budget for hardware / software seems to be only a guess.

Reviewer 2:

- This looks like a "good idea" that is not yet ready to graduate to a "project". It is also likely an area of interest to several agencies. This idea would greatly benefit from a collaborative approach with others such as the state colleges, game and parks and DAS/Building Division to determine common requirements and justification. The work of the criminal justice community in developing collaborative approaches is a good model. This proposal simply does not include enough information to proceed -- many areas were scored at "0" because the questions were not addressed in the proposal.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 27-06**

| Agency              | Project  | FY2002    | FY2003   |
|---------------------|--|-----------|----------|
| Department of Roads | Upgrade the Department's Equipment Management System | \$710,000 | \$60,000 |

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

This project is to replace our current equipment management system by either replacing it with a purchased product, to enhance our current system with significant new capabilities, or to develop a new custom system. The department is currently defining the requirements for the new system and researching third party products to determine whether to purchase or build a solution.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

*Estimate of One-time*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Application Definition.....           | \$30,000.00          |
| Application Analysis and Design ..... | \$20,000.00          |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition.....  | \$610,000.00         |
| Testing.....                          | \$15,000.00          |
| Training.....                         | \$15,000.00          |
| Implementation .....                  | \$20,000.00          |
| <hr/>                                 |                      |
| Total One-time Costs.....             | \$710,000.00         |

*Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade.....  | \$50,000.00          |
| Hardware Maintenance .....            | \$0.00               |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) ..... | \$0.00               |
| Maintenance & Support .....           | \$10,000.00          |
| <hr/>                                 |                      |
| Total On-going Costs.....             | \$60,000.00          |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean     | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 3          | 2          | 3          | 2.7      | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 3          | 0          | 1          | 1.3      | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0.3      | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 1          | 0          | 1          | 0.7      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0      | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 1          | 3          | 3          | 2.3      | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>7</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- Based on my experience, the cost seems high. They seem to be leaving the door open to a custom system. This is always a more expensive route with greater maintenance and service issues.

Reviewer 2:

- Insufficient information exists to prepare an evaluation.



NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 27-07**

| Agency              | Project  | FY2002 | FY2003    |
|---------------------|--|--------|-----------|
| Department of Roads | Upgrade the Department's Highway Maintenance Management System |        | \$760,000 |

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

This project is to replace our current highway maintenance management system with either a purchased product, to enhance our current system with significant new capabilities, or to develop a new custom system. The department is currently defining the requirements for the new system and researching third party products to determine whether to purchase or build a solution.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

*Estimate of One-time costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Application Definition.....           | \$30,000.00          |
| Application Analysis and Design ..... | \$20,000.00          |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition.....  | \$660,000.00         |
| Testing.....                          | \$15,000.00          |
| Training.....                         | \$15,000.00          |
| Implementation .....                  | \$20,000.00          |
| <hr/>                                 |                      |
| Total One-time Costs.....             | \$760,000.00         |

*Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs*

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade.....  | \$50,000.00          |
| Hardware Maintenance .....            | \$0.00               |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) ..... | \$0.00               |
| Maintenance & Support .....           | \$10,000.00          |
| <hr/>                                 |                      |
| Total On-going Costs.....             | \$60,000.00          |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean     | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 3          | 2          | 3          | 2.7      | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 1          | 0          | 1          | 0.7      | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0.3      | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 1          | 0          | 1          | 0.7      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0.0      | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 1          | 3          | 3          | 2.3      | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>7</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:

- Insufficient information exists to prepare an evaluation.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 27-10**

| Agency              | Project   | FY2002    | FY2003 |
|---------------------|---|-----------|--------|
| Department of Roads | Preparation for Migrating to PC/WEB Application Development | \$200,000 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

This project will prepare a plan on how the division and department will prepare itself for developing applications both in the near future (1-3 years) and long term (4-6 years). It is critical that we address this at this time as the emphasis is changing from legacy mainframe Cobol applications to PC and/or WEB browser based applications. We must start training our staff and implementing the tools and languages required for this new environment.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

***Estimate of One-time costs***

| <u>Cost Item</u>   | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|--|----------------------|
| It is estimated that 25 licenses of any software products needed.....  | \$50,000.00          |
| It is estimated that 8 ISD staff will be involved in researching this issue (800 hours).....                                       | \$40,000.00          |
| It is estimated that 8 ISD staff will be involved in preparing the plan to implement the approved recommendations (800 hours)..... | \$40,000.00          |
| It is estimated that all ISD development staff will be involved in training during implementation (600 hours).....                 | \$70,000.00          |
| <hr/> Total One-time Costs.....  | <hr/> \$200,000.00   |

***Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs***

| <u>Cost Item</u>                      | <u>Cost Estimate</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade.....  | \$25,000.00          |
| Hardware Maintenance.....             | \$0.00               |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) ..... | \$0.00               |
| <hr/> Maintenance & Support .....     | <hr/> \$0.00         |
| Total On-going Costs.....             | \$25,000.00          |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1   | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 8            | 3          | 4          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6            | 9          | 0          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5            | 5          | 0          | 3.3       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 5            | 8          | 0          | 4.3       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 4            | 1          | 0          | 1.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3            | 4          | 3          | 3.3       | 5                |
|  | <b>TOTAL</b> |            |            | <b>23</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 2:

- Switching staff from mainframe to PC/WEB technologies is a large undertaking. It is what the end users are demanding. It is important to take the business knowledge our current staff have and retain that, training them in the new tools. Constraints and assumptions are missing.
- Retention and retraining of current staff is an economical way to attain this goal. This request did not state that as an economic benefit but it certainly exists. If you hired a new employee with the PC/WEB skills, they may only stay long to round out their resume. Retaining existing staff can avoid that. Customers are demanding this type of presentation of data. IT staff must be trained to deliver it. Existing standards and policies will need to be changed, this project will attempt to do that. E-government is a high priority with this Administration, it is appropriate to have the IT staff move this direction.
- The proposal shows some costs for training, maintenance, and on-going support. The request is to develop a plan so these will be better known. I believe most of the items mentioned in the questions can be answered if the opportunity.
- Most of the issues asked in this section [Technical Impact] are to be resolved by the project itself. These are the questions to be answered. Clients are demanding these solutions. State IT staff need to be able to deliver in a coordinated, comprehensive manner. This request attempts to lay that foundation.
- There are several major risks that need addressing here. First, the risk involved with training current staff into new technologies. Not everyone will be able to make the transition. The concepts are new and different from procedural languages. Second, infrastructure changes will be needed in the way of hardware, networks, software, and security. Failure in anyone of these areas will mean significant problems. Finally, there is risk by not moving forward with this initiative. Web access is quickly becoming "standard business practice". We must support field staff and engineers with web accessible information. Each of these area could be addressed more. In any case, this needs to proceed.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 34-01**

| Agency             | Project                       | FY2002    | FY2003    |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Content | \$300,000 | \$300,000 |

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

The purpose of *Nebraska's e-Library: Content* is to expand and improve access to electronic information resources for Nebraska citizens by providing enhanced access to affordable, reliable, progressive, and equitable library and information services, regardless of economic status and geographic location. This will be achieved through the provision of statewide access to a core group of reference and research materials online, and enhanced access to those resources through the implementation of a common user interface. Other components include shared cataloging using a common database, comprehensive participation in group purchases and contracts through state subsidy programs, and enhanced access to existing print materials available in libraries statewide, using streamlined interlibrary loan (ILL) activities. These will be disseminated statewide through 1) the purchase and implementation of appropriate software, and 2) grants to libraries.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|                                       | FY2002            | FY2003            | Future  | Total             |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|
| Software                              | \$ 100,000        | \$ 100,000        | ongoing | \$ 200,000        |
| Grants                                | \$ 200,000        | \$ 200,000        | ongoing | \$ 400,000        |
| <b>TOTAL COSTS</b><br>(General Funds) | <b>\$ 300,000</b> | <b>\$ 300,000</b> |         | <b>\$ 600,000</b> |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 8          | 7          | 5          | 6.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9          | 6          | 7          | 7.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 4          | 3          | 1          | 2.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 5          | 10         | 0          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 5          | 5          | 4          | 4.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 2          | 3          | 3.0       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>29</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- More information is needed to conduct a thorough assessment.
- I think that this is good project, but the project did not score well because not enough information was provided for many of the questions. It appears that the Nebraska Library Commission can obtain substantial discounts by purchasing a state license for certain databases rather than making individual libraries subscribe separately. This cost savings alone may justify funding this project.

Reviewer 2:

- The information presented in this section is very general. This proposal has a significant level of dependence on another proposal.
- Information about the project's impact needs to be defined more clearly.
- It is difficult to make an assessment of the reasonableness of the budget when there is so little detail provided.

Reviewer 3:

- Insufficient information in some categories contributed to the low score.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 34-02**

| Agency             | Project                              | FY2002    | FY2003    |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Infrastructure | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |

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

The purpose of the project is to ensure equitable access to information technology, regardless of geographic location, economic circumstances, or size of community.

The purpose of *Nebraska's e-Library: Infrastructure* is to equip Nebraska's public libraries with adequate information technology software and connectivity to ensure equitable, comprehensive, high-speed access to library and information resources, regardless of geographic location, economic circumstances, or size of community.

The means for attaining the goal of this project include providing matching grants to libraries for initial or upgraded Internet access, computer equipment, and/or initial or upgraded library automation systems. This project will address the issues of minimum information technology requirements and adequate statewide connectivity through broadband, high-speed access. This project will establish a process for statewide information technology planning, taking into account local library technology plans and leveraging future participation in the Gates Foundation U. S. Public Library Project and current technology grants using federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds for public libraries and consortia that include public libraries.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|                 |            |            |                |            |
|-----------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| Grants          | FY2002     | FY2003     | Future ongoing | Total      |
| TOTAL COSTS     | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 |                | \$ 500,000 |
| (General Funds) | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 |                | \$ 500,000 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 8          | 6          | 3          | 5.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 4          | 2          | 0          | 2.0       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 6          | 3          | 5          | 4.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 10         | 6          | 10         | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 8          | 0          | 0          | 2.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 5          | 0          | 3          | 2.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>26</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- I really wish that more information had been provided so that this project would have received the score it truly deserves. Nebraska libraries have taken the leading role in providing public access to the Internet. However, many smaller libraries still lack Internet access. Nationally nearly 95% percent of libraries provide public access. In Nebraska, only 75% of public libraries provide public access. All libraries serving populations of 2,500 or more provide public access, but only 52 percent of libraries serving populations less than 1,000 provide public access. As more and more information and services are becoming available online, it is imperative that each library provides public access to the Internet.

Reviewer 2:

- The need is well-outlined but the expected outcomes are not defined in any detail. There is no reference made to measurement and assessment measures.
- Information about the project's impact needs to be defined more clearly and a justification for proceeding with the project in this manner needs to be made.

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

- The project team is not described. The roles and responsibilities are discussed but there are not milestones or deliverables outlined and no explanation as to why they are not applicable. No plan was submitted and no explanation provided as to why it was not applicable.
- There is a general statement concerning appropriate need but no indication in the narrative of how user needs were determined.
- The narrative does not address risk factors other than costs.
- It is not clear what relationship exists between the outcomes and the money.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 34-03**

| Agency             | Project                        | FY2002   | FY2003   |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Training | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |

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

*Nebraska's e-Library: Training* project addresses the need for improved information technology and training opportunities for Nebraska library personnel, with emphasis on networked information services, and the skills needed to utilize online information resources. Assessment of library personnel skills and abilities will define the content needs for workshops and training opportunities. These needs will be met through workshops, online tutorials and mini-courses, and through selected local, regional, and national resources that meet those needs. Training and educational opportunities for library staff will be developed and identified to ensure that every library in Nebraska has skilled and knowledgeable staff to meet citizen information needs. Competitive grant funds will be provided to achieve these objectives.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|                                |                     |                     |                   |                     |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Grants                         | FY2002<br>\$ 50,000 | FY2003<br>\$ 50,000 | Future<br>ongoing | Total<br>\$ 100,000 |
| TOTAL COSTS<br>(General Funds) | \$ 50,000           | \$ 50,000           |                   | \$ 100,000          |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 7          | 7          | 6          | 6.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7          | 5          | 4          | 5.3       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 2          | 3          | 3.3       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 10         | 10         | 10         | 10.0      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 8          | 3          | 4          | 5.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 4          | 3          | 3.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>34</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- This project would have scored better if a little more information had been provided. Overall, I think this is a worthy project.

Reviewer 2:

- There is a lack of detail in the narrative about what library staff will be targeted for training. There is no detail concerning how outcomes will be measured or assessed.
- There is a lack of detail in the narrative concerning the impact the funding will have. It appears that detail could have been provided because the Commission has awarded monies for training in the past.
- The narrative does not address specifics. At one point in the narrative, it is stated that this training has been done but there is no indication of timelines, deliverables, or milestones.
- This proposal relies on the funding of another proposal to reduce risk.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 37-01**

| Agency                      | Project | FY2002  | FY2003 |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | E-Files | \$4,158 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

The E-Files project will implement a computer environment for electronic storing and retrieving of Court files.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Domino.Doc Client Licenses - Initial License (66 @ \$41) | \$2,706 |
| Domino.Doc Client Annual Renewals (66 @ \$22)            | \$1,452 |
| Total:   | \$4,158 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 6          | 4          | 5          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6          | 5          | 4          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 5          | 5          | 5.0       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 7          | 7          | 6          | 6.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 8          | 0          | 0          | 2.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 2          | 2          | 1          | 1.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>26</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- More information about this project will be developed during the Research and Testing pilot to be completed by the agency working with IMServices.

Reviewer 2:

- The stated objective is to shift Settlement, Voc Rehab, and Adjudication records to electronic format, but the proposal and budget only address installation of software. Conversion and business process changes are not addressed.

Reviewer 3:

- Migration and support costs may be understated.



NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 37-02**

| Agency                      | Project                                    | FY2002   | FY2003 |
|-----------------------------|--|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Network Switch from Token Ring to Ethernet | \$18,900 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

This project moves the Court off the Token Ring protocol to a high speed Ethernet protocol.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Network Card Replacements (80 @ \$100)                 | \$ 8,000      |
| Router and Hub Replacements (7 @ \$1,200)              | 8,400         |
| State Department of Communications and PCLan Personnel | 2,500         |
| <b>Total:</b>  | <b>18,900</b> |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 3          | 9          | 7          | 6.3       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7          | 9          | 7          | 7.7       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 5          | 8          | 7          | 6.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 10         | 10         | 10         | 10.0      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 3          | 6          | 4          | 4.3       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 5          | 4          | 4.3       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>39</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- There were no assumptions for the project. The measurements are not clear. Although the project talks about waits at the "electronic counter", there are no defined measurements that indicate the criticality of the information being requested or the projected number of requests and time constraints currently being experienced.
- The justification for this project does not give any clear, measureable justification to judge the project's justification. There is no cost/benefit analysis, however, the benefits of moving servers to the State server farm is clearly understood by this reviewer.
- There is no training or staff development requirements identified, nor any maintenance or on-going support requirements defined. Token ring is different enough from Ethernet that there will be training and support issues. I am confused as to where the hubs, routers and network cards are all resident that would need to be replaced. If these are not in Lincoln, the complexity of the changes grows due to the staffing needs to make the changes.
- The technical impact of this solution fits with the state strategy.
- The risks identified are all related to the implementation of the project. However there are no risks identified outside the actual implementation. These would include items such as, no local expertise to manage an Ethernet network, upgrades in network data lines due to the need for increased speed, network management fees, etc.

Review 2:

- This appears to be a project that should be accomplished as it is of minimal cost and conforms to the infrastructure direction of the state. While some of the answers to the questions were minimal this is the type of project that is difficult to not give a high priority.

Reviewer 3:

- The proposal should present evidence that the slow speed is a network rather than a server problem.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 37-03**

| Agency                      | Project                      | FY2002   | FY2003 |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Internet Enabling Court Data | \$33,000 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

This project upgrades Oracle Server Database Licenses for real-time access to the information in these databases via the Internet.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Oracle Server Power Unit Licensing,<br>Power Units(2 CPUs x 750 mZh) x \$22/PU<br>(1500 @ \$22) | \$33,000        |
| <b>Total:</b>   | <b>\$33,000</b> |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 4          | 7          | 3          | 4.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 3          | 4          | 7          | 4.7       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 3          | 8          | 7          | 6.0       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 7          | 9          | 10         | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 2          | 8          | 7          | 5.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 4          | 5          | 4.3       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>34</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- While the proposal describes a need for licensing for Internet access to data there is no clear discussion of the types of data, timelines to implement access, or a discussion of need.
- Measuring and assessment mentions the upgrade of licenses but is not tied to any actual implementation of data access.
- Constraints are not really defined; the proposal just reiterates a need for licensing which is an access constraint not a proposal constraint.
- Project impact says the court will 'be positioned to provide access' but does not say if or when access will be implemented or what the actual access will be. Future goals are not tied to immediate upgrades. This proposal does not appropriately discuss the business case; it only describes a technical tool that can be the basis for a solution.
- Negotiating purchase id mentioned without reference to state contract or sole source or GSA, etc. Purchase is mentioned but not installation and installation staff.
- The impact is not clearly defined since there is not much discussion of actual applications, timelines to implement, budget and plans to implement Internet solutions, planned Internet access and needs.

Reviewer 2:

- Security and privacy issues require more explanation. On-going license maintenance costs are not identified.

Reviewer 3:

- Minimal objectives and outcomes emphasizing technical, rather than programmatic, objectives are provided.
- No implementation, beyond purchase of license, was provided.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 37-04**

| Agency                      | Project                        | FY2002   | FY2003 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Lotus Notes Mail Server Backup | \$28,680 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

This project will provide hot-standby and fail-safe recovery of the Court's Lotus Notes Mail Server and Discussion Databases.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Domino Enterprise Server License on Two Servers, 1st Yr (2 @ \$3,200)   | \$ 6,400.00 |
| Domino Enterprise Server License on Two Servers, 2nd Yr + (2 @ \$3,200) | \$ 6,400.00 |
| Microsoft NT Server Operating System, 5 User (1 @ \$500)                | \$ 500.00   |
| AntiVirus Software, Two Servers, 1st year (2 @ \$250)                   | \$ 500.00   |
| AntiVirus Software, Two Servers, 2nd yr + (2 @ \$250)                   | \$ 500.00   |
| Secure Socket Layer (SSL) on Two Servers, 1st Yr (2 @ \$250)            | \$ 500.00   |
| Secure Socket Layer (SSL) on Two Servers, 2nd Yr + (2 @ \$500)          | \$ 1,000.00 |
| Server Hardware, (Replace every four years)                             | \$10,000.00 |
| IMServices Data Center Hosting (24 @ \$120)                             | \$ 2,880.00 |
| Total:  | \$28,680.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 9          | 9          | 7          | 8.3       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 10         | 9          | 4          | 7.7       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 9          | 9          | 5          | 7.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 10         | 10         | 9          | 9.7       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 6          | 6          | 8          | 6.7       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 5          | 3          | 4.0       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>44</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- Type/mode of monitoring is not spelled out; whether manual or automated. Not as much a cost issue but more an operational expectation that should be clarified.
- This is not a new approach and has likely been done before in our environment and experience.
- The budget for hardware, software and server housing (services) is fairly explicit but no numbers are estimated for PCLan's people time participation.

Reviewer 3:

- The budget does not identify on-going costs. It is not clear whether the budget includes software to accomplish mirroring and fail-safe recovery. RAID technology to protect against disk drive failure may be another option.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 37-05**

| Agency                      | Project           | FY2002   | FY2003 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Server Protection | \$17,280 |        |

- Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

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

This project provides for moving of Court Servers into the IMServices "Server Farm".

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| IMServices Data Center Hosting - 144(6 Servers/Mth x 24mths) x \$120 | \$17,280.00 |
| Total:   | \$17,280.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 10         | 9          | 10         | 9.7       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 10         | 9          | 7          | 8.7       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 9          | 9          | 5          | 7.7       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 10         | 10         | 10         | 10.0      | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 7          | 6          | 8          | 7.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 4          | 5          | 2          | 3.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>47</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 3:

- The budget does not seem to include one-time installation costs.
- A cost of over \$500 per Notes user within the agency seems expensive.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**Project # 82-01**

| Agency                           | Project   | FY2002    | FY2003    |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|
| Deaf & Hard of Hearing, Comm. on | Telehealth Services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing People | \$516,899 | \$508,999 |

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

Through the advent of Telemedicine, various technology mediums are being tried to determine the most effect method to provide services to deaf and hard of hearing people in Western Nebraska. The Commission is conducting a pilot project to determine if video conferencing and using phone lines to transmit audio and picture to another location are a viable medium for the transmission of sign language communication.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

|                             | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2002 (Year 1) | Request for FY2003 (Year 2) | (Year 3)    | (Year 4)    | Future      | Total        |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Personnel Costs (a)      |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 2. Contractual Services     |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             |              |
| 2.1 Design                  |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 2.2 Programming             |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 2.3 Project Management      |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 2.4 Other                   | \$ 7,730.00              | \$ 2,000.00                 | \$ 2,000.00                 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 17,730.00 |
| 3. Supplies and Materials   | \$ 1,300.00              |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ 1,300.00  |
| 4. Telecommunications       | \$ 8,200.00              | \$ 7,500.00                 | \$ 7,500.00                 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 45,700.00 |
| 5. Training                 | \$ 1,230.00              |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ 1,230.00  |
| 6. Travel                   | \$ 1,540.00              |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ 1,540.00  |
| 7. Other Operating Costs    |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 8. Capital Expenditures (b) |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             |              |
| 8.1 Hardware                | \$ 20,000.00             |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ 20,000.00 |
| 8.2 Software                |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 8.3 Network                 |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| 8.4 Other                   |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| <b>TOTAL COSTS</b>          | \$ 40,000.00             | \$ 9,500.00                 | \$ 9,500.00                 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 87,500.00 |
| General Funds               |                          | \$ 9,500.00                 | \$ 9,500.00                 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 47,500.00 |
| Cash Funds                  | \$ 40,000.00             |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ 40,000.00 |
| Federal Funds               |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| Revolving Funds             |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| Other Funds                 |                          |                             |                             |             |             |             | \$ -         |
| <b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>          | \$ 40,000.00             | \$ 9,500.00                 | \$ 9,500.00                 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 87,500.00 |

**PROJECT SCORE**

|  | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Mean      | Maximum Possible |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes         | 2          | 4          | 0          | 2.0       | 10               |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6          | 6          | 0          | 4.0       | 10               |
| Section VI: Implementation                       | 2          | 5          | 0          | 2.3       | 10               |
| Section VII: Technical Impact                    | 7          | 6          | 0          | 4.3       | 10               |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment                    | 0          | 3          | 0          | 1.0       | 8                |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget        | 3          | 5          | 3          | 3.7       | 5                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     |            |            |            | <b>17</b> | <b>53</b>        |

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Reviewer 1:

- This was difficult to rate because you had to pull the information from the Goals and Objectives section of the proposal. This was the only section completed. The target beneficiaries are cursorily defined, however nothing supports how many people or any specific target areas or needs. The outcomes are defined as loosely defined as providing mental health training, education and specialists who communicate in sign language and are knowledgeable in deafness and hearing loss through technology to deaf and hard of hearing people. I don't know what that really means as an outcome.
- The project's documentation does not show that an economic impact is applicable, nor is there any documentation that shows that there were alternative solutions looked at.
- There is no clear implementation plan in this documentation. There are no dates or any identification of a project team other than the Commission that will administer the money. Roles and responsibilities are not addressed. There is no documentation that indicates that any stakeholders have been involved in any portion of the planning process.
- Although sketchy, the information related to the technology that will be used indicates that the Commission is working with the appropriate state entities to ensure that the equipment and facilities will be compatible with the State networks that are currently in existence.

Reviewer 2:

- Some of the information is contained in the goals and objectives but the issues outlined in Section IV were not addressed in the proposal.
- Implementation issues are briefly addressed in the beginning of the proposal and it is acknowledged that the funding requested is primarily for a T-1 line but there is a lack of detail about what deliverables and milestones are to result from this project.
- There is a lack of detail concerning the technical impact and how it will be measured. The project is going to be heavily dependent on video and as the focus of the project is Western Nebraska there are likely going to be some significant technical challenges.

Reviewer 3:

- There is insufficient information to evaluate this proposal.