D R A F T

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Technical Panel Priorities and Action Items for 2003-04

Priorities

TP-1   Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications
infrastructure that is scalable, reliable and efficient.

TP-2   Develop a technical architecture, including recommended standards and
guidelines, to provide for interoperability and greater efficiency in IT systems.

TP-3   Review technology projects or requests for funding recommended to the NITC,
including budget requests, NITC grant requests, and Information Technology
Infrastructure Fund projects.

Action Items

PRIORITY TP-1 **Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable and efficient.**

TP 1.1
Title: Provide Technical Support to the Collaborative Aggregation Partnership (CAP) for the Development of Statewide Network Services.
Description: The panel will provide technical support for the implementation of statewide network services through the CAP and related work groups.
Lead: Brenda Decker, Network Architecture Work Group
Timeframe: Ongoing

PRIORITY TP-2 **Develop a technical architecture, including recommended standards and guidelines, to provide for interoperability and greater efficiency in IT systems.**

TP 2.1
Title: Recommend Technical Standards, Guidelines, and Best Practices
Description: The panel, with input from the NITC councils and other coordinating entities, will recommend the adoption of technical standards, guidelines, and best practices.
Lead: Assigned by subject
Timeframe: Ongoing

TP 2.2
Title: Technical Support for Aggregation and Coordination of Networks
Description: The panel will provide technical support for the aggregation and coordination of networks.
Lead: Assigned by subject
Timeframe: Ongoing

TP 2.2.1
Title: Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group
Despription: The Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group was chartered by the Technical Panel on November 8, 2002 to develop the technical and non-technical recommendations needed in order to provide for a statewide, interconnected, synchronous video network serving citizens involved with education, state government, and telehealth.
Lead: Michael Beach
Timeframe: 1st Quarter 2003 - 1st Quarter 2004

PRIORITY TP-3
Review technology projects or requests for funding recommended to the NITC, including budget requests, NITC grant requests, and Information Technology Infrastructure Fund projects.

TP 3.1
Title: Project Reviews - Statutory
Description: Provide a technical review of project proposals as required by statute. Categories of projects that must be reviewed by the panel are: budget requests; GTCF grant fund applications; CTF grant fund applications; and ITIF funded projects. Certain long-term projects, such as NIS and NETCOM, are also reviewed periodically during the project implementation.
Lead: Rick Becker
Timeframe: Budget requests: Annual
                 GTCF and CTF grants: As received
                 ITIF funded projects: Prior to authorization of use of funds
                 Long-term projects: Ongoing
                 Education Innovation Fund Grants: Annual

TP 3.2
Title: Project Reviews - Other
Description: The panel will review projects not listed in 3.1 above at the request of the NITC, the project sponsor, or other responsible party.
Lead: Rick Becker
Timeframe: State Records Board grants: Quarterly
                 Voluntary reviews: As requested

TP 3.3
Title: Revise Procedures for Reviewing IT Projects and Purchases by State Agencies
Description: The panel will recommend revisions to the technical review procedures for IT related projects and purchases by state agencies. The purpose of the review process is to ensure compliance with technical standards, compatibility with existing or planned infrastructure, and sound decisions. The revised review process will be designed with the following considerations: 1) the process will incorporate all existing review procedures (e.g. the DAS 1909 form) to provide agencies with a one-step process; 2) the process for submitting requests will not be cumbersome; and 3) the review process will allow for a rapid response to the requesting agency.
Lead: DAS IT Sub-cabinet
Timeframe: 3rd Quarter 2003