M E E T I N G A G E N D A

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Wednesday, November 22, 2006
9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents: Click the links in the agenda
or click here for all documents (xx Pages, xxx KB).

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes - October 20, 2006*

4. Project Reviews*

- HHSS Project Proposals for FY2007-2009 Biennium
- DL Event Clearinghouse & Scheduling Software - Purchase

5. Standards and Guidelines

- Request for Exemption*
  - Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network - Exemption from "Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing"
- Recommendations to NITC *
  - Remote Access Standard | Comments Received (None)
  - Emergency Information Page | Comments Received (None)

6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)

- Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group
- Security Architecture Work Group

7. Election - Technical Panel Chair for 2007*

8. Other Business

9. Next Meeting Date

10. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Item

(The Technical Panel will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda, but reserves the right to adjust the order of items if necessary and may elect to take action on any of the items listed.)

NITC and Technical Panel Websites: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/
Meeting notice posted to the NITC Website: 25 OCT 2006
Meeting notice posted to the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar: 25 OCT 2006
Agenda posted to the NITC Website: 20 NOV 2006

T E C H N I C A L P A N E L M I N U T E S

TECHNICAL PANEL
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Friday, October 20, 2006
9:00 a.m. - 11:22 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brenda Decker, Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Walter Weir, University of Nebraska
Mike Winkle, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present to conduct official business. The meeting notice and meeting agenda were posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar website on September 28, 2006. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 18, 2006. The Open Meetings Act Information was posted to the on the south wall of the meeting room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER MINUTES

Ms. Decker moved to approve the September 12, 2006 minutes as presented. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes,Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes . Results: Yes-3, No-0. Motion carried.

Ms. Horn and Mr. Langer arrived at the meeting.

PROJECT REVIIEW - DL EVENT CLEARING HOUSE & SCHEDULING SOFTWARE - PURCHASE

As stated in section 79-1335: "The council shall not approve technology purchases for the council in excess of ten thousand dollars without approval of the technical panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission that the purchases are in compliance with any applicable commission standards." Gordon Rothemeyer reviewed the time frame. The OCIO (Office of the Chief Information Officer) is responsible for the RFP process and will award the contract. There will be an evaluation committee. After a contract has been awarded, the council will work with the vendor to prioritize tasks, and provide training to have the project in place

by July to start scheduling in August. The council has recommended to have NET involved in the technical aspect and to meet soon to discuss project management.

Panel members had questions regarding the establishment of a technical team; hardware and software for such a large endeavor; the RFP review and selection. The motion was delayed and it was decided by group consensus to have a special meeting on November 22nd to take action on this item.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES-DISCUSSION - REMOTE ACCESS
After further review, the Security Work Group recommended additional changes to the document. The panel discussed the following changes:

- Section 1.0 needed a clearer definition
- The title of Section 4.2.1 was changed to Remote Access from Non-State Owned and/or Managed Devices
- Under 4.2.1, a new bullet was needed with antivirus language similar to the second paragraph of 4.2.

Discussion occurred regarding enforcement of the standard.

Ms. Decker moved to post the Remote Access Standard, with the changes discussed, for the 30-day comment period. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes . Results: Yes-5, No-0. Motion carried.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - REVIEW- WEB: LOCATION OF DISASTER DOCUMENTATION

The purpose of the guideline was to have a commom location to post general information for the public for emergency purposes. All agencies would use a common naming convention that could be linked from the state home page. The State Goverment Council made the following revisions:

- Change title to read Emergency Information Page
- Change wording of 1.0 to read: "This guideline establishes the recommended location for an emergency information page -- where information for the general public would be posted in the event of a disaster -- on State of Nebraska agencies, boards and commissions websites."

The State Goverment Council approved the guideline for the 30-day comment period.

Mr. Weir moved to approve the Emergency Information Page guideline for the 30-day public comment period. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Horn-Yes, Decker-Yes, Winkle-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Weir-Yes . Results: Yes-5, No-0. Motion carried.

PROJECT PROPOSALS - FY2007-2009 BIENNIAL BUDGET - RECOMMENDATION TO THE NITC.

Based on the information provided, the Technical Panel finds that the projects listed below met the criteria: 1) The project is technically feasible; 2) The proposed technology is appropriate for the project; and 3) The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget:

- 05-01 Supreme Court, E-Filing in JUSTICE
- 05-02 Supreme Court, Digital Audio Recorders
- 13-01 Department of Education, Nebraska Transcript Project
- 37-01 Workers' Compensation Court, WCC Internet Enhancement and Security
- 37-02 Workers' Compensation Court, Court Re-engineering – Adjudication
- 37-03 Workers' Compensation Court, Court Re-engineering -Vocational Rehabilitation
- 47-01 NET, Satellite Reconfiguration Project
- 47-02 NET, Public Media Archive and Distribution Project
- 47-03 NET, Public Media at the Capitol
- 47-04 NET, Final DTV Transmitter

Based on the information provided, the Technical Panel finds that the following projects were technically feasible but that there was not adequate information to make a determination on proposed technology, budget and timeframe:

- 27-03 Department of Roads,Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) Enhancement
  Comments: The agency should carefully review and address the GIS issues raised by the reviewers.

- 50-01 State College System, Student Information
  Comments:
  • Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.
  • The Technical Panel concurs with the Education Council recommendation that encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and State College System's SIS projects.

- 51-01 University of Nebraska, Student Information System
  Comments: Same comments as #50-01.

Based on the information provided, the Technical Panel finds that that there was not adequate information to make a technical finding on the following projects:

- 27-01 Department of Roads, Expansion of Falcon DMS to Agency-wide Use
- 85-01 Retirement, Migration of PIONEER to the jClarity Platform
  Comment:
  • The agency has legitimate concerns about the current system, and the technical issues need to be addressed.
  • The agency should work with the Technical Panel to provide for an ongoing review of the technical elements of this project.

Ms. Decker moved to forward the Technical Panel's review and comments of the I.T. Budget Project Proposals to the NITC. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call

vote: Horn-Yes, Decker-Yes, Winkle-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Weir-Yes . Results: Yes-5, No-0. Motion carried.

There were two project proposals (25-01 and 25-02) that were received after the initial review process was completed. The Technical Panel will review these projects at their meeting on November 22, 2006.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (AS NEEDED)

Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group, Christy Horn. Southeast Community College, along with WebAim, is sponsoring accessibility training in January. Ms. Horn will be contacting SECC regarding collaborating training for UN. The state's webmasters would be invited to join in the University's training as well.

Security Architecture Work Group, Steve Hartman. The OCIO is in the process of completing the statewide vulnerability assessment. The internal scan has been completed and the reports will be ready next week. The work group is working on the development of a new security standard.

OTHER BUSINESS

The State Digital Summit sponsored by Government Technology magazine will be held on November 13th at the Embassy Suites in Lincoln, Nebraska.

NEXT MEETING DATE & ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held on Wednesday, November 22, 2006, 9:00 a.m. in Varner Hall, 3835 Holdrege Street, in Lincoln.

Ms. Horn moved to adjourn. Mr. Winkle seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-01	Health and Human Services System	New Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

In 1965, Title XIX of the Social Security Act initiated a jointly funded medical assistance program for certain individuals and families with low incomes and resources. The program, called Medicaid, is a cooperative venture between the Federal and State governments to assist States in providing medical care to eligible needy persons.

The Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) is the claims processing system for Nebraska's Medicaid Program. In addition to processing claims, the MMIS also supports coordination of benefits, surveillance and utilization review, federal and management reporting, and case management.

Last fiscal year the Nebraska MMIS was used to process nearly 9.5 million Medicaid claims, and issued over $1.3 billion in payments to providers. Over the past ten years, the number of Medicaid claims processed has nearly doubled, and the average monthly number of Medicaid eligibles has increased from 135,159 in fiscal year 1994 to 197,152 in 2004.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) requires a certified and continuously operational MMIS to fully fund administrative functions. CMS funds the MMIS at 75% for operations and 90% for MMIS enhancement and replacement. The federal fiscal year 2005 budget proposal released on February 5, 2005, proposed to cut the federal matching rate for MMIS enhancements from90% to 75%. Although this proposal was not adopted, the potential elimination of federal funding exists.

Three significant problem areas of the current system are:

1) **Outdated Technology:** Nebraska's MMIS was developed 27 years ago and has outlived most other states; Medicaid Management Information Systems. The current MMIS uses outdated technology and an older, inflexible technical design. Staff have worked hard to maintain the functionality of the MMIS, however, it is an extremely tenuous system often requiring "band aid" solutions. Several experts have concluded that the current MMIS in incapable of meeting expectations and future needs.

2) **Needs Outgrew System:** The Medicaid program has become increasingly complex, with service changes (e.g. hospice, behavioral health), eligibility changes, and new regulations (e.g. HIPAA). New program needs are difficult to address with the existing system. Labor-intensive "workarounds" are used to address these changes in the short-term, but do not represent a long-term solution.

3) **Costly to Maintain:** Because the MMIS is based on outdated technology and older, inflexible programming, it is costly to maintain, operate and enhance.

A Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) procurement will replace the current MMIS with a state-of-the-art MMIS. It will provide the Department with enhanced claims processing functions to increase claims productivity and accuracy. It will also provide tools to manage and distribute work, track and report all customer contracts and provide a portal for providers and clients to obtain and share needed information within the Department as well as to external agencies.

The new MMIS will be more closely aligned to the Medicaid Information Technology Architecture (MITA), which was developed and supported by Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). CMS is

using MITA as a tool for communicating a common vision for the Medicaid program and for providing guidance on achieving that vision. CMS will use an updated advance planning document (APD) review process and criteria to ensure that state IT planning meets MITA goals and objectives.

Some of the key technical architecture features include:

- Service-oriented architecture (SOA)
- Common interoperability and access services
- Adaptability and extensibility
- Hub architecture
- Performance measurement

The State of Nebraska released a RFP for a MMIS on December 15, 2005. Four bids were received. The bids were opened and reviewed by State Purchasing on April 26, 2006. After evaluation, all four bids were rejected on June 20, 2006. The bids were rejected for price, failing to meet the requirement that the bidder transfer ownership of some key portions to the State, and qualifications of the bidder. It is the State's intent to continue with procurement of a new MMIS.

The Department is submitting an Advance Planning Document (APDP to notify the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) of plans to procure a new MMIS and to request Federal Financial Participation (FFP) for the activities required for planning, procurement, design, development, implementation and certification.

FUNDING SUMMARY

The total cost for this project is estimated at $50 million. Based on previously submitted RFP's the federal match for this project will average 87%. A break out of individual expenses is not available at this time but will be included in the RFP responses.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	12	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	22	24	19	21.7	25
5: Technical Impact	15	18	18	17.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	9	6	7.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	8	9	7	8.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	15	13	13.7	20
			TOTAL	**80**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives are described adequately - Very strong goals/objectives/beneficiaries and outcomes description - Goals, objectives, benefits, and expected outcomes well thought out and presented. Using comprehensive project management process and procedure will benefit the implementation process.	- This project will be very similar in size and scope to the installation of a typical ERP system. It will also be a system that is probably quite similar to 50 other state systems doing the same thing. I would have liked to see some reference to that fact. - Could improve measures of success by relating them specifically to outcomes (i.e. one expected outcome is increased number of electronic claims, an appropriate measure of achievement would be change in e-claim numbers)

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- Page 5, the first bullet item appears to be incomplete; not sure if everything is mentioned. There is no measurement criteria defined to determine the quality and effectiveness of the resultant software application.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Appears to be well thought out - Explanation of other solutions evaluated is particularly strong - Good analysis of the four solutions presented pertaining to time frame and risk factors. State and federal mandates are clearly defined.	- It seems to me that if 50 states are all doing similar types of activities in this area the option of MMIS replacement with /Fiscal agent should possibly be given more consideration, I would have liked to see more data on this approach as well as the MMIS procurement approach. What are the real differences? - Tangible benefits are not fully explained. There is no projected economic return on investment (ROI) for any of the four solutions identified.
5: Technical Impact	- The SOA approach is a good one as it enables you to connect just about all of your computing assets into a cohesive whole, making it possible to get your systems speaking the same language together, regardless of their technology and what you may have been told in the past were 'incompatible' systems. - Technical elements are defined at the standards level, rather than software/hardware level, which is appropriate at this stage of project. Standards identified are appropriate for project. - Most of the technical issues are well developed and supported.	- A Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) is a very good approach to this proposal. SOA is supported by standards-based technologies like XML, web services, and SOAP, it is quickly moving from pilot projects to mainstream applications critical to business operations. One of the key standards accelerating the adoption of SOA is Business Process Execution Language for web services (BPEL). BPEL was created to address the requirements of composition of web services in a service-oriented environment. I would have liked to see a discussion on the use of BPEL as part of the architectural design that is associated with this project, since BPEL is a really good approach to model and map the business processes to the system design. - No clear discussion of reliability and security, beyond statement of adherence to common standards. - Security measures are not defined.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good discussion from an IT perspective - Good breakdown on teams that will be involved. The support requirements are clear and well defined.	- The business modeling process was really not discussed. If the agency does not look at this aspect then we are paving the cow paths. Implementing an SOA environment should include a review of all the business processes. - Stakeholder acceptance not addressed - I could not find where the Project sponsor(s) were identified. No information was given that indicated stakeholder acceptance was examined. Deliverables are loosely defined. Not clear which groups the "train the trainers" will train and which the contractor will train.
7: Risk Assessment	- Agree that this will not be a simple project. Going in with eyes wide open is positive. Coordination with other states will be necessary. - A number of valid risks and mitigation plans are identified. I do believe this project carries significant risk simply as a result of its size and scope. - The IT risks are well defined.	- Not much discussion regarding the risks associated with the business process design. This is going from the as-is to the to-be model. Will the architecture match the business process? What is that risk? - End-user computer proficiency could be a factor in the acceptance of new technology and the time needed to train the end-users.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Not much information, however the project is in an initial planning stage. - Financial information is sparse due to initial planning stage. There was no response to item #16.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.				
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.				
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.				

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as a "mandate".

NITC COMMENTS

- Mandate (Required by law, regulation, or other authority.)
- Regarding Project 25-01, New Medicaid Management Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
  - To leave Project 25-01 in the recommended "Mandate" list.
  - To note that the project was not submitted on time for an evaluation and Technical Panel review.
  - That the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for review of the project as needed.

  Commissioner Aerni seconded. Motion passed.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-02	Health and Human Services System	Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

The NHHS R&L Laboratory is in the process of identifying a new Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) to replace their current system, LabVantage SeedPak (version 3.98.1). The current system is outdated (Oracle 7.4.3). The new system will improve the efficiency for sample tracking, quality assurance documentation, record-keeping, document archival, data management, and data reporting. All of these enhancements will help the HHS Lab achieve and maintain accreditation under the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) and/or the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimated costs for the HHSS Laboratory LIMS

Expenditures for new hardware, software and services.

Also includes expenditures for ongoing support and maintenance

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Implementation Services							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training		$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00				$ 4,000.00
6. Travel		$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00				$ 4,000.00
7. Ongoing support and maintenance Costs		$ -	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 60,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$ 20,000.00					$ 20,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00				$ 300,000.00
8.3 Network		$ 3,000.00					$ 3,000.00
8.4 Other		$ 2,000.00					$ 2,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 179,000.00	$ 169,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 393,000.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds (22082)		$ 179,000.00	$ 169,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 393,000.00
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 179,000.00	$ 169,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 393,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	13	13.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	22	22	23	22.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	17	15	15.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	10	5	7.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	6	9	5	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	18	12	14.7	20
			TOTAL	**79**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Good description of goals/objectives - Complete project definition with reasonable measurement criteria. - The goals and objectives are strong, but it does read like a sales brochure…. A little more detail instead of the generalized statements would have been better.	- Minimal info about linkage to agency technology plan - found it as a reviewer, without assistance within the project proposal - Would like to see some quantity assigned to 'more testing', 'shorter time period', 'reduce data entry'. - Expected outcomes - could have been stronger. If there were that many goals and objectives, at a minimum, there should have been a reference to the goals and objectives. Question 2 - measurement and assessment methods - instructions ask for the methods that will be used. The statement of staff will determine when each phase is complete is not an answer. Of course staff will be used, but what criteria are they going to use. The methods are either not listed or are in vague terms. I would expect a project of this complexity to provide more of a methodology to the acceptance of each of the components of work. While I see this as a weakness, I also believe it is a detail that can be corrected and documented in the RFP and contract for the acquisition of the software. Question 3 - I don't understand how a project of this magnitude is not part of the agency technology plan.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good description of justification, although almost entirely in terms of intangible benefits, with little or no mention of tangible benefits. - Good business case. - Reading the entire proposal, the benefits of the new system will be very valuable, just not completely stated in this section.	- Only the "do nothing" option was mentioned - this may be because a RFP will be used to identify the solution, and thus comparative options weren't really known - Only considering a 'do nothing' alternative may have been too narrow of a focus. - Question 4 - it would seem the goals and objectives would again be tangible benefits to the project, not referenced in this question. Question 5 - While it is briefly mentioned, it should have been more clearly stated here that one option considered was the upgrading of the existing system, while it is not a viable option, it would seem it was thought about. If going to a manual system, as a result of the current system not functioning, will only increase the lab operation by 2 FTEs and maybe require a little more time for samples. I think the result would have a much larger impact that is noted for doing nothing. Question 6 - is not accreditation for the federal programs an important aspect of this process, it may not be a mandate, but should have been mentioned again....
5: Technical Impact	- Reasonably good comments regarding enhancements - although similar or duplicative of the comments offered in the business justification. - Question 7 - the enhancements are clearly covered and discussed. Some technical discussion. (see weaknesses)	- Very little technical detail provided in project proposal. - I would like to know how the system will provide for future enhancements and migration to avoid a total reimplementation in the future. - Question 7 - The technical discussion was weak and confusing. The answer states this system will function on an independent network, yet in question 8, it states the system will use present network and internet protocol. The answers seem to conflict each other. Also, there was no discussion of strengths and weaknesses in this question.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Pretty good overview of general schedule and milestones or phases that will be monitored and	- Doesn't speak much at all to the experience and qualifications of the team from HHSS that will be

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	managed as the project progresses	managing this project. - Question 9 - Did not think the answers came close to the information requested in the question. The answer was referencing the RFP will require. This question asked for detail now, we don't get to see the RFP on this document. Question 10 - was the same schedule listed before which could have used more narrative in the expectation for the deliverables. The deliverables are the gauge of project completion. Question 12 states a system administrator will be required to manage the system, but this position is not listed in the budget section. It would appear to be existing staff, but it is unclear.
7: Risk Assessment	- All risks seem to be understood and manageable.	- Not much detail in addressing how any potential risks would be mitigated. - Question 13- setting up the network - again seems to conflict with previous statements. Also, I would suspect there are other risks, such as the risk of the current system conflicting with the new system during dual operation. Question 14 - does not address strategies to address the risks listed in question 13, but talks about a specification list that will be in the RFP, and this list will minimize all of the risks. I do not understand the connection.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The budget seems reasonable.	- The budgeted software amount is entered in two years - not quite sure how this payment structure is envisioned. Maintenance at 10% could easily be over-optimistic, at least based on common software contracting practices. - Final expenditure will be related to the cost of the LIMS software which is controlled by the vendor. (76% of the total budget) - Question 16 - itemized list of hardware and software - 2 servers (possibly 3) this is inconsistent with the rest of the proposal, most of the time only 2 servers are listed. Also, no software is listed here, yet the entire proposal is for information system (software?). No FTEs - should address what is meant by a system administrator listed previously. On-going or replacement costs - nothing is listed, yet it appears there might be a risk of some laboratory equipment not working with a new system. It is also possible that not all current equipment will be able to function with the new system. Should be included as a risk and a possibility of additional expenditures. The last item listed states the funding is coming from the cash fund. Will there be an increase in fees to the customers listed earlier in the proposal or is there an expectation that fees for lab work will remain the same... This could have a significant impact on the customers of this project, yet nothing is mentioned...

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.				
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.				
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.				

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)
- Regarding Project 25-02, Laboratory Information Management System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
    - To leave Project 25-02 in the recommended Tier 3 list.
    - To note that the project was not submitted on time for an evaluation and Technical Panel review.
    - That the agency coordinate with the Technical Panel for review of the project as needed.

  Commissioner Flanagan seconded. Motion passed.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

New or Additional State Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

FY2007-2009 Biennium

Project Title	**DL Event Clearinghouse & Scheduling Software - Purchase**
Agency/Entity	**Distance Education Council**

Notes about this form:

1. **USE.** The Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC") is required by statute to "make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel, for which new or additional funding is requested." Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(8) In order to perform this review, the NITC and DAS Budget Division require agencies/entities to complete this form when requesting new or additional funding for technology projects.
2. **WHAT TECHNOLOGY BUDGET REQUESTS REQUIRE A PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM?** See the document entitled "Guidance on Information Technology Related Budget Requests" available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.
3. **DOWNLOADABLE FORM.** A Word version of this form is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.
4. **SUBMITTING THE FORM.** Completed project proposal forms should be submitted as an e-mail attachment to rick.becker@nitc.ne.gov.
5. **DEADLINE.** Completed forms must be submitted by September 15, 2006 (the same date budget requests are required to be submitted to the DAS Budget Division).
6. **QUESTIONS.** Contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at (402) 471-7984 or rick.becker@nitc.ne.gov

Section 1: General Information

Project Title	DL Event Clearinghouse & Scheduling Software - Purchase
Agency (or entity)	Distance Education Council

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	Gordon Roethemeyer
Address	Educational Service Unit #10
City, State, Zip	Kearney, NE 68845
Telephone	308-237-5927 ext.294
E-mail Address	groethem@nebdec.org

Section 2: Executive Summary

Provide a one or two paragraph summary of the proposed project. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project and the information technology required.

This project will procure a statewide synchronous videoconferencing event clearinghouse and scheduling control system for K-12 distance education classrooms. The system will include either mirrored or clustered servers, an event clearinghouse and instances of scheduling and device control software on computers located at each of the participating sites. The system will be used by K-12 educational entities for brokering events, scheduling distance education courses, and controlling distance-learning equipment in various locations for the purpose of conducting distance education classes.

Section 3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes (15 Points)

1. Describe the project, including:
   - Specific goals and objectives;
   - Expected beneficiaries of the project; and
   - Expected outcomes.

The goals and objectives of this project are:

- GOAL: To create an event clearinghouse
  - OBJECTIVE: Users will be able to broker events, join events, and/or search for available offerings
  - OBJECTIVE: The Distance Education Council will make a list of courses available to educational entities.
- GOAL: To purchase scheduling software licenses for districts and ESUs joining Network Nebraska.
  - OBJECTIVE: To provide incentive for entities to participate in Network Nebraska.
  - OBJECTIVE: Ensure statewide standardization and interoperability of scheduling.
  - OBJECTIVE: To minimize downtime through built-in troubleshooting capabilities.
- GOAL: To install one instance of the scheduling software at each qualified distance-learning site.

- OBJECTIVE: Users will be able to schedule events of various type including but not limited to: classes, ad hoc meetings, enrichment activities, dual credit courses and other events
- OBJECTIVE: The Distance Education Council will be able to facilitate the scheduling of distance education courses.
- OBJECTIVE: The Distance Education Council will be able to better assess and evaluate the needs of distance education services

The beneficiaries of this project will be students of the public schools of Nebraska, teachers, patrons, ESUs and post-secondary institutions. Each will benefit from the statewide exchange of distance learning courses, including courses that might not otherwise be available to some students; greater numbers of dual credit and graduate courses will be available to more consumers.

This project is designed to provide more equitability of educational opportunities for all Nebraska school children. For example, students in rural districts will be able to take classes that were once only available in urban school districts. All students will see increased opportunities to take college credit and advanced placement courses. Younger students will benefit from enhancement activities such as, virtual field trips and two-way synchronous video interaction with other students, scientists, museum curators and others. Other outcomes include the potential for professional development training, adult education classes, reduced travel costs, and the ability to hold two-way interactive videoconferences with statewide participation.

2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

A three-pronged approach will be used to measure and assess the outcomes of this project. The methods used will be as follows.

- The number of and type of courses offered would be compared to baseline data collected on the state of distance education of Nebraska prior to the start of this project.
- Surveys of distance learning coordinators, teachers and students will be conducted.
- The Distance Education Advisory committee will convene an ad hoc task force to report on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges.

3. Describe the project's relationship to your agency comprehensive information technology plan.

The State Technology Plan includes an initiative to create a Statewide Synchronous Video Network. One of the objectives of that initiative states –

> "Development or purchase of a scheduling system or enterprise resource management program that allows potential users to know the location and availability of resources, and/or set up or reserve ad hoc or regularly scheduled events with other entities."

In April 2006 LB 1208 was signed into law and as a result of that legislation the Distance Education Council was created. This project is being implemented in response to Section 20 of LB 1208, which charges the Distance Education Council with the following duties and responsibilities–

- To provide access to a lists of qualified distance education classes.

- Facilitate scheduling of distance education courses.
- Brokering of qualified distance education courses for purchase by educational entities.
- The assessment of distance education needs and evaluation of services.
- Compliance with technical standards set by the NITC.
- Establish a system for prioritizing courses.
- Schedule and prioritize access to Network Nebraska.
- Administration of Learning Management Systems.
- Coordinate with educational service units and postsecondary institutions to provide assistance for instructional design.

Section 4: Project Justification / Business Case (25 Points)

4. Provide the project justification in terms of tangible benefits (i.e. economic return on investment) and/or intangible benefits (e.g. additional services for customers).

Through the brokering of distance education courses the Distance Education Council will help schools pay teachers' salaries and qualify for incentive payments provided to schools that send or receive at least two, semester long, qualified distance education courses. The scheduling software will track many details about the exchange of distance education courses that will result in the ability to generate vital reports on the scope and breadth of distance learning. Another benefit will be less downtime because of troubleshooting capabilities built into the software. System managers will be able to detect and correct problems often before building level users are aware that a problem exists.

By year three of the project, with an integrated statewide system in place, more courses will be shared across the State and more post-secondary courses will be able to be provided via the statewide synchronous video system. The synchronous videoconferencing event clearinghouse and scheduling control system will make it much easier to make these connections. Schools will be able to schedule and conduct point-to-point and point-to-multipoint IP videoconferencing with other schools and other educational entities.

5. Describe other solutions that were evaluated, including their strengths and weaknesses, and why they were rejected. Explain the implications of doing nothing and why this option is not acceptable.

Before the advent of LB 1208 consideration was given to allowing each distance-learning consortium to decide what upgrade path it would follow without State assistance. Decisions about scheduling and whether or not to have an event clearinghouse also would have been left to consortia members. The strength of this approach would have been less cost since a statewide scheduling and clearinghouse system would not be purchased. The weakness would be that statewide event scheduling would be more difficult and the chance of interoperability between pods would be lessened. Without an event clearinghouse, brokering classes on a statewide basis would be much more difficult. The system put in place by this project will address these shortcomings and provide the ability to track and report the number of events occurring statewide in precise detail, troubleshooting will be easier, and less instruction time will be lost to equipment failure.

6. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

State legislation, LB 1208, mandates the responsibility for facilitating the scheduling of distance education courses to the Distance Education Council.

Section 5: Technical Impact (20 Points)

7. Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or implements a new technology system. Describe the technical elements of the project, including hardware, software, and communications requirements. Describe the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution.

In the summer of 2007 five ESUs and approximately ninety schools will update their aging JPEG/MPEG2 systems with new IP-based distance education equipment that complies with the H.264 protocol. The statewide synchronous videoconferencing event clearinghouse and scheduling control system will ensure interoperability and allow for the exchange of courses and event scheduling. The software will provide the far end control of distance learning equipment, track network usage and have the ability to troubleshoot problems remotely. During Phases II & III of the project additional schools, ESUs and post secondary institutions will join the network with approximately 100 sites being added in the summer of 2008 and another 100 sites in the summer of 2009.

This project will procure a statewide synchronous videoconferencing event clearinghouse and scheduling control system for K-12 distance education classrooms. Scheduling servers will be purchased and installed in either a mirrored or clustered configuration pending recommendations from the chosen vendor and the Network Design Committee. When all three phases of the project have been completed schools statewide will use a common system for scheduling and clearinghouse services. For the first time ever reports on the usage and participation in distance education will be quickly attainable.

A weakness in the chosen solution is the cost. It is estimated that the software could cost about $3000 per site with monthly maintenance fees of about $30.00 per school per month. It is believed that these costs will be offset by the value realized in having a statewide system that will lessen the amount of downtime and help increase the number of distance education courses offered to Nebraska students.

8. Address the following issues with respect to the proposed technology:
   - Describe the reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation) of the technology.
   - Address conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards.
   - Address the compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

The RFP posted in October 2006 was written by Tom Rolfes of the NITC and gave the requirements that the software must meet. The scheduling event clearinghouse and equipment control system was chosen on the basis of how well it meets the guidelines for reliability, security and scalability in addition to cost and other factors. The current plan is to purchase hardware meeting the vendor's minimum requirements for a statewide network and then plan for possible updates to the system in the following two years. Qwest in partnership with Renovo are familiar with the current statewide infrastructure and will address issues of compatibility.

Section 6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10 Points)

9. Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance. Describe the project team, including their roles, responsibilities, and experience.

Shown below is the preliminary timeline for implementing the project followed by the project team details. Sponsors of this project include the DOC, ESUs, NITC, NETC, NDE, Nebraska's Post-Secondary Institutions and Network Nebraska. Stakeholder acceptance appears to be at a high level since some existing consortia

have already upgraded equipment and expressed an interest in using the chosen scheduling software and clearinghouse system.

Nov-Dec 06	Customization of Event Clearinghouse Component of the Scheduling System
Jan, 07	Beta test of Event Clearinghouse Component of the Scheduling System
Jan, 07	Event Clearinghouse System Training for K-12, higher education staff
Feb, 07	Web posting of 07-08 courses on Event Clearinghouse System
Mar, 07	Regional Registration of 07-08 courses on Event Clearinghouse System
Apr, 07	Statewide Registration of 07-08 courses on Event Clearinghouse System
May, 07	Resolution of conflicts and solicitation of courses for unmet needs
May, 07	Regional equipment and network upgrade begins for ~100 sites
	Installation and configuration of switches/routers/CODECs
	Local circuit upgrades by vendor(s)
	Network Nebraska transport conversion
Jul,07	Programming of Device Control Component of the Scheduling System
Aug, 07	Testing of network and Scheduling System
Aug, 07	Classes begin in many schools

Title	Experience	Responsibilities
Executive Director, Distance Education Council	K-12 certified teacher Taught in public schools from 1976 to 1996 – 20 Educational Technology Specialist for ESU #2 – 1 for ESU #9 - 9	• Facilitate scheduling of distance education courses. • Brokering of qualified distance education courses for purchase by educational entities. • The assessment of distance education needs and evaluation of services. • Compliance with technical standards set by the NITC. • Establish a system for prioritizing courses. • Schedule and prioritize access to Network Nebraska. • Administration of Learning Management Systems. • Coordinate with educational service units and postsecondary institutions to provide assistance for instructional design.
Distance Education Council	17 ESU Administrators	Carryout the duties mandated by LB 1208 assist and evaluate executive director to ensure responsibilities are met.
Distance Education Council Advisory committee	Comprised of 17 people designated by administrators. This group includes 9 distance learning coordinators of the existing consortia, members from the ESU's Network Operation Committee and members from the ESU's Technology Affiliate Group, and one member from a post-secondary institution	Advise and assist the executive director with his duties. Facilitate communication with schools, help write rules and regulation, help with customization of software and clearinghouse. Receive training in use of scheduling/clearinghouse software. Assist with instructional design training.

10. List the major milestones and/or deliverables and provide a timeline for completing each.

Date	Deliverables
January 1, 2007	Event Clearinghouse System Online
May 1, 2007	Clearinghouse Schedule 2007-08 Courses
August 1, 2007	Device Control Testing
September 1, 2007	System Up, Review Phase 1 Features
January 1, 2008	Updates to Phase 1 Clearinghouse
May 1, 2008	Clearinghouse Schedule 2008-09 Courses
August 1, 2008	Successful Device Control Testing
September 1, 2008	Phase 2 Costs System Up, Review Phase 2 Features
January 1, 2009	Event Clearinghouse System Online
May 1, 2009	Clearinghouse Schedule 2009-10 Courses
August 1, 2009	Successful Device Control Testing
September 1, 2009	System Up, Review Phase 3 Features
January 1, 2010	Event Clearinghouse System Online
May 1, 2010	Clearinghouse Schedule 2010-11 Courses

11. Describe the training and staff development requirements.

January 2007: 6-12 northeast Nebraska regional technical support personnel
January 2007: 25-50 northeast Nebraska regional scheduling system administrators
January 2007: 100-200 northeast Nebraska site-based scheduling system administrators
July-August 2007: 150-300 northeast Nebraska teachers/instructors
January 2008: 6-12 south central/western Nebraska regional technical support personnel
January 2008: 25-50 south central/western Nebraska regional scheduling system administrators
January 2008: 100-200 south central/western Nebraska site-based scheduling system administrators
July-August 2008: 150-300 south central/western Nebraska teachers/instructors
January 2009: 6-12 southeast Nebraska regional technical support personnel
January 2009: 25-50 southeast Nebraska regional scheduling system administrators
January 2009: 100-200 southeast Nebraska site-based scheduling system administrators
July-August 2009: 150-300 southeast Nebraska teachers/instructors

12. Describe the ongoing support requirements.

The chosen vendor will supply ongoing support and training as a condition of the contract. Training in instructional design will be ongoing on a regional basis. Additional customization of the software to meet user needs will be handled by contracting with the vendor as needed.

Section 7: Risk Assessment (10 Points)

13. Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project and the relative importance of each.

Success of this project will depend on participation by the majority of K-12 schools in Nebraska. If the cost of joining Network Nebraska proves to be prohibitive or if the cost of upgrading existing equipment far exceeds the $20,000 reimbursements that schools will receive, then the project could fail. These factors loom as the biggest barriers. Other barriers include:

- a short timeline in which to get everything done
- collecting course schedules

- scheduling courses in time for spring registration
- resolving conflicts
- getting appropriate rules in place for governing the exchange of courses and qualifying for incentives
- low incentive payments for qualified distance learning courses

14. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

Each consortium will hold meetings of their member schools and inform them of incentives and benefits of participating in this project. Several consortia have received RUS Grants and have already upgraded much of their distance learning equipment. The Distance Education Council formed an advisory group, which includes distance learning coordinators, technology specialists, media coordinators and at least one representative of a post-secondary institution. This group will has been divided into subcommittees to address the issues of rules and regulations, prioritizing course access, commonality of schedules, instructional design and training. Management and hosting of servers will be outsourced to an entity identified by the office of the CIO.

Section 8: Financial Analysis and Budget (20 Points)

15. Financial Information

Financial and budget information can be provided in either of the following ways:

(1) If the information is available in some other format, either cut and paste the information into this document or transmit the information with this form; or

(2) Provide the information by completing the spreadsheet provided below.

Instructions: Double click on the Microsoft Excel icon below. An imbedded Excel spreadsheet will be launched. Input the appropriate financial information. Close the spreadsheet. The information you entered will automatically be saved with this document. If you want to review or revise the financial information, repeat the process just described.

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2006-07(Ramp Up)	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 1)	FY2010-011 (Year3)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$-
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$-
2.2 Programming							$-
2.3 Project Management							$-
2.4 Other (Tech. Support)		$7,125.00	$7,125.00				$14,250.00
3. Supplies and Materials							$-
4. Telecommunications							$-
5. Training		$15,651.00		$15,651.00	$15,651.00		$46,953.00
6. Travel							$-
7. Other Operating Costs (maintenance)		$16,966.00	$9,879.00	$14,408.00	$14,408.00		$55,661.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$15,000	$25,000				$-
8.2 Software		$154,014.00	$64,479.00	$38,164.00	$108,364.00		$365,021.00
8.3 Network							$-
8.4 Other							$-
TOTAL COSTS	$-	$207,756.00	$106,483.00	$68,223.00	$138,423.00	$-	$520,885.00
General Funds		$207,756.00	$106,483.00	$68,223.00	$138,423.00	$-	$520,885.00
Cash Funds							$-
Federal Funds							$-
Revolving Funds							$-
Other Funds							$-
TOTAL FUNDS	$-	$207,756.00	$106,483.00	$68,223.00	$138,423.00	$-	$520,885.00

16. Provide a detailed description of the budget items listed above. Include:
- An itemized list of hardware and software.
- If new FTE positions are included in the request, please provide a breakdown by position, including separate totals for salary and fringe benefits.
- Provide any on-going operation and replacement costs not included above, including funding source if known.
- Provide a breakdown of all non-state funding sources and funds provided per source.

The costs shown in the table above are taken from the winning bid proposal from Qwest with the exception of the hardware costs, which are based on the vendor's minimum recommended requirements in the ramp up year and allowing for additional hardware purchases in years 1 and 2. Contractual services costs are for technical support, training and annual maintenance. The amounts shown above increase each year as additional schools join Network Nebraska. The capital expenditures are more during the ramp up year because the amount paid out includes more of the cost of the scheduling software, the clearinghouse, and the scheduling servers. During each year approximately 100 -130 schools will join the network. The hardware costs are estimated based on the need for a minimum of three servers: a primary applications and web server, a database server, and a backup server in the ramp

up year with other servers and components possibly being added over the following two years. Hosting and management of the servers will be out sourced based on the decision by the office of the CIO after reviewing the responses to the Request for Information forms that were sent out to various entities. A representative of the office of CIO will make the recommendation on the entity to host and manage the servers at the time that this proposal is presented to the NITC Technical Panel for approval.

17. Please indicate where the funding requested for this project can be found in the agency budget request, including program numbers.

Not Applicable

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

Title: Remote Access Standard

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft standard under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is available in both PDF and Word versions at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can send them by e-mail to rick.becker@nitc.ne.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on November 21, 2006.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at their meeting on November 22, 2006. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC web site at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Remote Access Standard

Category	**Security Architecture**
Title	**Remote Access Standard**
Number	

Applicability

☑ State Government Agencies
- ☐ **All**.....Not Applicable
- ☑ **Excluding higher education institutions**.....Standard

☐ State Funded Entities - **All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document**.....Not Applicable

☑ Other: **All Public Entities**.....Guideline

Definitions:
Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval as outlined in section 3.2
Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	☐ **Adopted** ☑ **Draft** ☐ **Other:**_____
Dates	**Date: Draft October 20, 2006** **Date Adopted by NITC:** **Other: Previous Guideline adopted by the NITC on September 30, 2003.**

Prepared by: Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/

1.0 Standard

It is the responsibility of all State of Nebraska agencies to strictly control remote access from any device that connects from outside of the State of Nebraska network to a desktop, server or network device inside the State of Nebraska network and ensure that employees, contractors, vendors and any other agent granted remote access privileges to any State of Nebraska network utilize one of the approved secure remote access products listed in Appendix A. (Approved Remote Access products).

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

As employees and organizations utilize remote connectivity to the State of Nebraska networks, security becomes increasingly important. Accompanying and contributing to this trend is the explosive growth in the popularity of broadband connections and other technologies for remote access. These standards are designed to minimize the potential exposure from damages which may result from unauthorized use of resources; which include loss of sensitive or confidential data, intellectual property, damage to public image or damage to critical internal systems, etc. The purpose of this document is to define standards for connecting to any State of Nebraska agency from any host.

Objectives include:

- Provide guidance to State of Nebraska agencies for employees, contractors, vendors and any other agent that requests remote access to any State of Nebraska network.
- Provide a high level of security that uses standardized technology and remains adaptable in the face of changing technology products.
- Ensure a solution that is scalable to meet the current and future needs of state agencies, their employees, clients and customers, and business partners.
- Meet federal security requirements for remote access control.

3.0 Applicability

3.1 State Government Agencies

All State agencies, boards, and commissions are required to comply with the standard listed in Section 1.0. All existing Agencies utilizing non-standard remote access applications must convert to the standard listed in Section 1.0 as soon as fiscally prudent, unless the application is exempt.

3.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC Technical Panel upon request by an agency.

3.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a “Request for Exemption” to the NITC Technical Panel. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the NITC via e-mail. The NITC Technical Panel will consider the request and grant or deny the exemption. A denial of an exemption by the NITC Technical Panel may be appealed to the NITC.

4.0 Responsibility

4.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6))

4.2 State Agencies

Each state agency will be responsible for developing a policy that ensures that secure remote access to State resources is maintained, and/or implemented, including but not limited to selecting appropriate technologies, software, and tools in a manner consistent with this standard and other state agency security policies.

Each state agency will be responsible for ensuring that the computers connected to State resources contain an Anti-Virus program with current signatures and that the computer is free from Spyware, Adware, and rootkits that would place State resources in jeopardy.

4.2.1 Remote Access from Non-State Owned and/or Managed Devices

All Remote Access Users must sign and renew annually an agreement with the agency which addresses at a minimum the following:

- Remote access users are responsible for all actions incurred during their session in accordance with all State of Nebraska and agency standards and policies.
- All home networks connected to the Internet via a broadband connection should have a firewall installed, updated and operational.
- Web browsers settings should be selected or disabled as appropriate to increase security and limit vulnerability to intrusion.
- Operating systems should contain the most current security patches.
- All home computers must contain an Anti-Virus program with current signatures and that the computer is free from Spyware, Adware, and rootkits.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 NITC Security Officer Handbook (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/security/so_guide.doc)
5.2 NITC Network Security Policy (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html)
5.3 NITC Incident Response and Reporting Procedures for State Government (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html)
5.3 Appendix A
5.4 NITC Acceptable Use Policy (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/network/aup_20040309.pdf) and applicable Agency acceptable Use Policies

6.0 References

6.1 National Institute Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication, 800-46, “Security for Telecommuting and Broadband Communications”. (http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/index.html).

Appendix A
Approved Remote Access Products

Product	Version
nFuseCitrix	
State-sponsored VPN solution	
SSH	Version 2 (SSHv2) and above*

Configuration settings for SSHv2

- Change the default port that it listens on, say from TCP/22 to TCP/2222 (or some other value) which will render it invisible to port scans for SSH on the standard port
- Disallow 'root' from logging in directly to the console, which reduces the privilege of a connection even if the logon is guessed and makes its superuser password protection extremely difficult to defeat

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

Title: Emergency Information Page

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft guideline under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is available in both PDF and Word versions at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can send them by e-mail to rick.becker@nitc.ne.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on November 21, 2006.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at their meeting on November 22, 2006. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC web site at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Emergency Information Page

Category	**E-Government Architecture**
Title	**Emergency Information Page**
Number	

Applicability

☑ **State Government Agencies**
- ☐ All ..... **Not Applicable**
- ☑ Excluding Higher Education ..... **Guideline**

☐ **State Funded Entities -** All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... **Not Applicable**

☐ **Other:** _____ ..... **Not Applicable**

Definitions:
Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document.
Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	☐ Adopted ☑ Draft ☐ Other:_____
Dates	Draft Version Date: October 20, 2006 Date Adopted by NITC: Other:

Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/

1.0 Guideline

This guideline establishes the recommended location for an emergency information page -- where information for the general public would be posted in the event of a disaster -- on State of Nebraska agencies, boards and commissions websites.

1.1 Document Name

1.1.1 The name of the document should be 'disaster.html' in all lowercase. This web page may contain links to other disaster documentation.

1.2 Document Location

1.2.1 The disaster document should be placed in the top level directory of the entities website. Example –'http://www.mydomain.com/disaster.html'. NOT 'http://www.mydomain.com/docs/disaster.html'

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this guideline is to establish a standard location and document name that entities (defined in section 4) shall use to disseminate public disaster information via the Internet. This guideline does not regulate the contents of the above-mentioned disaster document itself.

3.0 Definitions

3.1 Web Page

A document stored on a server, consisting of an XHTML file and any related files for scripts and graphics, viewable through a web browser or the World Wide Web. Files linked from a web page such as Word (.doc), Portable Document Format (.pdf), and Excel (.xls) files are not web pages, as they can be viewed without access to a web browser.

3.2 Web Site

A set of interconnected web pages, usually including a homepage, generally located on the same server, and prepared and maintained as a collection of information by a person, group or organization.

4.0 Applicability

This guideline shall apply to all State of Nebraska agencies, boards and commissions.

5.0 Responsibility

Compliance with this standard is voluntary but strongly recommended.