

MEETING AGENDA

Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Tuesday, May 13, 2008
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 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. (67 Pages)

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes* - [April 8, 2008](#)
4. Project Reviews
 - Ongoing Reviews (as needed)
 - Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown
 - Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS - James Ohmberger
 - Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System
5. Standards and Guidelines
 - Request for Waivers*
 - [Educational Service Unit #10](#). Request for waiver from [NITC 7-403](#) (Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing)
 - [Background and Options Document](#)
 - [Comments Received](#) to the Background and Options Document
 - Confirm 30-Day Comment Period*
 - [NITC 1-201](#): Agency Information Technology Plan
 - [NITC 1-202](#): Project Review Process
 - Approval of Revised Version of [Attachment A](#) to NITC 1-204*
6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)
 - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Horn
 - Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Langer
 - Security Architecture Work Group - Hartman
7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting Date - June 10, 2008

9. 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://nitc.ne.gov/>

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on April 15, 2008.

The agenda was posted to the NITC website on May 9, 2008.

TECHNICAL PANEL
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday, April 8, 2008, 9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Kirk Langer, Technology Director, Lincoln Public Schools
Mike Winkle, Assistant GM, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications

MEMBERS ABSENT: Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. There were four members present at the time of roll call. A quorum was present. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on March 7, 2008. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on April 4, 2008. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall of the meeting room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 12, 2008 MINUTES

Ms. Decker moved to approve the [February 12, 2008](#) minutes as presented. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS - Ongoing Reviews (as needed)

Retirement Systems, Jerry Brown and Robin Goracke

- Phase I is complete.
- The assigned developers from the Office of the CIO now have the program code from Phase I available for review. This activity will evaluate the maintainability of the code and provide detail knowledge of the system functionality and architecture.
- Phase II initial requirements validation meetings have been completed. The final documentation review process has begun, with 6 of the 13 functional area draft requirements (Use Cases) delivered to NPERS for review.
- Phase II Design/Development continues. Most of this is accomplished off-shore.
- Phase III (Batch) Requirements Validation is scheduled to begin May 5, 2008.
- Saber is currently evaluating the possibility of doing Phase II & III testing at the same time. We think this is a good approach, because many functions in Phase II require a batch processes to execute at multiple points during the entire process. Otherwise, the testing would have to simulate these batch processes.
- We will be meeting with the OCIO Project Office to finalize the procedures to be followed in the use of Clarity project management software. This will include periodic update procedures and use of the Document Manager.
- Presentation of specific project Issues, Risks, etc. by Robin Goracke. The project has developed a method to address and track issues. There are currently 10 issues identified. There have been

addressed and closed with seven still in progress. The project is currently addressing three risk factors:

- Manager leaving NPERS. These duties have been delegated until someone is hired. There should be a new hire decision made this week.
- Saber Resource constraints using automated test scripts. Saber has a tool that may work and they are also bringing in their analysts.
- NPERS resource constraints. Testing timeframe has been changed to alleviate risk.

Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS – No report.

Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System, Walter Weir

Bids have been received and vendor demonstrations will begin on Monday in Kearney. Each vendor will be given 2 days for their presentation. For the first day, general information about their product will be provided. On the second day, they will be asked to provide scripts and how they would be implemented. A total of \$20 million has been appropriated by the legislature. In May, the State College Systems will be incorporated into the University of Nebraska's SAP system. A vendor decision will be made by the summer for approval by the Board of Regent in June. The project will begin in September with a December 2010 completion date.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - Requests for Waivers

Game and Parks Commission. Follow-up on conditional waiver granted by the Technical Panel on January 8, 2008 to NITC 8-301 (Password Standard)

The Technical Panel had approved a conditional waiver and requested that the agency report back to the Technical Panel. A letter from Rex Amack, Director, and dated February 21, 2008 was provided to the members.

Mr. Winkle moved that the agency has met the conditional waiver requirement and to approve the waiver. Mr. Weir seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

Department of Correctional Services. Request for waiver from [NITC 8-301](#) (Password Standard)

Request for waiver reads as follows: "DCS requests an exception to the NITC requirement to change passwords every 90 days to permit the DCS to use a six month password change cycle for the inmate accounts assigned to thin client devices used to interface with the JDE Sales and Manufacturing modules of the NIS. When the thin client is logged into the system, it is done without the inmate entering the account ID or password. The OCIO support staff installs and updates the account IDs and passwords. The thin clients are configured to sign in and allow access to only those areas of the application deemed necessary. The NIS Team set up the application's security to meet this requirement."

A question was raised regarding privacy data. There is no access to social security numbers or confidential data.

Mr. Winkle moved approval of the [Department of Correctional Services](#) waiver. Ms. Decker seconded. Roll call vote: Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, Winkle-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

[Laurel-Concord Public Schools, et al.](#) Request for waiver from [NITC 7-403](#) (Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing)

The request is being made because the polycam cart systems employed by these four school districts were not able to be controlled by the Renovo software at the start of the 2007-08 school year. Since the Renovo software could not control the single codec, internal MCU devices utilized by the cart system, the

districts were not in compliance with the standard. The waiver being requested is to be retroactive to the beginning of this academic year. After July 2008, the Renovo licensing should be available for purchase.

The panel members recommended to wait on the waiver until after ESU 10 presents their information.

After hearing ESU 10 presentation, Ms. Decker moved to approve the [Laurel-Concord Public Schools, et al](#) waiver. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

[Educational Service Unit #10](#) . Request for waiver from NITC 7-403 (Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing) ESU #10 Presentation [Slides](#)
John Stritt and Ron Cone

Per documentation provided by ESU 10, the following is a brief overview supporting their request to be exempt from scheduling using the Renovo system. The request is for a one year waiver, July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

- Renovo is the scheduling/reporting system selected to support the existing 3 and 1 codec solution and any bridge system. The southwest and the northeast distance education networks are supported for controlling their devices with Renovo software.
- ESU 10 has chosen to use a different technology solution in that each codec has an internal multiple connection unit (MCU). The reason ESU 10 chose this solution was that they felt it was less proprietary and would allow for a more mobile situation for locating the technology. Additionally the setup and purchasing cost of the 3 and 1 codec solution was at least twice as much as the mobile cart solution.
- In discussions with Renovo, they indicated that their current scheduling solution was especially well designed for the 3 and 1 codec solution or for working as a scheduler for point-to-point devices. In pre-RFP discussions, Renovo also indicated that they were not aware of an interest or need for multipoint device control.
- In November of 2007, Renovo shared that they were working on an upgrade of their scheduling system that would allow them to schedule internal MCU devices. Renovo is aware that ESU 10 schools are not planning on using the 3 and 1 codec system and yet they have not demonstrated or shared that they are now capable of supporting an internal MCU codec device.

These waiver requests raise issues that need to be considered by the NITC and the legislature regarding interoperability. Schools must be on Network Nebraska to qualify for the incentives of LB 1208. If schools are on Network Nebraska, then they must also meet the standard for the scheduling software. Phase II schools are purchasing equipment between now and July. Timelines are an issue to be eligible for funding. Higher education institutions are also stakeholders.

Technical Panel members need more information and discussion before granting a waiver. It was recommended to bring stakeholders to the table for discussion prior to taking action – Distance Education Council's Technology group, and technical staff from the Educational Service Units, Community Colleges, and the University of Nebraska.

Mr. Weir moved to table a decision on the ESU 10 waiver until the May 13 Technical Panel meeting. Ms. Decker seconded. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

Mr. Rolfes and Mr. Becker will organize the stakeholders meeting.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - Discussion of documents relating to LB 823 and the Legislative Performance Audit

Mr. Becker informed that panel that the following items will be discussed at the next meeting:

- NITC 1-201: Agency IT Plan. [2004 version](#) form
- NITC 1-202: IT Project Proposal Form and Project Review Process - [Current form](#)

- NITC 1-203: Enterprise Projects
- NITC 1-205: Project Monitoring and Progress Reports

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group, Christy Horn. Ms. Horn was not present.

Learning Management System Standards Work Group, Kirk Langer. There was nothing specific to report.

Security Architecture Work Group, Steve Hartman. The Cyber Security Conference is being held on April 22 at the Downtown Holiday Inn.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held at 9:00 a.m. on May 13, 2008 at Varner Hall, 3835 Holdrege Street in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Ms. Decker moved to adjourn. Mr. Winkle seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

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

March 4, 2008

Agency Name - Educational Service Unit #10

Presented By - John Stritt, Distance Education Director, jstritt@esu10.org

NITC Standards and Guidelines - NITC Policy 7-403

Subject - Request for Exemption From State Scheduling System

Description of the problem:

ESU 10 currently provides distance education support for 29 schools in ESU 10, 9 schools in ESU 11, and 4 schools in ESU 7. As part of the statewide upgrade, the ESU 10 supported schools have made contractual agreements with transport vendors to upgrade existing networks to allow all of our member schools to operate in an IP based video network which will allow us to join Network Nebraska.

At the February 26 Distance Education Council (DEC) advisory meeting, we were made aware of NITC policy which contradicted the DEC distance education policy regarding the responsibility of all Network Nebraska member schools to have all codec devices scheduled.

As part of the NITC policy Section 1-103, it does state that a waiver exemption could be filed which we wish to do regarding NITC Policy 7-403. As ESU 10 is responsible for providing support for our area schools, we would like to be exempt from this requirement for the upcoming year of 2008-09.

The following is a brief overview supporting why we would like to be exempt from scheduling using the Renovo system.

- Renovo is the scheduling/reporting system selected to support the existing 3 and 1 codec solution and any bridge system. The southwest and the northeast distance education networks are supported for controlling their devices.
- ESU 10 has chosen to use a different technology solution in that each codec has an internal multiple connection unit (MCU). The reason we chose this solution was we felt it was less proprietary and would allow for a more mobile solution for locating the technology. Additionally the setup and purchasing cost of the 3 and 1 codec solution was at least twice as much as the mobile cart solution.
- In discussion with Renovo, they have indicated that their current scheduling solution was designed for the 3 and 1 codec solution or working as a scheduler for point-to-point devices. In early discussion, Renovo also indicated that they were not aware of an interest or need for multipoint device control.
- In November of 2007, Renovo shared that they were working on an upgrade of their scheduling system that would allow them to schedule multipoint devices. Renovo is aware that we are not planning on using the 3 and 1 codec and yet they have not demonstrated or shared that they are now capable of supporting this type of device.

At ESU 10, we believe that the vision for distance education services will continue to evolve to a portable multi-device system. In addition to being able to purchase additional codecs, we also believe that software based codecs become additional options.

Future questions that need to be answered related to the policy and the current service would include:

- Will all of these different codec systems need to be scheduled?
- Will all entities that wish to connect to a scheduled codec have to also be a licensed device or could this be a clearinghouse only cost?
- Do all higher institutions have to schedule all of their devices?
- Is the Renovo system the only solution for meeting the guidelines as stated in the scheduling standard for synchronous learning and video conferencing?
- Does Renovo even meet the defined standards?
 - Section 1.1 “Controlling the network and end point hardware and bandwidth...”
 - Section 1.1.1 “Control all hardware in a network”
 - Section 1.1.1.6 “Have a defined quality of service”
 - Section 1.1.1.15 “Capable of controlling all specific equipment...”
 - Section 1.1.1.16 “Facilitate various types of events”.
- Are there more cost efficient ways for the same or better services?

We at ESU 10 believe that the intent of the standards and guidelines are an admirable way to support a unified state system. Although we respect the intent, we believe that there is too many unknowns for the coming year including what devices the service can support, the cost of those services, the extent to which all codecs might have to be part of this service, and does this one service provide for future technology options or just take care of how we are used to doing things.

Preferred Solution - At minimum we would like our schools to have at least a one year option regarding licensing devices as outlined in the policy. The long term and best solution we believe is that K-12 schools should be allowed to make their own decision regarding the licensing of codec devices.

Educationally yours

John Stritt
ESU 10 Distance Education Director



Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Category	Video Architecture
Title	Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Standard <input type="checkbox"/> Excluding Not Applicable
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... Standard
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Entities using state-owned or state-leased communication networks for synchronous video..... Standard
	Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval (see Section 3.1). Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Version Date: April 17, 2006 Date Adopted by NITC: May 1, 2006 Other: Contact information updated in § 3.1.1 on February 28, 2008.

1.0 Standard

This document consists of a list of features that ought to be available in any system that is developed for use in scheduling of synchronous events using videoconferencing technology.

It is the intent that any and all such scheduling systems defined by the specifications below be accessible either through the Internet or within a defined intranet as decided upon by the system administrators.

The following sections attempt to describe the various levels and types of scheduling or coordination that might be considered.

1.1 Hardware control component

When attempting to link two or more sites electronically, some system must coordinate the connectivity between/among the sites. This includes controlling the network and endpoint hardware and bandwidth necessary to cause a successful connection.

1.1.1 Standards for hardware control system

A system should be able to control all hardware in a network and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to enable the following:

- 1.1.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.1.1.2 Locate devices by IP address (both static and DHCP)
- 1.1.1.3 Locate devices by MAC address
- 1.1.1.4 Facilitate far-end control in endpoint devices with the capability
- 1.1.1.5 Display a call list that is understood by non-techs using plain English site description
- 1.1.1.6 Have a defined quality of service
- 1.1.1.7 Hardware and software systems must work such that the scheduling system is available for use at least 99.9% of the time
- 1.1.1.8 The system should not require reset/reboot more often than once per week
- 1.1.1.9 Have a minimum of a one-year warranty
- 1.1.1.10 Annual maintenance fees after the warranty has run out should not exceed 10% of original purchase price
- 1.1.1.11 Keep automated log data that may be defined by and searched in ways to be defined by the system administrator(s) with multiple possible search definitions
- 1.1.1.12 Maintain security in ways that can be defined by system administrators including:
 - 1.1.1.12.1 Keeping log information secure
 - 1.1.1.12.2 Limiting access to an event
 - 1.1.1.12.3 Turning encryption on/off in endpoint devices with the capability

- 1.1.1.12.4 Identifying security capability to system administrators and event coordinators by site
- 1.1.1.12.5 Provide an identity management system that allows for multiple levels of user access as defined by system administrators
- 1.1.1.13 Facilitate ad hoc events by users with permission from system administrators
- 1.1.1.14 Facilitate scheduled events by users with permission from system administrators
- 1.1.1.15 Be capable of controlling all specific equipment used in the network (CODECs, routers, switchers, MCUs, firewall systems, etc.)
- 1.1.1.16 Facilitate various types of events
 - 1.1.1.16.1 Broadcast to all
 - 1.1.1.16.2 Broadcast to some
 - 1.1.1.16.3 2-way point-to-point
 - 1.1.1.16.4 2-way multipoint
 - 1.1.1.16.5 A combination of broadcast and 2-way

1.2 Event logging component

If a system coordinator has a requirement to track information about events some mechanism would have to be in place. This may include knowing the number of people at a site, the minutes an event runs at any given site, or the number of events a specific organization schedules.

1.2.1 Standards for event logging system

A system should be able to automatically store data and permit reports and be capable of linking into the all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.2.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.2.1.2 Store data in an ODBC compliant relational database
- 1.2.1.3 Provide fields for logging various pieces of information
 - 1.2.1.3.1 minutes a site is available/not available
 - 1.2.1.3.2 minutes a site is used
 - 1.2.1.3.3 number of event attendees
 - 1.2.1.3.4 type of event as defined by system administrators
 - 1.2.1.3.5 number of sites per event
- 1.2.1.4 Permit system administrator defined fields (no fewer than 64)
 - 1.2.1.4.1 Definable by site, groups of sites, and groups of groups
- 1.2.1.5 Related GUI entry for call setup as defined by system administrators
 - 1.2.1.5.1 Physical site location

- 1.2.1.5.2 Local contact and facility arrangement info
 - 1.2.1.5.2.1 Costs, availability, site rules
 - 1.2.1.5.2.2 ADA options available
- 1.2.1.5.3 Searchable criteria for describing or accessing spaces
- 1.2.1.5.4 Must have a GUI that is understandable in plain English
- 1.2.1.6 Facilitate search to know what facilities are in conflict or are often in conflict
 - 1.2.1.6.1 number of conflicts for a given site over a specific amount of time
- 1.2.1.7 Accommodate a facility “wait” list / availability queue
 - 1.2.1.7.1 If a facility is already confirmed for an event, it should log who has requested the same facility then auto notify the requester(s) if the event causing the conflict is cancelled
- 1.2.1.8 Account for billing charges per event/location and total bill generation after the event

1.3 Facilities coordination component

If an event will include locations for which more than one person/organization has responsibility, then some mechanism must exist for coordinating use of facilities. There may be technical or administrative limits as to the number or types of sites that can participate in any given event. This could be as simple as users coordinating times over the telephone or through e-mail, but for some applications there may be a greater need for pre-scheduling and coordination among multiple administrators.

1.3.1 Standards for facilities coordination system

A system should enable access to facilities based on defined permissions, resolve conflicts based on pre-determined policies and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.3.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.3.1.2 System editable user access
 - 1.3.1.2.1 Activate a facility such that it is known to the system and to system users
 - 1.3.1.2.2 Building level admin such that the facilities at a specific location can set policies for that site and permit use by others
 - 1.3.1.2.3 Regional admin (organization / geo-political) such that a group of facilities can set policies for all related sites and permit use by others

- 1.3.1.2.4 Sys admin (configuration) such that technical system setup, operation and maintenance may be conducted
- 1.3.1.2.5 Sector admin such that groups of groups of facilities can set policies for all related sites and permit use by others
- 1.3.1.2.6 Room request such that any designated site user or administrator may request access to a facility they do not already have rights to schedule
- 1.3.1.2.7 Participant access defaults
 - 1.3.1.2.7.1 All denied unless specifically permitted
 - 1.3.1.2.7.2 All permitted unless specifically denied
- 1.3.1.2.8 User account directory service with definable permissions for each account
- 1.3.1.3 Types of coordination
 - 1.3.1.3.1 Event posting to inform others of possible access
 - 1.3.1.3.2 Site joining to allow other to access
 - 1.3.1.3.3 Ad hoc to allow immediate activation of unscheduled events
 - 1.3.1.3.4 Pre-planned events that may occur once or cyclically
 - 1.3.1.3.5 Inter network coordination to permit interaction of sites both within and outside a controlled network
 - 1.3.1.3.6 Intra network coordination to permit interaction of sites within a controlled network
 - 1.3.1.3.7 Administrator defined bandwidth prioritization to minimize network bottlenecks
 - 1.3.1.3.8 Administrator defined asset prioritization to minimize system conflicts
 - 1.3.1.3.9 Site-requested bandwidth speed
- 1.3.1.4 Facilities information to be posted
 - 1.3.1.4.1 Identify technology available by site
 - 1.3.1.4.2 Physical site location
 - 1.3.1.4.3 Local contact and facility arrangement info
 - 1.3.1.4.3.1 Costs, availability, site rules
 - 1.3.1.4.3.2 ADA options available
- 1.3.1.5 Event information to be posted
 - 1.3.1.5.1 Definable credit type
 - 1.3.1.5.2 Definable student type
 - 1.3.1.5.3 Event/course prerequisites
 - 1.3.1.5.4 Event/course descriptions
 - 1.3.1.5.5 Teacher / event leader / presenter
 - 1.3.1.5.6 Materials needed
 - 1.3.1.5.7 Event coordinator info
 - 1.3.1.5.8 Target audience
 - 1.3.1.5.9 Mapquest-like link

1.4 People coordination component

If a specific location is to be used this implies that operational people may need to be dedicated to cause successful events. Since there will be a variety of site designs and operations, then there will be a variety of the demand of staff time. Likewise each facility will have limits on how many people can attend at any one location. Finally, there may be limitations as to the total number of event participants allowed.

1.4.1 Standards for people coordination system

A system should enable interaction of people based on policies set by system administrators and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.4.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.4.1.2 Allow for multiple permission levels
 - 1.4.1.2.1 View schedules
 - 1.4.1.2.2 Request systems/facilities
 - 1.4.1.2.3 Approve systems/facilities use
- 1.4.1.3 Provide information about instructor/facilitator and their availability
- 1.4.1.4 Allow for predetermined maximum number of attendees
- 1.4.1.5 Track and display count of committed attendees
- 1.4.1.6 Track and display remaining permitted attendees
- 1.4.1.7 Allow for predetermined maximum number of sites
- 1.4.1.8 Track and display count of committed sites
- 1.4.1.9 Track and display remaining permitted sites

1.5 Event clearinghouse component

As system users see a need for pre-scheduled events coordinated among a large number of facilities and administrators, the concept of a virtual location for brokering of events becomes attractive. Such a clearinghouse could serve as a way that event coordinators might let others know the specifics of events they are planning (a certain class with a specific sort of content will be offered on a certain schedule for a certain period of time or a specific event will happen one time on a specific day at a specific time).

Such a clearinghouse could also serve as a way for interested parties to find events that meet their specific needs (a school administrator has a certain number of students who need a specific class that is not offered locally). Availability might also include information about participant or site number limitations (the total seats/sites in the class/event, the number requested/registered so far and the number remaining of the total).

1.5.1 Standards for an event clearing house system

A system should enable online interaction for publishing of event information and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.5.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.5.1.2 Posting of one-time single events
- 1.5.1.3 Posting of sequenced or cyclical events
- 1.5.1.4 Posting of costs to participate in an event
- 1.5.1.5 Permit system administrator defined fields (no less than 256)
- 1.5.1.6 Provide for automated multiple time zone accommodation
- 1.5.1.7 Posting of multiple standard bell schedules related to formal educational events
- 1.5.1.8 Permitting or excluding view of encrypted/secured events such that those with permission may see that the events are available and those without permission won't even be able to know that these events are taking place
- 1.5.1.9 Posting of all, part or none of the information defined in the standards in this document as defined by system administrators
- 1.5.1.10 Use an ODBC compliant relational database
- 1.5.1.11 System administrator defined search/reporting capability
- 1.5.1.12 Posting of facility group affiliation
- 1.5.1.13 Provide for automated email notification of site requests/confirmations
 - 1.5.1.13.1 Events offered
 - 1.5.1.13.2 Events needed
 - 1.5.1.13.3 Event outages
 - 1.5.1.13.4 Event conflicts
- 1.5.1.14 Provide for automated site schedule generation to include
 - 1.5.1.14.1 Events offered
 - 1.5.1.14.2 Events needed
 - 1.5.1.14.3 Event outages
 - 1.5.1.14.4 Event conflicts
- 1.5.1.15 Provide for event cancellation "drop dead" date policies for events to include automated email notifications
 - 1.5.1.15.1 Minimums not met
 - 1.5.1.15.2 Facilities conflict not resolved
 - 1.5.1.15.3 Email notification
- 1.5.1.16 Provide for links to asynchronous event-related material (eLearning)
- 1.5.1.17 Provide for automated billing
- 1.5.1.18 Provide for post event evaluations as defined by system administrators

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this standard is to establish and define the needs for scheduling to be addressed when purchasing and maintaining scheduling coordination systems.

2.1 Background

The State of Nebraska is about to exceed 300 IP-based videoconferencing facilities within the sectors of K-12 education, higher education, informal education, telehealth, and state agencies. In order for any particular entity to be able to connect to any other particular entity (within or outside their subsector), some software system is required to complete the connection, maintain the connection, and to list the directory of participating entities.

The standards expressed herein is a product of a meeting that took place on February 3, 2006, with input from over 20 representatives from the NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group, coming from institutions all across the State. It is this unselfish dedication to achieving a common good that makes such a software system possible.

When describing scheduling of teleconferencing events there is a variety of descriptive language expressed by those who use the technology. Depending on how "scheduling" is defined, the need may be described on a continuum from "not needed" to "locally coordinated" to "centrally coordinated".

2.2 Objective

The objective of this standard is to enable all existing and future synchronous distance learning and videoconferencing facilities in Nebraska to achieve interoperability and maintain an acceptable quality of service through scheduled and ad hoc event coordination.

3.0 Applicability

These standards apply to synchronous distance learning and videoconferencing facilities as follows:

- If utilizing state-owned or state-leased communications networks:
 - Any synchronous distance learning facility or videoconferencing application which utilizes state-owned or state-leased communications networks must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5; or
 - The entity must provide, or arrange for, coordination on their behalf through some other entity with the stated capability.

- If using state funding:
 - All **new** facilities or applications receiving state funding must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5.
 - All **existing** facilities or applications receiving state funding for ongoing operations must convert to the standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5 as soon as fiscally prudent or upon renewal of any existing scheduling system service contract, whichever comes first.

- These standards **do not apply** to the following entities:
 - University of Nebraska (relating to the university’s academic research mission)
 - Any entity which applies for, and receives, an exemption.

General Statement on Applicability

The Governing board or chief administrative officer of each organization is responsible for compliance with these standards. The NITC will consider adherence to technical standards as part of its evaluation and prioritization of funding requests

3.1 Exemption

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

3.1.1 Exemption Process

Any agency or other entity 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 (ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov) or letter (Office of the NITC, 501 S. 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68509). 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

An effective program for scheduling standards compliance involves cooperation of many different entities. Major participants and their responsibilities include:

1. Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The NITC provides strategic direction for state agencies and educational institutions in the area of information technology. The NITC also has statutory responsibility to adopt minimum technical standards and guidelines for acceptable and cost-effective use of information technology. Implicit in these requirements is the responsibility to promote adequate quality of service and uniformity for information systems through adoption of policies, standards, and guidelines.
2. Technical Panel Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group. The NITC Technical Panel, with advice from the Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group, has responsibility for recommending scheduling standard policies and guidelines and making available best practices to operational entities.
3. Agency and Institutional Heads. The highest authority within an agency or institution is responsible for interoperability of information resources that are consistent with this policy. The authority may delegate this responsibility but delegation does not remove the accountability.
4. Information Technology Staff. Technical staff must be aware of the opportunities and responsibility to meet the goals of interoperability of information systems.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group Charter:

<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/video/charter.pdf>

5.2 Glossary of Technical Terms

<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/itc/citizens/glossary.htm>

NITC 7-403 Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Introduction:

On Tuesday, April 8, staff from ESU 10 in Kearney presented the NITC Technical Panel with a request for waiver from NITC Standard 7-403 on behalf of 38 schools in ESUs 10 and 11. The NITC Technical Panel tabled the request until their May 13, 2008 meeting, pending further information and discussion.

The objective of the 7-403 standard is to “enable all existing and future synchronous distance learning and videoconferencing facilities in Nebraska to achieve interoperability and maintain an acceptable quality of service through scheduled and ad hoc event coordination”. The standard’s technical requirements state that any statewide software system for videoconferencing and video distance learning must include five separate components: 1.1 Hardware Control; 1.2 Event Logging; 1.3 Facilities Coordination; 1.4 People Coordination; and 1.5 Event Clearinghouse. Pursuant to LB 1208 (2006), the State of Nebraska Office of the CIO competitively bid the statewide software scheduling system based on the NITC standard and awarded the statewide contract to the Qwest Corporation/Renovo Software in November of 2006. The Distance Education Council, created by LB 1208, is tasked with the administration of this software for education entities and was allocated over \$1 million by the Legislature to purchase, install and support the system. Support for ongoing maintenance of Renovo software licenses is also provided by the Legislature to the Distance Education Council.

The Renovo software system is currently being used by 92 K-12 entities in northeast Nebraska, approximately 37 K-12 entities in southwest Nebraska, and three community colleges. This request for waiver, if approved, would allow the 38 schools in ESUs 10 and 11 to have partial or full exemption from the standard over a temporary or permanent duration of time. If the waiver is denied, the entities would be required to comply with the standard if A) they use Network Nebraska for Internet or backbone transport; and B) if their new or existing facilities or applications use state funding.

Since this issue of interoperability between codecs and the use of such a clearinghouse and device control system extends far beyond these 38 schools in south-central Nebraska, the NITC Technical Panel is seeking your input and comments prior to a public work session which has been scheduled for Friday, May 2, 9:00am-11:00am, in Lincoln. Entities may respond by e-mail by submitting questions, clarifications, or by providing comments of a pro, con or neutral and informative nature. The comments will be synthesized into a document that will assist the NITC Technical Panel to act on the waiver request at their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, May 13, 2008 at 9:00am.

Responses to this solicitation should be addressed to rick.becker@nebraska.gov and tom.rolfes@nebraska.gov and are due on or before April 28, 2008.

Supporting documents:

ESU 10 Waiver Request http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/meetings/documents/20080408/waiver_7-403_ESU10.pdf
Standard 7-403 http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/video/SchedulingStandards_20060501.pdf
State Contract-Qwest/Renovo [http://www.das.state.ne.us/materiel/purchasing/contracts/pdfs/22707\(o4\)awd.pdf](http://www.das.state.ne.us/materiel/purchasing/contracts/pdfs/22707(o4)awd.pdf)
4/8/08 Technical Panel Meeting Agenda <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/meetings/agenda/tpagenda20080408.html>

NITC 7-403 Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Background information:

1. 79-1233 The CIO shall bid for such (distance education) equipment and software and shall allow educational entities as defined in section 79-1332 to participate in such statewide leasing or purchasing contracts.
2. 79-1336 The (equipment) reimbursements may include installation costs for such hardware or software. Applications shall be accepted by the department beginning in the first year that the school district or the educational service unit **accesses Network Nebraska** and ending June 30, 2013.
3. 79-1335 The Distance Education Council shall only provide assistance in brokering or scheduling courses to educational entities that have **access to Network Nebraska**.
4. 79-1332 (5) Qualified distance education course means a distance education course...for which all of the participating educational entities are required to have **access to Network Nebraska**;
5. 79-1248 The duties of the Distance Education Council (ESU Coordinating Council, as of 7-1-2008) include: (6) **Compliance with technical standards as set forth by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission** and academic standards as set forth by the State Department of Education related to distance education; (8) Scheduling and prioritization for access to Network Nebraska by educational entities in cooperation with the Chief Information Officer and **using scheduling software or scheduling services which meet any applicable standards established by the commission**;
6. NITC Standard 7-403 includes five components: 1.1 Hardware Control; 1.2 Event Logging; 1.3 Facilities Coordination; 1.4 People Coordination; 1.5 Event Clearinghouse.
7. NITC Standard 7-403 Applicability reads: These standards apply to synchronous distance learning and videoconferencing facilities as follows:
 - A. If utilizing state-owned or state-leased communications networks:
 - a. Any synchronous distance learning facility or videoconferencing application which utilizes state-owned or state-leased communications networks must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5; or
 - b. The entity must provide, or arrange for, coordination on their behalf through some other entity with the stated capability.
 - B. If using state funding:
 - a. All **new** facilities or applications receiving state funding must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5.
 - b. All **existing** facilities or applications receiving state funding for ongoing operations must convert to the standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5 as soon as fiscally prudent or upon renewal of any existing scheduling system service contract, whichever comes first.
8. The Nebraska Legislature, through LB 1208, provided approximately \$1,008,000 to purchase the statewide scheduling software, as administered by the Distance Education Council. This amount was based on the projected cost of three codec licenses, installation, maintenance and hosting services, for every public high school, ESU and public college campus in the State. Additional Legislative disbursements were described in the LB 1208 fiscal note to help pay for ongoing maintenance.

Timeline of Development for Standard 7-403:

1. LB 1208 was introduced on 1-18-06, heard in the Education Committee on 2-13-06, and passed by the Legislature on 4-13-06;
2. The Technical Panel's Statewide Scheduling System work group met all day on 2-3-06 to begin drafting the NITC standard, in response to LB1208 (K-12, higher ed, telehealth, CIO, NET, and military were all represented);
3. A draft of the statewide scheduling standard was presented to the Technical Panel on 3-13-06, put out for 30 days public comment (no comments) and was approved by the NITC on 5-1-06;
4. RFP1683Z1 was released on 10-3-06 and awarded to Qwest/Renovo on 11-20-06. There were four bidders and the DEC Executive Director and two ESU staff were included on the six-member bid evaluation team;
5. Configuration of the Renovo Clearinghouse and codec control system continued through spring 2007;
6. Phase I implementation of Renovo was completed in August 2007 with 97 entities in northeast Nebraska.

Synopsis of arguments presented by ESU 10 for non-compliance with NITC Standard 7-403:

1. The Applicability of the Standard is too broad. There are questions whether it should apply to all of the following devices or clusters of devices :
 - A. Triple-codec configurations (e.g. Cytek, Dascom configurations);
 - B. Single codec with internal MCU (e.g. BNI, Sony GS-70, Lifesize, Polycom 8000/9000);
 - C. Single codec with no internal MCU (e.g. Tandberg, Polycom, Sony);
 - D. Desktop, Laptop videoconferencing (e.g. any of a variety of desktop videoconferencing configurations)
 - E. External MCU or bridge (e.g. Codian, Polycom MGC-100)

NOTE: The Technology Refreshment meeting of 3-18-07 assigned the following tasks:

- a. The Distance Education Council and the Nebraska Department of Education will review the minimum equipment (e.g. codec, laptop) and video viewing requirements (e.g. size of display) to comply with Rule 10 “Simultaneous Presence”: *004.04D1 Synchronous Course Option: Synchronous courses are those multi-site or distance learning courses in which the teacher and student(s) are simultaneously present; can both see and hear one another; and questions may be answered and instructional accommodations made immediately.*
 - b. The NITC Technical Panel will be prepared to review and update the Standard 7-403 (Statewide Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing), especially in the applicability section: Any synchronous distance learning facility or videoconferencing application which utilizes state-owned or state-leased communications networks must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5.
2. There are additional cost implications. As classroom videoconferencing devices proliferate beyond the three codec licenses allocated and purchased by the Distance Education Council, districts and colleges are having to purchase their own licenses (e.g. \$570/codec, \$103 installation, \$74 ongoing maintenance).

NOTE: The scheduling software costs are not an eligible service under the Federal E-rate program, but they are an allowable cost under the special state aid Technology Allowance provision for equalized schools. Also, high schools that exchange qualified distance education courses are eligible for up to \$1000 for each semester class sent or received under Neb. Rev. Stat. 79-1337.

3. The chosen software company, Renovo, did not have internal MCU codec control capabilities at the start of the 2007-08 year. Through the Technology Refreshment Clause meeting of March 18th, Renovo was asked by the CIO to test and verify that their software can perform this function by July 1, 2008, in time for it to be purchased by Phase I and II entities.

NOTE: Further discussions with Renovo reveal that software control of Lifesize and Polycom internal MCU codecs will be ready by June 1, 2008, and BNI functionality could be developed by July 1, 2008 if an order for BNI codec licenses is placed.

4. ESU 10 staff contend that the Renovo Hardware Control component is unnecessary; that classroom teachers can manually start classroom conferences on a daily basis simply by using the software and hand-held remote that comes with each codec.

NOTE: Although technically true, the intent of the NITC standard and subsequent software purchase was to unite and integrate course postings and device control into a single system and to interconnect codec devices from all over the State, regardless of manufacturer or location. Senator Stuhr, during floor debate on LB 1208, directly referred to this statewide “connectiveness” as something that was needed to be achieved “between the K-12 school districts, the ESUs, the community colleges, the postsecondary schools, and the universities”.

NITC Technical Panel Options:

1. Deny the waiver request.
Implications: All entities connected to Network Nebraska for the 2008-09 program year and beyond would be required to utilize the Renovo software comprised of all five components (i.e. 1.1 Hardware Control; 1.2 Event Logging; 1.3 Facilities Coordination; 1.4 People Coordination; 1.5 Event Clearinghouse). K-12 districts would presumably have their first three codecs licensed and provided by the Distance Education Council and any codecs over and above the first three would be paid for by the school district. Higher education participation in the Renovo system, with the exception of dual credit origination codecs (which may be funded by the Distance Education Council), would be funded by the higher education entities.
2. Grant a temporary (2008-09) waiver of all five standard components to ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools.
Implications: More education entities would probably follow with waiver requests of their own. For the 2008-09 school year, this would create an environment where ESU 10/11 school classes are not listed in the clearinghouse and codecs are controlled manually whereas other schools' classes are posted to the Renovo Clearinghouse and their codecs are controlled by the Renovo scheduling software. This may present an impediment to the interregional posting and exchange of courses between groups of schools that are software-scheduled and those that are not.
3. Grant a permanent waiver of all five standard components to ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools.
Implications: More education entities would probably follow with waiver requests of their own. For the foreseeable future, this would create an environment where ESU 10/11 school classes are not listed in the clearinghouse and codecs are controlled manually whereas other schools' classes are posted to the Renovo Clearinghouse and their codecs are controlled by the Renovo scheduling software. This may present an impediment to the interregional posting and exchange of courses between groups of schools that are software-scheduled and those that are not.
4. Grant a temporary (2008-09) partial waiver of only the hardware control component to ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools.
Implications: All ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools would be required to utilize the four components of the Renovo software (i.e. 1.2 Event Logging; 1.3 Facilities Coordination; 1.4 People Coordination; 1.5 Event Clearinghouse) for the 2008-09 year, with the exception of the 1.1 Hardware Control. Other entities would be able to see the classes offered by the ESU 10 and ESU 11 schools in the Clearinghouse; the ESU 10 and ESU 11 schools just wouldn't have their codecs controlled by the Renovo software. In July 2009, the ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools would be required to comply with the hardware control component.
5. Grant a permanent partial waiver of only the hardware control component to ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools.
Implications: All ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools would be required to utilize the four components of the Renovo software (i.e. 1.2 Event Logging; 1.3 Facilities Coordination; 1.4 People Coordination; 1.5 Event Clearinghouse), but not the 1.1 Hardware Control. Other entities would be able to see the classes offered by the ESU 10 and ESU 11 schools in the Clearinghouse; the ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools just wouldn't have their codecs controlled by the Renovo software.
6. Grant a permanent partial waiver of only the codecs of ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools that exceed the three per site funded by the DEC.
Implications: Requires full software utilization and licensing of the first three codecs of every school district but removes the standards requirement for the additional codecs and therefore, the fiscal impact.

Possible follow-up Work, depending upon the Technical Panel decision of 5-13-08:

1. Revise the 7-403 Scheduling Standards to apply only to specific codec devices and situations (e.g. recurring course exchange over static IP codecs and not laptop/desktop videoconferencing)
2. Revise the 7-403 Scheduling Standard to include four of the five components but not require the hardware control component.
3. Convert the 7-403 Scheduling Standard to a Guideline.
4. Amend the Scheduling Software contract with Qwest/Renovo to include a deliverable and cost for a Clearinghouse-only product listing.

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

May 2, 2008

Comments Received

Educational Service Unit #10 request for waiver from NITC 7-403 (Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing)

Yvette Holly, University of Nebraska Medical Center	1
Craig Carlson, Metro Community College	2
Eric Jones, Central Community College	3
Gordon Roethemeyer, Distance Education Council	6
Nigel Buss, ESU 8-Neligh.....	7
John Stritt, ESU 10-Kearney.....	8
Craig Peterson, ESU 11-Holdrege.....	10
Steven Stortz, Christ Lutheran School-Norfolk	11
Wayne Bell, ESU 10-Kearney.....	12
B. J. Peters, ESU 13-Scottsbluff.....	13
Shirley Schall, SNDEN/ESU 16-North Platte	14
(response to Gordon Roethemeyer's comments)	
Chris Petroff, ESU 9-Hastings	16
Ron Cone, ESU 10-Kearney.....	17
Charles Osteen, Mid-Plains Community College.....	18
Beth Kabes, ESU 7-Columbus	20
John Fiene, University of Nebraska-Omaha.....	21

From: Yvette Holly [yholly@unmc.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2008 1:08 PM
To: Rolfes, Tom
Cc: Arnold J Bateman; Walter_Weir/UNCA/UNEBR%UNIVERSITY_OF_NEBRASKA
Subject: Re:

Tom,

In reviewing ESU's request for waiver, I suggest the NITC Technical Panel grant ESU a temporary waiver.

Yvette

Yvette Holly, Assistant Vice Chancellor
Information Technology Services
University of Nebraska Medical Center
985030 Nebraska Medical Center
Omaha, NE 68198-5030

email: yholly@unmc.edu
phone: 402-559-7253
fax: 402-559-5579

From: Carlson, Craig [mailto:CCarlson@mccneb.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2008 9:43 AM
To: Rolfes, Tom
Subject: RE: Waiver request

Hi Tom,

I have reviewed the documents available for this request.

I would fully support the request by Educational Service Unit #10 to not use the Renovo Scheduling System.

Metropolitan Community College has used the Renovo system for several years with good success. As our system moved from automated and dedicated room system to the IP Cart solution, the need and usefulness of the Renovo system dropped drastically. We now have taken the Renovo system off line and have not renewed our support contract. As a result our Just-In-Time use has risen and we no longer have connection conflicts to deal with. We use our in-house, on line, room scheduling system to prevent conflicts and provide use logs. The CODECs do keep connection logs as well.

Our IP Cart solution is much like ESU #10 in that each cart has the internal four port multipoint software activated. This significantly lowers the cost over the "3 and 1" CODEC solution. The Renovo software that MCC had, DID allow for multipoint connection, so I am not sure why they would indicate they were working on an upgrade for the State system (perhaps integration issues).

I would think that it is also possible for ESU #10 to make their own connections within their area and still be in the Renovo Database allowing others to connect to them via the Renovo Scheduler. (Inclusion in the database may be a cost issue).

I would be glad to discuss this in more detail if you would like.

Craig C. Carlson, NCE
Broadcast Television Engineer
Metropolitan Community College
Omaha, NE
(402) 289-1240
Cell (402) 677-4696
ccarlson@mccneb.edu

COMMENTS ON TRI-VALLEY DISTANCE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM STATE SCHEDULING SYSTEM

4/28/2008

Introduction:

Central Community College (CCC) supports the goals outlined in LB1208 legislation to develop a statewide video system for education. We would like to express concern and offer an alternative to the Tri-Valley Distance Education Consortium (TVDEC) request for an exemption from the LB1208 scheduling requirements. If the NITC wishes to approve a postponement but not an exemption, CCC would support moving the TVDEC changeover to Network Nebraska to July 1, 2009. This would allow the current year to be used as an opportunity to find solutions for the TVDEC concerns.

Issues as we understand them:

CCC understands TVDEC concerns:

1. Scheduling software requirement.
 - a. Cost related to licenses for codec devices
 - b. Impact related to requirement to join Network Nebraska
 - c. Changes in video conferencing technology
2. The TVDEC feels they need more time to understand how the scheduling system will affect their current equipment.
3. The TVDEC DEC advisory team needs more time to identify measureable goals and data collection and study.

Other questions:

1. For courses to receive high school credit, the classrooms must have continuous presence. The point-to-point nature of connections outlined by TVDEC is continuous presence; however, there is a question by some about whether the network TVDEC proposed will meet this requirement for more than one site.
2. If a school in Network Nebraska wanted to send or receive a course to a non-Network Nebraska school, is the school eligible to use that course for its state reimbursement under LB1208?

It is our understanding the Renovo Company and BNI equipment manufacturer are in communication and are working on solutions for the equipment control. The TVDEC and others are waiting for that control to be tested and proven.

As part of the TVDEC presentation to the NITC Tech Board TVDEC pointed out several important points about changing directions in video conference technology.

- Desktop and open source software is used to connect to conferences these connections designed as one-to-one or one-to-bridge systems. There is still a need to schedule the bridge connection. The student then needs to find a point from which to connect. The connection may be from a classroom or from their home. In either case, the user needs to be assured the

equipment is available for their use and the instructor needs to be assured the students can connect.

- Additionally, the use of the roll-about or portable carts presents a clearly cost-effective alternative to the dedicated classroom. These carts are one-third the cost of a dedicated room and allow the technology to come to the class rather than the class to come to the technology. Again, the issue is to make sure the equipment is available in the scheduled space, is connected to the network and open to the students/meeting.

Under the LB1208 legislation, the expressed goal is to encourage sharing resources and improving educational opportunities. To carry this out, the NITC is to bring the education community and public agencies of the state together into one network with common standards, scheduling and related tasks. From the presentation by the TVDEC, we understand schools tend to connect to each other in point-to-point or classroom-to-classroom situations. The need for scheduling software is less in these situations but still relevant and important.

Discussion:

Prior to the Northeast conversion, CCC was a member of the following video network consortiums:

- Crossroads (ESU 7)
- TVDEC, Tri-Valley North (ESU10)
- TVDEC, Tri-Valley South (ESU 11)
- Central Nebraska Distance Education Consortium (ESU 9)

Under the new enlarged network, TVDEC represents half of the counties in the CCC service area. Three additional counties are in the Mid-Plains Community College service area and one county is in the Northeast Community College area.

Video conferencing and delivering courses to the area high schools is an important part of the CCC mission. It is the mission of Nebraska schools and the community colleges to offer educational events to enhance educational opportunities for students, particularly students who are time and place bound. Network Nebraska and Renovo software are the tools to accomplish this.

With the adoption of LB1208 we moved forward with enthusiasm to plan and develop programs to take advantage of a single video network. Meanwhile, the economy and cost of fuel has made the network an even more important tool for CCC to serve students who are time and place bound. We would like to expand our course offerings in the evenings and summers at the high schools. Automated equipment in the right place at the right time is important to making this possible.

The table below shows, besides our six campus sites each year, our connections to roughly 50 sites. This is in addition to outside agencies and meetings scheduled between the community colleges and other organizations.

COURSES DELIVERED BY CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE TO AREA HIGH SCHOOLS AND FOCUSED ON EARLY ENTRY STUDENTS					
	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08*partial year
Credit generated	3861	3471	2442	2576	2362
Different courses	59	42	30	31	22
Sites	53	54	60	55	49

INTERNAL TO CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE CAMPUSES AND CENTERS					
	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08*partial year
Credits generated	1623	2367	4276	4492	4022
Different courses	19	29	33	58	58

We use our 12 classroom video network 50 weeks a year, 5 days a week (sometimes 6) from 7:30 AM to 10:00 PM. When we are not using the system for classes, we use the systems for other purposes (such as meetings and staff training). With such a large network we must have an automated system to reach remote sites otherwise scheduling becomes an overwhelming task. We must know and be assured that equipment is in the right place at the right time and that it will perform at the requested time. Hardware control, event logging, and facilities scheduling are keys to orderly operation of a video network.

Conclusion:

If the exemption were approved, CCC would have to operate in three consortiums and schedule in at least two different networks:

- TVDEC- Tri-Valley asking for the exemption
- ESU 7- has already joined Network Nebraska
- ESU 9- has been moved to the 09-10 change over

In addition, we have concerns about how effective and efficient the interconnection of the three video networks would work.

An exemption from the standards would:

1. Not carry out the goals of the TVDEC or the NITC
2. Not allow us to test and prove all the systems meet the state video and audio standard.
3. Not require the Renovo Company to work with BNI equipment manufacturer to prove out controls of the codecs.
4. Set a dangerous precedent for opting in and out of a statewide network to support not only K-12 but also postsecondary education to rural Nebraska.

Questions:

Will classes sent or received on BNI codec systems (assuming they cannot be scheduled) be ineligible for incentives even though they were purchased before LB 1208 was passed but are still used for distance learning?

If BNI devices are now compliant with NITC standards but Renovo is unwilling to update the scheduling software so that BNI Systems can be scheduled and controlled, unless they (Renovo) are compensated, whose responsibility will it be to cover the costs to have Renovo update their software?

At the time that RFP1683Z1 was issued wasn't it known that BNI systems were in use by a considerable number of schools, ESUs and other entities including: Henry Doorly Zoo, Homestead National Monument and the Joslyn Art Museum?

Why wasn't RFP1683Z1 written with requirements that all BNI codec systems be able to be scheduled and controlled by the chosen scheduling and device control system, since it was known that there were a large number of BNI systems in use in the state and since it could have been anticipated that these systems would be able to be updated if they didn't meet standards at the time the RFP was written?

Will software programs such as Polycom's PVX be required to be licensed and controlled by Renovo?

Isn't it very likely that Polycom's PVX and other software codecs will continue to be improved and gain popularity but will not be able to be used for distance learning because NITC policy will prevent the use of these devices unless someone pays Renovo to write the code to schedule and control them?

Are MCU Bridges considered to be codec devices and, if so, do they have to be licensed and controlled by Renovo if the entities that own them are members of Network Nebraska? If this is the case, isn't this placing a big financial burden on these entities?

Will all codec devices owned by libraries, hospitals, colleges and the State have to be licensed and controlled by Renovo?

Has the State licensed all of its codec devices and notified the Distance Education Council of these licenses?

Does deciding not to license all codec devices also mean that the offending entity cannot be a member of Network Nebraska?

Must schools and other entities that agree to have their codec devices licensed with Renovo also have those devices controlled by Renovo, or can they choose to use Renovo for clearinghouse services only and/or setup all their reservations as "No Transmit" conferences?

Comment:

It is considerations of these types that guided the DEC Advisory Committee to pass policies concerning the use of the scheduling system. The workgroup that wrote the policies were all distance learning coordinators that deal with distance learning issues on a daily basis. The policies that they wrote, and that both the Advisory Committee and the Distance Education Council approved, recognize the importance of scheduling and clearinghouse services but do not agree with a requirement that every device must be licensed and controlled by Renovo. I urge the NITC Tech Panel to amend its policy and work with the Distance Education Council Advisory Committee to arrive at a new policy that responds to the requirements of the legislation but does not stifle innovation and the use of new technology.

Gordon Roethemeyer
Distance Education Council

Thoughts and Comments...

If you truly want a statewide sharing of educational opportunities for all Nebraska learners then the cornerstone is now in place for that reality to happen in our state.

The Renovo Software System is currently being used by 92 K-12 entities in northeast Nebraska, approximately 37 K-12 entities in southwest Nebraska, and three community colleges.

Having everybody in the State of Nebraska on a single scheduling and clearinghouse system makes perfect sense. One system makes it much easier for everyone to know what is available or not available for sites and classes. If you want to do a session with someone whom is not using the State of Nebraska scheduling and clearinghouse software for your classes or video conferencing, you will have to contact that site person each time; you lose reliability, confidence and over-all use due to lack of far-end site knowledge.

For all Nebraska entities, a Single System for Scheduling, Reporting, Conflict Checking, Clearinghouse and Trouble shooting. Everything resides under one database – all knowledge is in one location, providing no guessing and user success!

For any Nebraska post secondary to have access to a Nebraska K-12 School District to offer curriculum, content and/or educational opportunities the notion of different scheduling systems between geographic locations or ESU's is absurd. "Who are you going to call?"

If people are not scheduling their session(s) utilizing the current scheduling software, then you run the risk of not being able to make a connection because someone else has manually turned on that codec for another purpose. This causes frustration on several levels! First of all surprise; then whose problem is it, originate site or receive site, who gave administrative permission or not, how to turn on the room, no participants, there's more! Personally, this has happened to me several times over the past months.

Sometimes a common ground or single piece is necessary for all the parts to work together and be successful!

Nigel Buss

From: John Stritt [jstritt@esu10.org]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 2:07 PM
To: Rolfes, Tom; Becker, Rick
Subject: NITC Waiver Request Followup

As you will be meeting on Friday to review the waiver request, I wanted to share a few additional thoughts regarding that request.

In our presentation, we sought to address the NITC policy requiring mandatory scheduling from several angles. These included technical, cost, and Network Nebraska participation. I believe there is a fourth item which should be considered which is the intent behind LB1208.

Technical - As the Technical Panel is for providing analysis and recommendations to the NITC, your review of this waiver should be mostly influenced from that angle. Questions related to the policy requirement could include:

- Does the purchased software meet all five components as outlined in standard 7-403?
 - What is the standard for or meaning of "hardware control"?
 - Is the only way to do event logging, facilities coordination, and people coordination through a scheduling program?
 - Is the "event clearinghouse" a function that must be tied directly to a scheduling program?
- What implications are their for defining "some other entity with the stated capability?"
 - Is a bridge with management software "fit" the standards as outlined in 7-403?
 - Are their other scheduling or management programs that "fit" the standards?
 - What standard is there regarding a clearinghouse?
- How is a scheduled device unit determined?
 - Are the video and audio standards clearly defined to identify all devices that should be scheduled as CODECS?
 - Are there CODECS that could be exempt because they are not used for class purposes?
 - Are all Network Nebraska members responsible for having ALL devices scheduled?
 - If not, which members are exempt and why?
- Are there CODECS that "must" be controlled to allow for operability?
 - How does the 3 in 1 polycom system differ from the internal MCU when connecting to multiple sites?
 - Will the scheduling system override and thus solve a problem if an unscheduled "ad hoc" session is going?
 - Should all sessions be required to be scheduled events?

Costs - As was shared, both post-secondary and secondary schools may be involved in some up front license costs as well as ongoing maintenance fees.

- Who is responsible to pay additional costs for "extra" expenses not covered as part of the original contract?
- As other CODECS including bridges and other new codecs are developed/released, who will be responsible for extra costs to meet code and license these devices?

Network Nebraska Participation – What impact will the current policy have on participation?

- What is the definition of a Network Nebraska participant?

- When can an entity participate/join Network Nebraska but not be responsible for meeting the scheduling requirement?
- If entities such as post-secondary or private schools are not eligible for incentives, what are the reasons for licensing "all" of their codec devices?
- Will all eligible agencies who elect to participate and receive incentives maintain the ongoing requirements beyond the "four year" commitment?

LB 1208 Intent – The "eyes of the beholder" go a long way in trying to see what the intent of LB 1208 might have been. What was the intent?

- Was the intent to have a backbone that would allow and encourage participation of "all" non-profit agencies?
- How does control of a network work both for and against the ongoing changes in technology?
- What was meant by "connect" all schools allowing them to share classes?
- Does connect mean technically schedule or does it mean provide information so that schools are aware of and will make arrangements/agreements for exchange of a course?

In 2006, the adoption of the policy may have looked like the correct way to start out with the network. The policy does serve as a filter. Filters are not new, but need to be revisited and changed when the costs are greater than the benefits. The scheduling program does provide a needed if not required technical service for the 3 in 1 systems as it would be a technical nightmare to have each site trying to connect together on a multiple entry. For other devices, it is simply a software program to override a service that is currently part of that system.

Let the schools decide the benefit of using the scheduling software based on the technology they own or wish to purchase. If schools know of educational opportunities and feel that they will benefit their students, they will review what the necessary technical arrangements might be to participate in that opportunity.

What our schools should be looking for are the long term benefits based on educational opportunities rather than buying licenses to acquire a short term financial outcome.

John Stritt
Tri-Valley Distance Education Director
76 Plaza Blvd.
Kearney NE 68847
308-440-1767 (cell)
308-865-5664 ext 281 (phone)
308-233-9066 (fax)
jstritt@esu10.org

Tom

It is my concern that we will handicap the use of video conferencing in schools if we restrict it to require all video conferencing units be scheduled and controlled. If this is the case then how are we to handle the unsupported equipment in schools that Renovo can't address. Items such as the i2eye video phones that deaf students use when receiving video interpreting services through CSD, which frankly I hadn't even thought about until last week. One of my schools has used such a device and I am sure they aren't wanting to pay for a license for that student to receive services they are already receiving.

I have felt that when the RFP was written for the scheduling software that it only looked at those units in the Northeast and Southwest Distance Learning consortium because they were either upgrading at the time or the first to be upgraded. I think as a state we failed to look at the needs of all schools coming on including those in years 2 and 3 and the BNI solutions which comprise a large portion of the State.

I also run the Polycom PVX software on my laptop and have no inclination of having Renovo control any aspect of my work machine nor do I want to address the firewall issues dealing with such control.

I would just like the NITC to reconsider the standards being proposed and to take the least restrictive stance not the most restrictive as there will be a number of possibilities our groups are thinking of how this may affect the learning of that student(s).

~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~
Craig Peterson
Media/Technology Coordinator
Network Administrator
COOP Coordinator
Educational Service Unit No. 11
P.O. Box 858
412 W. 14th Ave.
Holdrege, NE 68949
<mailto:peterson@esull.org>
petersonesull.5901@ivisit.net
Office (308)995-6585
Cellular (308)991-6334
Fax (308)995-6587
~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~::~

From: Steven Stortz [mailto:sstortz@clnorfolk.org]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 3:10 PM
To: Rolfes, Tom
Subject: Seeking input: NITC Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Tom,
As you and I talked at NETA, my thoughts are that the districts are receiving reimbursement for equipment, and should therefore conform to the requirements set forth by the committee. The choice to provide equipment beyond the initial room, is just that - a choice. They are responsible for the decision to purchase the equipment with the realization that in order to use it, they must conform to the set guidelines. For this all to work we need everyone on the same page.
Steve

--
Steven Stortz
Media Specialist
Christ Lutheran School

From: Wayne Bell [mailto:wbell@esu10.org]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 3:15 PM
To: rickbecker@nebraska.gov; Rolfes, Tom
Cc: Ron Cone; John Stritt; buhing@esu1.org
Subject: Waiver form standard 7-403

Dear Sirs:

Thank you for allowing comment on the ESU 10 request for waiver of NITC Standard 7-403. I'm sure that Ron Cone and John Stritt will deal with the technical side of this issue. I just have some brief thoughts about statewide connectivity and the role of the NITC toward that end. It has been interesting to sit back and listen to people debate. There seems to be some blurred lines as to responsibility and control between the NITC and the DEC. More discussion will need to be held between these two entities to gain clarity as to roles and purposes.

If the legislative session would have been 90 days rather than 60 this whole concept of connectiveness would have been addressed and better defined. I have a feeling it will be addressed next year unless some sort of consensus is reached in the interim. When Senator Stuhr debated LB 1208 on the floor it is my opinion that she wanted a statewide connection. I can't remember it being mentioned that scheduling was an essential requirement to achieve this end. I'll need to do some historical research. That rigid train of thought though seems to be the overriding impetus in the interpretation of this standard.

Connectiveness can be viewed as the network that provides the opportunity to share courses. A data exchange of courses or clearinghouse also provides connectiveness as this supports the exchange of offerings to schools statewide. Device control, codecs, seems to add a technical piece that can or can not add convenience and functionality to a network, but it is not essential. It appears that Renovo considered upgrading their system to better meet needs but have not yet, to my knowledge, accomplished that task. To rely on this device as the controlling factor for a statewide system seems illogical.

Those who deal with standards in the world of distance education have a tough job. Change is constant and what was good 6 months ago can be archaic now. My request is that some solution be found for this issue that is not buried in rigidity and bureaucracy. This whole area of technology is fluid and all set and implied standards need to assure interoperability but must be flexible enough to embrace the newest of advances that continually improve opportunities for school districts and ESUs. What was perfect for the northeast one year ago is far less than perfect for central Nebraska this year. We need to stay ahead of the curve at our level and not get bogged down in the morass of exhaustive rule and regulation. To best meet the needs of the school districts of this state we need to find a process to think forward at all times pointed towards the future and not be constrained by the past and present. To do this will require excellent leadership and great flexibility, but the minds in this state are up to the challenge.

This waiver is a step in the right direction to keep people connected and moving forward. We need to embrace new ideas – not repel them!

Thanks for allowing me to respond.

Wayne A. Bell, Administrator
Educational Service Unit 10

From: Peters, B. J. [mailto:BPeters@ESU13.ORG]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 2:07 PM
To: Rolfes, Tom
Subject: NITC Scheduling standard for distance learning

Tom,
Some thoughts on the ESU #10 request for exemption from the state scheduling system.

My biggest fear is that if allowed we start heading back towards the days of where we were before and that is a regional approach to distance learning instead of a statewide network of interoperability. I understand that no one is being forced to use the state scheduling system but I don't want to see entities opting out of using the Renovo system and paying licensing fees but still standing in line to collect the incentive money from LB1208. We can't have it both ways. There at least needs to be some pricing distinction for placing courses in the clearinghouse but not being scheduled. I realize that the video conferencing industry is introducing codec-less IP systems all the time but I don't see those as being used in a day-to-day class setup. The state may need to come up with some kind of distinction between simple desk top, point-to-point systems and the systems being used by our schools in delivery of day to day classes.

B.J. Peters
Coordinator
Western Nebraska Distance Learning Consortium
Educational Service Unit #13
4215 Avenue I
Scottsbluff, NE 69361
Phone: 308-635-3696
Fax: 308-635-2729
Cell: 308-631-3932
Web Page: <http://dl.esu13.org/>

From: Shirley Schall [sschall@esu15.org]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 3:34 PM
To: Becker, Rick; Rolfes, Tom; Advisory Committee; Bob Uhing
Cc: Chris Petroff; John Stritt; B.J. Peters; Nigel Buss; Beth Kabes; Diane Wolfe; Charles Doyle
Subject: Re: Questions & Comments on Standard 7-403

I have just a couple counter-points:

It is my understanding that BNI has recently contacted Renovo about bringing the BNI equipment up-to-date with the scheduling standard. It would only be good business practice on Renovo's part not to work on the BNI upgrade unless they had a firm commitment that the software would be purchased and used on the BNI machines. With the exemption request by Tri-Valley--which could, if successful--then bring a request by Southeast, the company cannot know if one or one hundred and fifty codecs are in question.

If we are going to have a true, statewide network, then all members should participate. If you vote to allow the BNI sites not to participate in the statewide scheduler, then do we just forget the standards? BNI knew the day of the codec evaluations at UNK that they were out of the running if their equipment could not be scheduled through software yet to be determined at that time. Tom Rolfes made sure they understood that this was a criteria for selection, and their representatives acknowledged the fact. And as for the Zoo, Homestead, and other locations using BNI, that is because, as a Zoo employee stated last week at the NDLA convention, they are "a part of the Southeast Network." It is not because they evaluated the products from a lot of equipment vendors and chose the BNI system. Were they not given the equipment as part of a grant?

If we parcel out non-participating networks here and there, and allow everybody--compliant or not--to get incentive money, we had better come up with a name other than "Network Nebraska."

Shirley Schall, Director
Southwest Nebraska Distance Education Network

> Here are my questions and a comment.
>
>
> Questions:
> Will classes sent or received on BNI codec systems (assuming they
> cannot be
> scheduled) be ineligible for incentives even though they were
> purchased before LB 1208 was passed but are still used for distance learning?
>
> If BNI devices are now compliant with NITC standards but Renovo is
> unwilling to update the scheduling software so that BNI Systems can be
> scheduled and controlled, unless they (Renovo) are compensated, whose
> responsibility will it be to cover the costs to have Renovo update
> their software?
>
> At the time that RFP1683Z1 was issued wasn't it known that BNI systems
> were in use by a considerable number of schools, ESUs and other
> entities
> including: Henry Doorly Zoo, Homestead National Monument and the
> Joslyn Art Museum?
>
> Why wasn't RFP1683Z1 written with requirements that all BNI codec
> systems be able to be scheduled and controlled by the chosen
> scheduling and device control system, since it was known that there
> were a large number of BNI systems in use in the state and since it
> could have been anticipated that these systems would be able to be

> updated if they didn't meet standards at the time the RFP was written?
>
> Will software programs such as Polycom's PVX be required to be
> licensed and controlled by Renovo?
>
> Isn't it very likely that Polycom's PVX and other software codecs will
> continue to be improved and gain popularity but will not be able to be
> used for distance learning because NITC policy will prevent the use of
> these devices unless someone pays Renovo to write the code to schedule
> and control them?
>
> Are MCU Bridges considered to be codec devices and, if so, do they
> have to be licensed and controlled by Renovo if the entities that own
> them are members of Network Nebraska? If this is the case, isn't this
> placing a big financial burden on these entities?
>
> Will all codec devices owned by libraries, hospitals, colleges and the
> State have to be licensed and controlled by Renovo?
>
> Has the State licensed all of its codec devices and notified the
> Distance Education Council of these licenses?
>
> Does deciding not to license all codec devices also mean that the
> offending entity cannot be a member of Network Nebraska?
>
> Must schools and other entities that agree to have their codec devices
> licensed with Renovo also have those devices controlled by Renovo, or
> can they choose to use Renovo for clearinghouse services only and/or
> setup all their reservations as ³No Transmit² conferences?
>
> Comment:
> It is considerations of these types that guided the DEC Advisory
> Committee to pass policies concerning the use of the scheduling
> system. The workgroup that wrote the policies were all distance
> learning coordinators that deal with distance learning issues on a
> daily basis. The policies that they wrote, and that both the Advisory
> Committee and the Distance Education Council approved, recognize the
> importance of scheduling and clearinghouse services but do not agree
> with a requirement that every device must be licensed and controlled
> by Renovo. I urge the NITC Tech Panel to amend its policy and work
> with the Distance Education Council Advisory Committee to arrive at a
> new policy that responds to the requirements of the legislation but
> does not stifle innovation and the use of new technology.
>
> Gordon Roethemeyer
> Distance Education Council
> --
> Gordon Roethemeyer
> Executive Director
> Distance Education Council
> Educational Service Unit #10
> PO BOX 850
> Kearney, NE 68845
>
> Email: groethem@nebdec.org
> Phone: 308-237-5927 ext. 294
> Cell: 308-440-0706
> Website: <http://www.nebdec.org>
>
>
>

To: NITC Technical Panel
From: Chris Petroff, CNDEC Director
Date: April 28, 2008
RE: ESU10 Exemption Request

Technical Panel - May 2, 2008
Page 16 of 21

It seems to me we have four separate issues:

1. Renovo's business model
2. NITC Standard 7-403
3. Technology and user preferences
4. Validation

Renovo's current business model is based on a licensing and maintenance fee for CODECs. While the scheduling standard lists these requirements, Hardware Control, Event Logging, Facilities Coordination, and People Coordination, I consider these to be an integral part of what I call scheduling/hardware control. Renovo currently offers two main services, scheduling/hardware control and a clearinghouse. Users may opt to use both of these services in an integrated fashion, or one without the other. Renovo licensing has one fee to include both services.

Based on the current Renovo business model, I would recommend that each K12 district be required to license their district based on the 3x1 CODEC pricing. This would provide a district license for the full mesh 3x1, or MCU CODECS, or up to three individual point to point CODECS, to utilize the clearinghouse and/or scheduling/hardware control. I would further recommend that those licensed districts can without any additional licensing, a) utilize Network Nebraska for other video conferencing CODECs that are not Renovo scheduling/hardware controlled, and, b) utilize the clearinghouse for all DL courses. But for any licensed district that desires hardware control of additional CODECs thru Renovo scheduling, an additional license would be required for each CODEC.

The management of such a licensing requirement would be fairly straight forward. All video conferencing districts requesting state funds and/or riding Network Nebraska would be licensed based on the 3x1 pricing. As a district requests hardware control of additional CODECs, a license fee would be applied based on the CODEC.

In review of NITC Standard 7-403, I concur with the goal of statewide interoperability. To that end, ensuring all equipment purchased with the NDE reimbursement monies meets that standard seems reasonable. I am not so sure that the requirement that all video conferencing CODECs on Network Nebraska be licensed, as I have stated above, and as such see the necessity to revise the standard. To date not all CODECs can be controlled, and technology innovations will far out reach the programmers' ability to meet the needs as they arise. In many cases the individual districts may prefer to not use the Renovo scheduler/hardware control, and should not be forced to do so. Now, if these are DL classes that are seeking NDE incentive monies or still validating equipment reimbursements, and no other provision is provided for such validation, the Renovo scheduler and licensing may be the only option.

In regards to the request by ESU#10 to be exempt from NITC Standard 7-403 and licensing for one or more years, if Renovo does not have a proven MCU hardware control solution, AND ESU #10 schools do not plan to use the Renovo Clearinghouse as well, then a temporary exemption should be granted. But if ESU #10 schools plan to use the Renovo Clearinghouse, then I do not think an exemption applies.

Related questions I have are: Can equipment not consistent with NITC Standard 7-403, that is, equipment that can not be controlled, be denied for purchase if NDE reimbursement is to be applied? Or will such equipment be allowed to be purchased, and NDE reimbursement will not apply if that is the case?

From: Ron Cone [rcone@esu10.org]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 4:01 PM
To: Rolfes, Tom; Becker, Rick
Cc: John Stritt
Subject: Standard 7-403 Exemption Request

Others from ESU 10 have already commented on parts of the reasons for the exemption request, so I'll contribute some different thoughts and keep them short.

Standard 7-403 itself has many shortcomings itself as it applies to Renovo meeting the technical standard. I have not had the privilege of using an account on the system, but have talked with others about the features (or lack thereof).

For example:

Section 1.1 Hardware Control Components

1.1.1.6 Have a defined Quality of service

--- has this been published by Renovo or the State and what does it mean (uptime, MTBF, or QoS tagging)?

1.1.1.11 Searching capabilities

– do we have these capabilities as defined in the standard?

1.1.1.12.3 Endpoint Encryption

– can Renovo turn on/off encryption?

1.1.1.15 Be capable of controlling all specific equipment used in the network (CODECs, routers, switcher, MCUs, firewalls systems, etc.)

If it can, why haven't we heard or seen anything about it doing these features. I'm sure the NNNC would be using them and talking about them.

1.1.1.16 Facilitate various types of events (broadcasts)

Again, I haven't heard anything about this, so I'm guessing that it's not available in Renovo (but I would like to be shown otherwise).

I could go on with other parts of the standard, but since this is the focus of the debate and request, I'll end here and ask for clarification and specific examples of how Renovo can do all these things now.

Sincerely,

Ron Cone

Mid-Plains Community College Response to Educational Service Unit 10/11's Request for Waiver of NITC Standard 7-403

Mid-Plains Community College (MPCC) supports LB 1208 Legislation to develop a statewide education video delivery system using Internet Protocol (IP) based technology. We recognize and appreciate the position of ESU 10/11's request and agree that there are yet "future questions that need to be answered related to the policy and current service." We hope and expect that these and other questions will be resolved in a timely manner and that Nebraska will enjoy a comprehensive statewide delivery system equitable and beneficial to all.

Impact on Mid-Plains Community College

Under current circumstances should ESU 10/11 and the schools they represent continue with the equipment installations they are recommending and do not participate in the Renovo scheduling system MPCC course offerings will be negatively impacted in the following manner:

1. While ESU 10/11's equipment is capable of connecting to any other IP system throughout the state, should one of MPCC classrooms connect with one of the ESU 10/11 classrooms only the MPCC room and the ESU 10/11 classroom can fully interact. None of the other students in the other locations who are simultaneously connected to MPCC will be able to interact with the ESU 10/11 classroom. This prohibits direct student to student interactivity, and student questions must then be rephrased by the faculty member so that everyone can hear them.

While this will not impact a large number of High Schools in MPCC's State designated area, it will affect a few.

In addition, even now we have a request from a HS in the Tri-Valley area for a course because (in this subject matter area) Central Community College offerings are completely full. Connecting to this High School can technically be accomplished, but the limitations to student interactivity may be a deterrent to effectively offering this course.

Impact on other High Schools

Possibly more significant than the impact on MPCC is the potential impact that ESU 10/11's non-compliance would have on other High School to High School interactivity.

If the waiver is denied, ESU 10/11 would be termed non-compliant with the NITC standards and their involvement with any future course sharing with other

Network Nebraska schools would (could) prohibit those schools from receiving course credits eligible for the LB 1208 incentives. Hence this position threatens the use of the statewide network.

Conclusion

Mid-Plains would agree with NITC's Technical Panel Option # 4 which states:

4. Grant a temporary (2008-2009) partial waiver of only the hardware control component to ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools.

Implications: All ESU 10 and ESU 11 area schools would be required to utilize the four components of the Renovo Software...Event Logging; Facilities Coordination; People Coordination; Event Clearinghouse for the 2008-2009 year, with the exception of the Hardware Control. Other entities would be able to see the classes offered by the ESU's...schools in the Clearinghouse; the ESU 10/11 schools just wouldn't have their codecs controlled by the Renovo software. In July 2009, the ESU 10 and 11 area schools would be required to comply with the hardware control component.....

This position gives ESU 10/11 an additional year to test the compatibility of their Lifesize equipment with the Renovo software, allow time for clarification of the questions about licensing devices, while not penalizing other High Schools who may have the opportunity to send or receive a course from ESU 10/11.

-----Original Message-----

From: bkabes@esu7.org [mailto:bkabes@esu7.org]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2008 5:08 PM

To: Rolfes, Tom

Cc: nbuss@esu8.org; sschall@esu15.org; dmwolfe@esu2.org

Subject: Re: Seeking input: NITC Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Comments about waiver request below:

In a statewide system such as Network Nebraska, all stakeholders must participate in an equal and same fashion. My understanding of the waiver request is to forgo using such a system and wait to determine the best situation for said applicant. I can agree with a request in that situation.

However, I do not agree that if the waiver should be given, the applicant will be able to share in the receipt of incentives for schools currently dedicated to the statewide system and support this system.

Another concern is for those schools currently agreeing to the parameters of the legislative bill. If the schools currently using the system, by paying for the maintenance and paying for the fees for Network Nebraska, participate with a school that is not complying with the parameters of the law, will complying school lose possible incentive receipts? Or perhaps jeopardize their good standing with Network Nebraska and the office of the CIO?

For this system to operate as a statewide system and to be fair for all of those that are participating within the guidelines of the law, the cost of all of the system should be shared equally by all users. Each school building participating in the project should be paying the same share as the rest of the buildings. That cost includes the maintenance of the scheduling upkeep and the participation fee for Network Nebraska.

Beth Kabes

From: John Fiene [mailto:jfiene@mail.unomaha.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2008 11:19 AM
To: Rolfes, Tom
Subject: Re: [neheit] Seeking input: NITC Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Tom, I have no problem with a temporary waiver, but the issues raised in the request would seem to warrant further discussion of the tech panel and council.

Cheers!

John

NITC 1-201 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

Title: Agency Information Technology Plan

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/>.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on June 8, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for June 10, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at <http://nitc.ne.gov/>.

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

NITC 1-201 (Draft)

Title	Agency Information Technology Plan
Category	General Provisions
Applicability	All state agencies, boards, and commissions

1. Purpose

By statute, "[o]n or before September 15 of each even-numbered year, all state agencies, boards, and commissions shall report to the Chief Information Officer, in a format determined by the commission, an information technology plan that includes an accounting of all technology assets, including planned acquisitions and

upgrades.” (Laws 2008, LB 823, §6). This document contains the approved format for agency information technology plans.

2. Approved Format for Agency Information Technology Plans

Attachment A, entitled "Agency Information Technology Plan," is the approved format for agency information technology plans due on or before September 15, 2008.

Attachment A: Agency Information Technology Plan (Word Document)

VERSION DATE: Draft - May 2, 2008
HISTORY:
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
and the
Office of the Chief Information Officer

DRAFT
Agency Information Technology Plan
2008 Form

Due: September 15, 2008

Notes about this form:

1. **STATUTORY REQUIREMENT.** “On or before September 15 of each even-numbered year, all state agencies, boards, and commissions shall report to the Chief Information Officer, in a format determined by the [Nebraska Information Technology Commission], an information technology plan that includes an accounting of all technology assets, including planned acquisitions and upgrades.” (Laws 2008, LB 823, §6). This document -- prepared with input from state agencies and the Technical Panel -- is the approved format for agency information technology plans.
2. **GENERAL GUIDANCE ON COMPLETING THIS FORM.** This form provides a basic format for providing the information requested. Agencies can add clarifying comments or modify the tables provided as necessary to provide the information. The agency should assume the information provided is a public record. Do not include information which would compromise your information technology security. Please indicate in the document where information is not provided for security reasons.
3. **DEADLINE.** The Agency Information Technology Plan is due on September 15, 2008.
4. **SUBMITTING THE FORM.** The completed form should be submitted as an email attachment to the Office of the CIO at: ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov
5. **QUESTIONS.** Contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at (402) 471-7984 or ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov

Agency

Agency IT Contact
Email Address
Phone

1. Current Assets

1.1 Applications

1.1.1 Off-the-Shelf Applications

Provide an estimated number of licenses for each of the following applications:

	Estimated Number of Users/Licenses	Version(s) (Optional)
Productivity Suite		
Microsoft Office		
WordPerfect Office		
OpenOffice/StarOffice		
Other (Specify)		
Internet Browser		
Microsoft Internet Explorer		
Firefox/Mozilla		
Safari		
Other (Specify)		
Desktop Antivirus		
Symantec/Norton		
McAfee		
Other		
Email and Calendaring		
Microsoft Outlook/Exchange		
Lotus Notes		
Other (Specify)		
Instant Messaging		
Lotus		
Jabber		
Other (Specify)		
Database Management (DBMS)		
IBM		
Oracle		
Microsoft SQL		
AS/400		
Other (Specify)		
Applications Development Tools		
Microsoft Visual Studio		

IBM Rational Application Developer		
Micro Focus COBOL		
Other (Specify)		

1.1.2 Other Off-the-Shelf Applications

List other significant off-the-shelf applications utilized by the agency:

Application	Estimated Number of Users/Licenses	Version(s) (Optional)

1.1.3 Custom Applications

List custom applications used by the agency, including (a) the general purpose of the application; (b) the platform on which it is running; (c) application development tools used; and (d) how the application is supported.

Application:
Platform:
Development Tools:
How Supported:

Application:
Platform:
Development Tools:
How Supported:

1.2 Data

1.2.1 Databases

List the significant databases maintained by the agency and a brief description of each.

Database:
Brief Description:

Database:
Brief Description:

1.2.2 Data Exchange

List the significant electronic data exchanges your agency has with other entities.

Title/Description:
Other Entity:
Purpose:
Is this exchange encrypted?:

Title/Description:
Other Entity:
Purpose:
Is this exchange encrypted?:

1.3 Hardware

1.3.1 General Description of Computing Environment

Provide a general description of the elements of the computing environment in the agency (mainframe, midrange, desktop computers, thin clients, etc.).

Description:

1.3.2 Hardware Assets

Complete the following table. For “current” assets, enter the total number of each item currently owned/leased by the agency. For “planned” assets, enter an estimated number of each item at the end of the biennium on June 30, 2011.

	Current				Planned			
	Windows	Mac	Linux	Other	Windows	Mac	Linux	Other
Desktop Computers								
Laptop Computers								
Servers								

Provide a brief narrative describing the reason/rationale for any significant change in the number of planned hardware assets as compared to the number of current hardware assets. Also, provide a description of the agency’s hardware replacement cycle.

Narrative:

1.4 Network Environment

1.4.1 General Description

Provide a general description of the agency’s network environment. You may optionally include any related diagrams, etc. Also, describe any desktop management and/or LAN monitoring tools used by the agency.

Description:

1.4.2 Network Devices

Complete the following table. For “current” devices, enter the total number of each item currently owned/leased by the agency. For “planned” devices, enter an estimated number of each item at the end of the biennium on June 30, 2011.

	Current	Planned
Firewalls (Hardware)		
Wireless Access Points		
Video Cameras (USB)		
IP Phones		
POP Servers		
Web Servers		
Application Delivery (e.g. Citrix, Terminal Services servers) (Specify)		

Provide a brief narrative describing the reason/rationale for any significant change in the number of planned devices as compared to the number of current devices.

Narrative:

2. Staff and Training

2.1 Staff and Related Support Personnel

Identify staffing necessary to maintain your current IT environment, including contractor and OCIO staff supporting your agency specific environment.

	Approximate FTE
Agency IT Staff	
Contractors	
OCIO Staff	

2.2 IT Related Training

Summarize the agency's efforts to address training needs relating to information technology, including training for IT staff and users.

Description:

3. Survey

	Yes	No	In Progress	Not Applicable
3.1 Security - Please answer the following questions regarding your agency's efforts to maintain a secure information technology environment. [The questions refer to the Nebraska Information Technology Commission's Security Policies. These policies are available at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/]				
Has your agency implemented the NITC's Security Policies?				
Has your agency implemented other security policies?				
If your answer to the previous question is YES, please list the other security policies. List:				
3.2 Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity - For purposes of this document, the term "Disaster Recovery Plan" refers to preparations for restoring information technology systems following a major disruption.				
Does your agency have a disaster recovery plan?				
If your answer to the previous question is YES, have you tested your disaster recovery plan?				
If your answer to the previous question is YES, have you revised your disaster recovery plan based on the results of your test?				
Does your agency perform regular back-ups of important agency data?				
If your answer to the previous questions is YES, does your agency maintain off-site storage of back-up data?				
3.3 Accessibility / Assistive Technology				
Does your agency include the Nebraska Technology Access Clause in contracts for information technology purchases? (See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 73-205. The Technology Access Clause is posted at				

	Yes	No	In Progress	Not Applicable
http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/)				
Does your agency have procedures in place to identify the information technology related requirements of users with disabilities?				
Does your agency provide training opportunities for management, procurement, and technical personnel on how to meet the accessibility needs of users with disabilities?				
Has your agency evaluated its website(s) to ensure accessibility to all persons with disabilities? If yes, what tools were used to evaluate accessibility? ___ http://www.w3.org/WAI/ER/existingtools.html ___ http://www.vischeck.com/ ___ http://www.henterjoyce.com/fs_downloads/jaws_form.asp ___ Other (please specify _____)				
3.4 Geographic Information System (GIS)				
Does your agency have plans, over the next biennium, for the development and/or acquisition of GIS/geospatial data or web-based systems to display or make accessible this type of data that is estimated to cost more than \$25,000?				
If your answer to the previous question is YES, please provide a brief description:				

4. Projects and Future Plans

4.1 Projects Currently Active

List current IT projects, including a description of the project, the current project status, projected completion date and costs.

Project Title:
Brief Description:
Current Status:
Projected Completion Date:
Total Project Cost:

Project Title:
Brief Description:
Current Status:
Projected Completion Date:
Total Project Cost:

4.2 Projects Planned to be Started in FY2008-2009

List IT projects that are planned to start before the end of the current fiscal year which were not listed in the previous section.

Project Title:
Brief Description:
Projected Start Date:
Projected Completion Date:

Total Project Cost:

Project Title:

Brief Description:

Projected Start Date:

Projected Completion Date:

Total Project Cost:

4.3 Projects Planned for the FY2009-2011 Biennium

List IT project planned for the next biennium. (Note: If funding for a project has been requested and an IT Project Proposal entered in the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System, you only need to list the project title and note that it is included in the agency budget request.)

Project Title:

Brief Description:

Projected Start Date:

Projected Completion Date:

Total Project Cost:

Project Title:

Brief Description:

Projected Start Date:

Projected Completion Date:

Total Project Cost:

4.4 Long-Term Plans (Beyond the FY2009-2011 Biennium)

Describe any long-term plans for projects to be started after the FY2009-2011 biennium.

Agency Narrative:

4.5 Other Issues

This is a general comment section where the agency can identify issues not captured in another section of the plan. This provides an opportunity to address issues which may, or may not, impact an agency IT budget; such things as known risks, trends, or issues for which there is not currently enough information to be included in the other sections. This section can also be used to summarize the agency's strategies and future direction for the use of information technology within the agency.

Agency Narrative:

NITC 1-202 (DRAFT)

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

Title: Project Review Process

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/>.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on June 8, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for June 10, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at <http://nitc.ne.gov/>.

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

NITC 1-202 (Draft)

Title	Project Review Process
Category	General Provisions
Applicability	Applies to all entities required to submit information technology projects for review by the Technical Panel.

1. Purpose

This document establishes the project review process for certain budget requests and grant requests as required by statute.

2. Budget Request Reviews

The 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...” Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(8) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823). And “[g]overnmental entities, state agencies, and political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(5) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823).

The following are the steps in the project review process for budget requests:

- A project is submitted by an agency.
- Individual reviewers are assigned to the project.
- Individual reviewers score and comment on the project.
- The submitting agency has the opportunity to respond to reviewer comments.
- The reviewer scores and comments, as well as any agency response, are reviewed by the Technical Panel at a public meeting. The Technical Panel may make additional comments and recommendations.
- Depending on the subject matter of the project, one or more of the NITC advisory councils may review and provide comments and recommendations on the project.
- The NITC reviews the project, along with related comments and recommendations, and makes a final recommendation to be included in a report to the Governor and Legislature.

2.1 Minimum Requirements for Project Submission

Attachment A, entitled "Guidance on Information Technology Related Budget Requests - Project Proposal Form Requirements," provides guidance and establishes the minimum requirements for the submission of a Project Proposal Form.

2.2 Project Proposal Form

Attachment B, entitled "Project Proposal Form," establishes the format for submission of projects. Project proposals should be submitted by entering the information into the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS) in the "IT Project Proposal" section.

2.3 Individual Reviewers

2.3.1 Number of Reviewers. Each project will be reviewed and scored by at least three qualified reviewers, at least one of whom is either a member or alternate on the Technical Panel.

2.3.2 Qualified Reviewers.

2.3.2.1 All members and alternates of the Technical Panel and chartered NITC advisory councils are qualified reviewers.

2.3.2.2 Other individuals who have completed Attachment C, entitled "Project Reviewer Information Sheet," and been approved by the Technical Panel are qualified reviewers.

2.3.2.3 A provisional review may be performed by an individual who has not been formally approved by the Technical Panel as a qualified reviewer pursuant to section 2.3.2.2. The Technical Panel will be informed of any provisional review as part of the notification requirements of section 2.3.3. The Technical Panel will consider approving the individual as a qualified reviewer at the next meeting of the panel. If the Technical Panel does not approve the individual as a qualified reviewer, the project proposal review may be completed without regard to the requirements of 2.3.1.

2.3.3 Assignment of Reviewers. Based on the subject matter of each project, an initial assignment of reviewers will be performed in a manner determined by the Technical Panel. Technical Panel members will be notified, by email, of the projects under review and the initial assignment of reviewers for each project. Members will have 24 hours to object to any of the reviewers assigned to a project. A member may object by sending an email to the other members, noting the specific assignment for which there is an objection and the reason(s) for the objection. If there are objections, new assignments will be made and communicated in the same manner as described above; or, at the discretion of the Technical Panel Chair, a special meeting of the Technical Panel may be called to assign reviewers. If there are no objections to the initial assignments, or any reassignments, the assigned reviewers will be provided with the documents necessary to complete the reviews. Should an individual reviewer be unable to complete an assigned review, a new reviewer will be assigned and the members notified in the same manner as the initial assignment.

2.3.4 Reviewer Responsibility. Individual reviewers will review and score each section of a project proposal based on criteria established by the Technical Panel. Reviewers may also make comments or recommendations regarding the project proposal.

2.4 Agency Response

The submitting agency will be provided with the review scores and comments and be given an opportunity to submit a written response, or other clarifying information.

2.5 Technical Panel Review

The Technical Panel will review the project proposals, including the reviewer scores and comments and any agency response, at a public

meeting. The Technical Panel may make additional comments and recommendations to the NITC.

2.6 Advisory Council Review

Depending on the subject matter of the project, one or more of the NITC advisory councils may review and provide comments and recommendations on a project to the NITC.

2.7 NITC Review and Recommendations

The NITC will review the projects, including any comments and recommendations from the Technical Panel and advisory councils, and make final recommendations on the projects to be included in a report to the Governor and Legislature.

3. Community Technology Fund and Government Technology Collaboration Fund Grant Reviews

Grants from the Community Technology Fund and Government Technology Collaboration Fund may be approved by the NITC "only after review by the technical panel." Neb. Rev. Stat. §§86-522 and 86-523.

3.1 Advisory Group Review and Recommendation

The Community Council and eHealth Council may review and make recommendations to the NITC regarding applications for the use of the Community Technology Fund. The State Government Council may review and make recommendations to the NITC regarding applications for the use of the Government Technology Collaboration Fund.

3.2 Technical Panel Review and Recommendation

The Technical Panel will review any application for the use of the Community Technology Fund or Government Technology Collaboration Fund at a public meeting. The Technical Panel may provide comments and recommendations to the NITC.

4. Other Technical Reviews

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-521, the Technical Panel "shall review any technology project presented to the Nebraska Information Technology Commission...." The Technical Panel will conduct any such review at a public meeting. The Technical Panel may determine the format of the information presented and may appoint qualified reviewers to assist the panel as necessary.

[Attachment A](#): Guidance on Information Technology Related Budget Requests - Project Proposal Form Requirements

[Attachment B](#): Project Proposal Form (Word Document)

[Attachment C](#): Project Reviewer Information Sheet (Word Document)

VERSION DATE: Draft - May 8, 2008
HISTORY:
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Guidance on Information Technology Related Budget Requests Project Proposal Form Requirements

Issue:

Does an information technology project in your agency's budget request require the completion of a Project Proposal Form?

Background:

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..." Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(8) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823). "Governmental entities, state agencies, and political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions." Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(5) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823). In order to perform this review, the NITC and DAS Budget Division require agencies/entities to complete a Project Proposal Form when requesting funding for technology projects.

Some, but not all information technology budget requests will require the completion of the Project Proposal Form. This document is intended to provide guidance on which projects require completion of this form.

Definitions:

Information technology is defined as "computing and telecommunications systems, their supporting infrastructure, and interconnectivity used to acquire, transport, process, analyze, store, and disseminate information electronically." Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-507. Supporting infrastructure includes both the physical infrastructure such as computers or networks and non-physical components such as personnel, training, customer support, and software.

A **significant project**, for the purposes of this document, means a project which: 1) costs more than \$250,000; OR 2) costs more than \$25,000 AND has a major effect on a core business function OR has an impact that affects multiple agencies. This definition does not include on-going operational costs of information technology such as replacement of computers, operating system upgrades, routine data processing costs, existing support personnel, or application maintenance.

Guidance:

A Project Proposal Form is required for all significant information technology projects. Review the definitions above and complete the Worksheet on the following page to determine if your project requires a Project Proposal Form.

ALL requests for funding, whether or not a Project Proposal Form is completed, must still be provided for in the standard agency budget requests submitted to the DAS Budget Division.

Agencies should contact their budget analyst with any questions about whether specific projects require the completion of a Project Proposal Form. The Budget Division will consult with the Office of the CIO / NITC on these questions.

WORKSHEET

1. Is this an information technology related funding request? YES or NO

If YES, continue.

If NO, STOP. A project proposal form is not required.

2. Is the funding request for on-going operational costs such as replacement of computers, operating system upgrades, routine data processing costs, existing support personnel, or application maintenance? YES or NO

If YES, STOP. A project proposal form is not required.

If NO, continue.

3. Is the cost of the project more than \$250,000? YES or NO

If YES, STOP. A PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM NEEDS TO BE COMPLETED.

If NO, continue.

4. Is the cost of the project more than \$25,000? YES or NO

If YES, continue.

If NO, STOP. A project proposal form is not required.

5. Does the project have a major effect on a core business function? YES or NO

- OR -

6. Does the project have an impact that affects multiple agencies? YES or NO

If you answered YES to either question 5 or 6, A PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM NEEDS TO BE COMPLETED.

If you answered NO to both questions 5 and 6, a project proposal form is not required.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

Funding Requests for Information Technology Projects

FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget

IMPORTANT NOTE: Starting with FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget requests, project proposals should only be submitted by entering the information into the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS). The information requested in this Microsoft Word version of the form should be entered in the NBRRS in the "IT Project Proposal" section. The tabs in the "IT Project Proposal" section coincide with sections contained in this Microsoft Word version of the form. Information may be cut-and-pasted from this form or directly entered into the NBRRS.

ALSO NOTE that for each IT Project Proposal created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.

Project Title	
Agency/Entity	

Project Proposal Form
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget Requests

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...” Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(8) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823). “Governmental entities, state agencies, and political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(5) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823). In order to perform this review, the NITC and DAS Budget Division require agencies/entities to complete this form when requesting funding for technology projects.
2. **WHICH TECHNOLOGY BUDGET REQUESTS REQUIRE A PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM?** See the document entitled NITC 1-202 “Project Review Process for Information Technology Budget Requests and Grant Applications” available at <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/>. Attachment A to that document establishes the minimum requirements for project submission.
3. **COMPLETING THE FORM IN THE NEBRASKA BUDGET REQUEST AND REPORTING SYSTEM (NBRRS).** Starting with FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget requests, project proposals should only be submitted by entering the information into the NBRRS. The information requested in this Microsoft Word version of the form should be entered in the NBRRS in the “IT Project Proposal” section. The tabs in the “IT Project Proposal” section coincide with sections contained in this Microsoft Word version of the form. Information may be cut-and-pasted from this form or directly entered into the NBRRS. **ALSO NOTE** that for each “IT Project Proposal” created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an “IT Issue” in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.
4. **QUESTIONS.** Contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at (402) 471-7984 or rick.becker@nitc.ne.gov

Project Proposal Form
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget Requests

Section 1: General Information

Project Title	<input type="text"/>
Agency (or entity)	<input type="text"/>

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	<input type="text"/>
Address	<input type="text"/>
City, State, Zip	<input type="text"/>
Telephone	<input type="text"/>
E-mail Address	<input type="text"/>

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.

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.
2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.
3. Describe the project's relationship to your agency comprehensive information technology plan.

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

Project Proposal Form
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget Requests

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.
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://nitc.ne.gov/standards/>) and generally accepted industry standards.
 - Address the compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

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.
10. List the major milestones and/or deliverables and provide a timeline for completing each.
11. Describe the training and staff development requirements.
12. Describe the ongoing support requirements.

Section 7: Risk Assessment (10 Points)

13. Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project and the relative importance of each.
14. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

Project Proposal Form
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget Requests

Section 8: Financial Analysis and Budget (20 Points)

15. Financial Information

Below is a screen shot of the "Financial" information tab in the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System used to enter the finance information for this project (NOTE: For each IT Project Proposal created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.):

IT Project Request Costs						
Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$0					
Project Management	\$0					
Data Conversion	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Telecommunications						
Data	\$0					
Video	\$0					
Voice	\$0					
Wireless	\$0					
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Training						
Technical Staff	\$0					
End-user Staff	\$0					
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnel Cost	\$0					
Supplies & Materials	\$0					
Travel	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	\$0					
Software	\$0					
Network	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Request	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
▼ Funding						
	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr.	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$0					
Cash Fund	\$0					
Federal Fund	\$0					
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					

Done

das-nebs-cat.ne.gov

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Reviewer Information Sheet

Purpose: By statute, the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission is responsible for performing technical reviews of certain budget requests and grant applications. As part of the review process established in NITC policies (NITC 1-202), the Technical Panel may request qualified individuals to review, score, and comment on project proposals as part of the technical review process. This document requests background information from potential reviewers allowing the Technical Panel to document a reviewer's qualifications. Please send the completed form to: ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov

Name	
Agency/Employer	
Title	
Email Address	
Phone	

1. Employment History (IT Related Only)
2. Education
3. Professional Training and Certifications
4. Information Technology Areas of Expertise (Optional. List areas of expertise.)

Technical Panel Review

Date	
Action	

**State of Nebraska
Office of the CIO**

List of Preapproved Items for Purchase

For the purpose of procurement reviews conducted pursuant to NEB. REV. STAT. §§ 81-1117, 81-1120.17 and 81-1120.20, the following items are preapproved for purchase by agencies, if the cost of the item is less than \$500.00:

1. Functionally equivalent parts needed to repair existing equipment
2. Cables for connecting computer components
3. Power Cords / Adapters
4. Extender Cables for Keyboards / Mice
5. KVM (Keyboard - Video - Mouse) Switches
6. USB / PS2 Connectors
7. Memory Chips
8. Laptop Batteries
9. Laptop Docking Stations
10. UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply)
11. Keyboards
12. Mice
13. Speakers
14. Monitors that are ordered without a system
15. Hard Drives
16. CD/DVD Drives
17. Video Cards
18. Network Cards
19. Barcode Pens and Readers
20. Card Readers
21. Smart Board Overlays
22. Projectors and Projector Lamps
23. Desktop Printers
24. Printer Toner and Ink
25. Desktop Scanners
26. Small Label Printers
27. Blank CDs or DVDs
28. Blank Tapes
29. Digital Voice Recorders
30. Flash Drives
31. Software Books
32. Training CDs or DVDs
33. Logic boards and computers that are integral parts of equipment that serves a primary purpose other than information management, including digital cameras, lab equipment, and motor vehicles. (Items covered here are not subject to the \$500.00 limit.)

Date of Last Revision: May 1, 2008_DRAFT
[Current version posted at: <http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/1-204-Attachment-A.pdf>]

Deleted: February 11, 2008