MEETING AGENDA

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

Tuesday, April 9, 2013
9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents (25 pages)

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

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes* - February 12, 2013

4. Enterprise Projects

   - Project Update
       - Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN) - Sue Krogman, Bob Wilhelm, Tim Hoffbauer and Pete Peterson
   - Project Status Dashboard - Andy Weekly

5. Standards and Guidelines

   - Recommendations to the NITC*
       - NITC 5-202: Blocking Email Attachments (Repeal)
           - No Comments
           - State Government Council Recommendation: Repeal
       - NITC 5-203: Blocking Unsolicited Bulk Email / "Spam" (Repeal)
           - No Comments
           - State Government Council Recommendation: Repeal

6. Work Group Updates (as needed)

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn (Next Meeting - May 14, 2013)

* 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.)

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on March 5, 2013. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on April 5, 2013. Nebraska Open Meetings Act

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday, February 12, 2013, 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska
Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Michael Winkle, NET

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. There were four members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on December 17, 2012. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on February 8, 2013. The Nebraska Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 11, 2012 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Decker moved to approve the December 11, 2012 minutes as presented. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Horn-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

Project Update - NDE - Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) - John Moon, Valorie Foy, Brent Gaswick, Brian Halstrom, Nebraska Department of Education

An RFP has been released. The vendors will be discussed at the March 2013 meeting of the Board of Education. There were software issues with the writing portion of the text. The software was putting extra lines in or moving lines of text around.   The department has been working with the vendor to correct the problem. A quick fix was sent out to districts.   Mr. Langer stated that the feedback he was getting from teachers to the NESA writing test was that it was very frustrating, especially when editing.

A question was raised about the accessibility of the software for students with disabilities for writing papers. Ms. Horn informed the project staff that the Federal regulations are saying there is no separate testing but equal. This will be a problem for the state if we cannot get software that our students with disabilities can also use. Federal lawsuits can be filed against the state. Vendors must provide accessibility. Ms. Horn recommended that the project do some research regarding the handwritten test versus online. The State of Nebraska has an accessibility clause in all contracts.

Mr. Langer expressed concerned regarding the release of the RFP.   A few months ago, the project provided a project update. The Technical Panel had expressed several concerns regarding mobile devices, project budget and accessibility compliance, as well as impact on Network Nebraska. The panel requested to be involved in the RFP process but so far have had limited opportunities for input. For

example, no Technical Panel members were invited to attend the vendor demonstrations. Mr. Langer asked the Department of Education that as it makes a decision on the vendor to keep in mind that this impacts technology choices for school districts.

Mr. Weir restated that the Technical Panel is willing to assist in the evaluation of the RFP. The panel members want to be part of the process.

Project Status [Dashboard](#)
Andy Weekly, Office of the CIO

Members had a follow-up discussion from last meeting on Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN) project. The panhandle region is testing and working on their ring. They are experiencing problems with the provider. The project has a new Project Manager and is still struggling with governance issues. Mr. Weekly will work with Ms. Scofield to request an update at the next meeting.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - Recommendations to the NITC*

[NITC 7-104](#): Web Domain Name Standard (New) - [Comments Received](#)
Purpose: The purpose of this standard is to provide for consistent domain names for state government websites.

The State Government Council tabled action on this until their next meeting on February 14.

Staff recommended changes to the draft standard based on comments received. The recommended changes were included in the meeting materials.

Ms. Horn moved to recommend approval of [NITC 7-104](#): Web Domain Name Standard with the recommended changes. Ms. Decker seconded. Roll call vote: Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

NITC 8-101: Information Security Policy ([Amendment](#)) - No Comments Received

The State Government Council has reviewed the amendment and has recommended approval. Section 8, Portable Devices, is amended to read

> **Portable Devices**
> All portable computing devices (e.g. notebooks, USB flash drives, PDA's, laptops and mobile phones) and information must be secured to prevent compromise of confidentiality or integrity. No device may store or transmit sensitive information without suitable protective measures that are approved by the agency data owner(s).
> Special care must be taken to ensure that information stored on the device is not compromised. Appropriate safeguards must be in place for the physical protection, access control, cryptographic technique, back up, virus protection, and properly connected to the State network. All mobile devices must utilize the screen locking feature on their device when not in use and after a period of inactivity.
> Devices storing sensitive and/or critical information must not be left unattended and, where possible, must be physically locked away, or utilize special locks to secure the equipment. Employees in the possession of portable devices must not check these devices in airline luggage systems. These devices must remain in the possession of the traveler as hand luggage unless restricted by Federal or State authorities.

Mr. Langer moved to recommend approval of the amendments to NITC 8-101: Information Security Policy ([Amendment](#)). Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Langer-Yes, Horn-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Weir-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - REQUEST FOR WAIVER

DHHS - Request for Waiver from the requirements of NITC 7-104: Web Domain Name Standard (Proposed)
Purpose: The purpose of this standard is to provide for consistent domain names for state government websites.

The Department of Health and Human Services Web Team has asked for a waiver in order to build a microsite for 18-25 year olds to warn them of tobacco use and would like to use .org, .net or .com and would have a promotional campaign. The microsite would reside in nebraska.gov. The microsite would sit in front of the firewalls but would have the DHHS security.

Mr. Decker moved to approve the request for waiver from the requirements of NITC 7-104 Web Domain Name Standard. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - AFFIRM POSTING FOR 30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD*

NITC 5-202: Blocking Email Attachments (Repeal)
Purpose: It is important to take steps to protect the state's computing environment against the threat of viruses. Email attachments with certain extensions are often used in virus attacks because of their execution access and the amount of damage they can cause. Therefore, the State of Nebraska prohibits certain attachments from being transmitted through email.

NITC 5-203: Blocking Unsolicited Bulk Email / "Spam" (Repeal)
Purpose and Objectives: This standard addresses the burden on state resources due to UBE and how state agencies may address the issue. Agencies cannot expect to "solve" all problems that arise from UBE, only mitigate them. UBE creates a significant drain of technical and operational resources. In 2003, the state will receive an estimated 2 million UBE messages for approximately 12,000 employees using e-mail. These numbers will likely continue to rise. UBE needs to be reduced to the extent possible without adding excessive costs or exceptional risks to normal flow of legitimate e-mail.

Both of these standards were written when agencies were running their own servers. Now that we have a single system, these standards are no longer needed. The State Government Council recommended repeal.

Ms. Decker moved to affirm the posting of NITC 5-202: Blocking Email Attachments and NITC 5-203: Blocking Unsolicited Bulk Email/"Spam" for the 30-day comment period. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes and Weir-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Security Architecture Work Group - Chris Hobbs. Staff is recommending that the Security Architecture Work Group be re-chartered under the State Government Council. The Technical Panel would continue to receive regular updates from the work group.

Ms. Horn moved to repeal the Security Architecture Work Group Charter. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes and Weir-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Intergovernmental Data Communications Work Group - Tim Cao. Mr. Cao provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled "County server Consolidation Project Update February 12, 2013." Consolidation work began late 2009 and early 2010. The architectural and network design was completed 2010. The Proof of Concept was completed early 2011. Implementation of Phase 1 began in June 2011. The first

28 counties were consolidated in September 2011. Phase II began in January 2013. Implementation of Phase II is schedule to occur July-September 2013.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

ADJOURN

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

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held on March 12, 2013, 9:00 a.m.

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

Project Status Form

General Information			
Project Name			Date
Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)			March 2013
Sponsoring Agency			
NEMA and ~~Nebraska Council of Regions~~ Nebraska Public Safety Communications Council (NPSCC)			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Bob Wilhelm	402-471-7409	bob.wilhelm @nebraska.gov	NEMA
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Joint effort btw NEMA/the Nebraska Public Safety Communications Council (NPSCC). Sue Krogman coordinating.	Direct inquiries to Wilhelm.	bob.wilhelm @nebraska.gov	NEMA

Project Start Date	9/1/2009	Project End Date	09/30/2012	Revised End Date	09/30/2013

Key Questions		Explanation (if Yes)
1. Has the project scope of work changed?	☐ Yes ☒ No	
2. Will upcoming target dates be missed?	☒ Yes ☐ No	Possibly. Based on the uncertainty of the infrastructure needed for the project and the time involved in obtaining the environmental approvals to proceed with the project, any target dates are fluid. In addition there has been a delay in completing, testing and accepting the Pilot Ring primarily due to the difficulty in locating adequate tower sites and negotiating leasing agreements and/or MOU's.
3. Does the project team have resource constraints?	☐ Yes ☒ No	
4. Are there problems or concerns that require stakeholder or top management attention?	☒ Yes ☐ No	Sometimes, however we strive to insure they are receiving the required attention as they arise.

Summary Project Status

Any item classified as red or yellow requires an explanation in the Status box that follows this section. Additional priority items can be added to the list for status reporting.

Select one color in each of the Reporting Period columns to indicate your best assessment of:	Last Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY]			This Reporting Period [02/01/2013]		
1. Overall Project Status	☐ Red	☒ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☒ Yellow	☐ Green
2. Schedule	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green	☐ Red	☒ Yellow	☐ Green
3. Budget (capital, overall project hours)	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green
4. Scope	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green
5. Quality	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☒ Green

Color Legend

🟥	*Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or deliverables. Requires immediate escalation and management involvement.*
🟨	*Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or deliverables. PM will manage based on risk mitigation planning.*
🟩	*Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.*

Monthly Status Summary

Provide a summary of the project status since the last reporting period. (This summary will become part of the monthly NITC Dashboard.)

See below

UPDATE FOR MARCH 2013 – The S/W regional installations are almost complete. Contractor working on identifying infrastructure to link S/W and S/C to N/C and eastern part of the state. Considering the possible need to build 3 or 4 towers in S/C and N/E regions. Awaiting information from the contractor and OCIO on details to determine need, height, strength etc. of the potential towers/sites in question.

UPDATE FOR FEBRUARY 2013 – Contractor is in the process of ordering equipment for the E/C, S/W (although much of the S/W regional equipment has been installed), and S/E regional sites where EHP's have been received. Additional structural analysis and surveys of potential sites in the N/E, E/C and S/E areas will be completed in the search for acceptable infrastructure.

UPDATE FOR DECEMBER 2012 - The contractor is moving forward with installations and the ordering of equipment. Information for EHP submissions has slowed but this has been discussed with the contractor and they state they will provide more information soon. Contractor has met with the N/E, E/C and S/E regions to discuss the process and information that CSI needs to move forward and with identifying usable tower sites, etc. Has begun to install equipment in the S/W region. Governor signed new Executive Order creating the Nebraska Public Safety Communications Council (NPSCC) and eliminated the previous Executive Orders that established NCOR and NWIN.

UPDATE FOR OCTOBER 2012 – The contractor is moving forward with installations and the ordering of equipment. The contractor is also providing the information necessary for the Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) reviews and assessing the viability of some of the proposed sites and prioritizing the EHP direction to those areas where construction may occur in a more timely manner based on infrastructure. All PSIC funds were paid out for this project by September 30, 2012 (end of grant) and we have moved on to using State Homeland Security Grant funds as the primary source of funding for this project.

UPDATE FOR AUGUST 2012 – Testing of the Panhandle Pilot Ring occurred on June 5th and 9th. The Regional and state representatives were satisfied that the testing met the final testing criteria and the contractor, CSI, was advised that they were authorized to implement the remainder of the project. Since that time much equipment for the Southwest Ring has been ordered with PSIC funds as that grant ends on June 30, 2012. Additional purchasing of equipment for the Southwest ring has and will continue under the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) funds that were identified for this project. Adequate infrastructure (towers, etc.) continue to be problematic for this project.

UPDATE FOR JUNE 2012 – Testing did not occur as scheduled recently due to technical issues. Next scheduled date for the testing of the ring is June 5, 2012. Efforts have been underway to complete both the SHSGP grant environmental reviews so that the SHSGP grants may be used to fund the project when the PSIC grant expires on June 30, 2012. Testing is planned to occur at an Ogallala site.

UPDATE FOR APRIL 2012 - Construction of the Pilot Ring (Panhandle Region) began in September 2011 with completion, system testing and signoff now planned to take place in April, 2012. In the Southwest region, all path studies, tower mapping, structural analyses and grounding tests have been completed and equipment will be ordered after the Pilot Region is tested and accepted (after April, 2012) and all the environmental studies are completed for the State Homeland Security Grant. Completion and signoff of the Pilot Region is a prerequisite for starting construction in the rest of the regions. In the South Central and Southeast regions, all path studies, tower mapping, structural analyses and grounding tests are ongoing. Equipment is anticipated to be ordered for South Central by June 2012. In the remaining regions (East Central, Northeast and Tri-County) pre-construction efforts have begun.
Although construction of the Pilot Region continues, the project has been impacted negatively by the inability to secure adequate tower sites. Alternate locations are being sought, reluctant tower hosts are being re-contacted and tower remediation options are being studied. The end result is that we do not anticipate testing or acceptance of the Pilot system prior to April, 2012. Lessons learned on the Pilot Ring will serve the project well as the project moves east.

Significant Milestones (Met, Not Met, Scheduled)				Insert additional lines as necessary.		
Milestone	Met	Not Met	Sche-duled	Original Date	Actual Date	Impact (if late)
Pilot Region Network Sign-off	☒	☐	☐	March, 2011	June 2012	
Survey, Tower Mapping, Structural Engineering of towers in Southwest Region	☒	☐	☐	July, 2011	June 2012	
Survey, Tower Mapping, Structural Engineering of towers in South Central Region	☒	☐	☐	July, 2011	June 2012	
Survey, Tower Mapping, Structural Engineering of towers in East Central Region	☒	☐	☐	July, 2011	June 2012	
Pre-design meeting with Northeast Region	☒	☐	☐	May, 2011	May, 2011	
Survey, Tower Mapping, Structural Engineering of towers in Southeast Region	☐	☐	☒	August, 2011	June, 2013	
Survey, Tower Mapping, Structural Engineering of towers in Northeast Region	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	July, 2013	
Survey, Tower Mapping, Structural Engineering of towers in remainder of North Central Region	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	May 2013	
Southwest Region Pre-Deployment Meeting	☒	☐	☐	January, 2011	May, 2011	
Southwest Region Installation	☐	☐	☒	February, 2012	April 2013	This is nearing completion as far as identified and acceptable sites are concerned. There is a possibility that additional tower will be constructed to complete the S/W ring and connect to the S/C region.
Begin optimization of Southwest Region equipment and software.	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	September 2013	Deadlines will be moved back accordingly.
Southwest Region Network Sign-off	☐	☐	☒	March, 2012	October, 2013	

Task	☑/☐	☑/☐	☑/☐			
South Central Region Pre-Deployment Meeting	☒	☐	☐	January, 2012	February, 2012	
South Central Region Installation	☐	☐	☒	February, 2012	July, 2013	Deadlines will be moved back accordingly.
Begin optimization of South Central Region equipment and software.	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	November 2013	
South Central Region Network Sign-off	☐	☐	☒	March, 2012	December 2013	
Southeast Region Pre-Deployment Meeting	☒	☐	☐	January, 2012	March, 2012	
Southeast Region Installation	☐	☐	☒	February, 2011	June 2013	Deadlines will be moved back accordingly.
Begin optimization of Southeast Region equipment and software.	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	September 2013	
Southeast Region Network Sign-off	☐	☐	☒	March, 2011	December 2013	
East Central Region Pre-Deployment Meeting	☐	☐	☒	January, 2011	August, 2013	
East Central Region Installation	☐	☐	☒	February, 2011	June 2013	Deadlines will be moved back accordingly.
Begin optimization of East Central Region equipment and software.	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	October 2013	
East Central Region Network Sign-off	☐	☐	☒	March, 2011	November, 2013	
Northeast Region Installation	☐	☐	☒	February, 2011	December 2013	Deadlines will be moved back accordingly.
Begin optimization of Northeast Region equipment and software.	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	March 2014	
Northeast Region Network Sign-off	☐	☐	☒	March, 2011	April 2014	
Tri-County Region Pre-Deployment Meeting	☐	☐	☒	January, 2011	February 2014	
Tri-County Region Installation	☐	☐	☒	February, 2011	May 2014	Deadlines will be moved back accordingly.
Begin optimization of Tri-County Region equipment and software.	☐	☐	☒	October, 2011	July 2014	

Tri-County Region Network Sign-off	☐	☐	☒	March, 2011	August 2014	

Project Issues Insert additional lines as necessary.				
Description	**Impact on Project - (H,M,L)**	**Date Resolution is Needed**	**Issue Resolution Assigned to**	**Date Resolved**
Finding adequate towers/structurres to place the NRIN system on	H	Ongoing	Sue Krogman & NPSCC Representatives	Ongoing
MOUs and Lease Agreements	H	Ongoing	Sue Krogman & NPSCC Representatives	Ongoing

Impact: **H=High -** major impact on time, scope, cost. Issue must be resolved.   **M= Medium**- moderate impact to time, scope, cost. **L=Low**- Issue will not impact project delivery

Project Risks Insert additional lines as necessary.			
Major Risk Events	High Medium Low	Risk Mitigation	Mitigation Responsible Party
Finding adequate towers to locate the NRIN system on	H	Deal with facility owners to gain access to their towers, etc.	Sue Krogman & NPSCC & Local Representatives
MOUs and Lease Agreements	H	Deal with facility owners to gain access to their towers, etc.	Sue Krogman & NPSCC & Local Representatives

Decision Points Insert additional lines as necessary. Use this section to document any major decisions that impact target dates, scope, cost, or budget.			
Decision Point	Decision Due Date	Decision made by (name or names)	Decision's Impact on Project
Path Design & tower availability	Ongoing	Sue Krogman Tech team/CSI	Determines timeliness of buildout

Comparison of Budgeted to Actual Expenditures
Use a chart like the following to show actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate.

Fiscal Year [YYYY]

Budget Item	Actual Costs to Date	Estimate to Complete	Total Estimated Costs	Total Planned Budget
Salaries	$170,000.00		$170,000.00	$170,000.00
Contract Services (Includes Equipment for NRIN.)	$3,814,764.69	$5,664,910.56	$9,479,675.25	$9,479,675.25
Total Costs	$3,984,764.69	$5,494,910.56	$9,649,675.25	$9,649,675.25

Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc.

Additional Comments / Concerns Use this section to insert comments / concerns not included in any other section.

 The above "Actual Costs to Date" Column reflects amount spent up to approx. 3/6/2013. Source: Dan Hiller's spreadsheet.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – As of April, 2013

Project:	**LINK – Procurement**			Contact:	**Bo Botelho**	
Start Date	1/14/2013	Orig. Completion Date	10/31/2013	Revised Completion Date		
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	⚪	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Schedule	⚪	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Budget	⚪	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Scope	⚪	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪

Comments

April update:
No report for April.

February update:
Bo Botelho will replace Steve Sulek as the project manager on the Procurement portion of LINK. Initial kickoff was held 1/14/2013. Currently working on developing the project plan and business processes.

Project:	**Network Nebraska Education**			Contact:	**Tom Rolfes**	
Start Date	05/01/2006	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date		7/01/2013
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢

Comments

April update:
As of April 1, 2013, the Office of the CIO had received commitments from 5 public schools and 1 private college that they would be joining Network Nebraska on 7/1/2013. An additional 70 WAN circuits will need to be re-routed as their telecom providers have changed. Initial commodity Internet projections for 2013-14 show a 95% increase in Internet demand for K-12. Backbone bandwidth capacity will be maxed out due to the limitations on the current contract with NebraskaLink. E-rate funding for the 2012-13 backbone and statewide Internet was approved on April 1, 2013.

February update:
RFP4180Z1 was released on November 15 and bid opening was delayed until December 26 due to weather. This procurement affects approximately 50 WAN circuits, most of which are in south central Nebraska. A Best and Final Offer bid round was initiated to secure the best prices possible. At least one private college and one private school are considering Network Nebraska for summer 2013. Initial commodity Internet projections for 2013-14 show a 75% increase in Internet demand. Backbone bandwidth may be maxed out due to the limitations on the current contract with NebraskaLink. E-rate funding for the 2011-12 backbone was approved for ~$183,000.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
The Network Nebraska-Education Participation Fee fund account has received UNCSN's 2nd quarter project invoice. Software Maintenance of the iSupport Helpdesk system and UNCSN Travel has exceeded the Participation Fee budget for those line items. UNCSN's 3rd quarter project invoice should arrive in early May.

Project:	**Nebraska Statewide Radio System (formerly Public Safety Wireless)**		Contact:		**Mike Jeffres**	
Start Date	06/01/2009	Orig. Completion Date	09/30/2013	Revised Completion Date		
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Schedule	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Budget	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Scope	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪
Comments						

April update:
System checklist and final deliverables in process.

February update:
No report for February.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
System acceptance and project closeout in process.

Project:	**Fusion Center**		Contact:		**Kevin Knorr**	
Start Date	04/13/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/11/2011	Revised Completion Date		06/22/2012
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

April update:
The dual layer authentication is fixed and in final testing before we deploy our training.

We are still moving forward on this project. We continue to provide training and are in the process of full deployment. The vendor and all stakeholders have been working towards a solution to the NCJIS user authentication. No changes to report for this reporting period.

Project:	**Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) – Year 2012-13**		Contact:		**John Moon**	
	(formerly Statewide Online Assessment)					

Start Date	07/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2011	Revised Completion Date		06/30/2013
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Budget	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢

Comments

April update:
No report for April.

February update:
The State of the Schools Report (SOSR) with assessment results from NeSA tests was released on November 20, 2013. State and Federal accountability information based on the NeSA results were provided in the SOSR.

In December 2012, NDE received three proposals for the RFP released in October 24, 2013. A committee is reviewing the submissions and will recommend a vendor for the next contract beginning in July 1, 2013. The recommendation will be made to the board in March 2013.

In January 2013, the NeSA-Writing window opened. There have been several software issues during the writing assessment. NDE has addressed the issues with our vendor and received daily reports on problems experienced by the districts in assessing their students. No resolution has addressed all the software issues.

On February 4, 2013, NDE sent student information to our vendor. Later in February, DRC/CAL will provide online and paper/pencil test administrative training on procedures/guidance. The training will address many issues associated with statewide testing, such as alternate tests, accommodations, student management, test management, etc.

In March 2013, the testing window for NeSA – Reading, Math, and Science will begin March 25 and end on May 3. The management tools for online testing will open on March 4 with test session tickets being available at that time.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) is a statewide assessment system mandated by Nebraska Statute. Nebraska Department of Education has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) to continue the development of the assessment system including management, development, delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, reporting, and standard setting for the online and pencil/paper reading, science, and mathematics tests for July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. DRC will facilitate the delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, and reporting for the alternate pencil/paper reading, science, and mathematics tests during the same assessment window. Online writing assessment will be added to the NeSA system in 2012 for grades 8 and 11.

Student data will be transferred from the Nebraska Student Staff Record System (NSSRS) to DRC's student data assessment system. The online subcontractor Computerized Assessments & Learning (CAL) for the online components of the assessment system will upload the student data from DRC. Schools will install CAL's software on local computers and software updates will be automatically uploaded when students log onto the assessment system. The student responses are cached on the local computer and sent to CAL. Each district has used CAL's school capacity process to evaluate online requirements for NeSA testing. The student responses for secure online assessments will be collected by CAL and transferred to DRC for analysis and reporting. During spring 2012, NDE is estimating that over 150,000 students will participate in the Reading, Science, and Mathematics operational testing while about 40,000 students will complete the writing assessment online. Whereas the NeSA reading/science/math test window is from March 25 through May 3, 2013, the NeSA writing test window is January 21 through February 8, 2013. Test administrators will be able to monitor testing

during the test window and review test results immediately after test administration (raw scores only). DRC's comprehensive corrections system will permit NDE to correct student records for duplicates, incorrect school assignment, etc during the month of May for writing and June for the reading, math, and science. Complete reporting of student results to districts, schools, and parents from DRC will be completed in August 2013 and reported in the State of the Schools Report in October 2013.

Project:	**Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)**		Contact:		**Bob Wilhelm**	
Start Date	10/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/01/2013	Revised Completion Date		09/30/2013
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Schedule	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

NEMA is struggling with issues of governance and maintenance of the network. Governance would be needed at the local jurisdiction and not at the state agency (there is no state agency is heading the project, it's all run at the local jurisdiction). There is no formal governance heading the project.

April update:
The southwest regional installations are almost complete. Contractor working on identifying infrastructure to link southwest and south-central to north-central and eastern part of the state. Considering the possible need to build 3 or 4 towers in south-central and northeast regions. Awaiting information from the contractor and OCIO on details to determine need, height, strength etc. of the potential towers/sites in question.

February update:
The contractor is in the process of ordering equipment for the east-central, southwest (although much of the southwest regional equipment has been installed), and southeast regional sites where Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) Screening forms have been received. Additional structural analysis and surveys of potential sites in the northeast, east-central and southeast areas will be completed in the search for acceptable infrastructure.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
It's possible that upcoming target dates might be missed. Based on the uncertainty of the infrastructure needed for the project and the time involved in obtaining the environmental approvals to proceed with the project, any target dates are fluid. In addition there has been a delay in completing, testing and accepting the Pilot Ring primarily due to the difficulty in locating adequate tower sites and negotiating leasing agreements and/or MOU's.

Project:	MMIS			Contact:		
Start Date	N/A	Orig. Completion Date	N/A	Revised Completion Date		N/A
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Comments						

Project On Hold until renewed

Project:	Adjudication Re-engineering (Phase 1A)			Contact:	Randy Cecrle	
Start Date	09/01/2011	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date		09/30/2013
	April	February	December	October	August	June
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟡	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

April update:
The project is moving into the user testing phases.

---------Project Description

Adjudication Re-engineering is a multi-phase project that will span a number of years to incorporate e-filing, electronic docket files, public web access to docket status, e-documents creation and judges e-signing of decisions and orders, and other performance improvement changes.

Project 1a - Release of Liability E-Filing is focusing on the development of one pleading type to complete the full end-to-end set of e-filing functions and limited changes to Clerks Review to process the submitted e-documents in the same manner as performed today with paper.

Project 1b - Semi-automated Docket / RFJA Setup, Electronic Docket File, and possibly Centralized Scanning will follow up immediately after 1a is completed. A rough time frame for completion is first half of calendar year 2013.

Because of the tight integration of judicial data and functions with non-judicial data and functions, (such as Vocational Rehabilitation), WCC systems, including e-filing, are separate from the rest of the courts in the state.

Because of the court's limited jurisdiction, our e-filing system is being designed to provide web-based drafting of pleading documents by outside attorneys, which utilize internal WCC electronic docket information. PDFs are generated for printing and "wet signatures" and the submittal with the "/s/" signature format as is the current rule and practice by the other courts in the state.

Future projects will focus on adding the remainder of the pleading types to e-filing.

Other adjudication functions to be addressed following Project 2 include:
- Scheduling and Calendar management,
- Public access to case status and case documents,

- Judge's Decisions and Orders management,
- Automated notification to other sections of the court of court case changes,
- Electronic transmission of documents to the Court of Appeals,
- Electronic Exhibit management.

There has not been any identification of additional out-of-pocket costs following Project 2, other than the knowledge that electronic storage costs will grow as more e-documents are added to the Electronic Docket Files.

February update:
The completion date was changed from March 31, 2013 to September 30, 2013. Adjudication testing has been temporarily delayed because of Adjudication staff turnover and retraining of new staff affecting time resources of Adjudication management team. WCC management was involved in the revising of the project end date.

The project listed below is reporting voluntarily and is not considered as an Enterprise Project by the NITC.

Project:	**Law Enforcement Message Switch Replacement**		Contact:		**Suzy Fredrickson**	
Start Date	08/01/2011	Orig. Completion Date	05/15/2012	Project Completion Date		01/23/2013
	February	December	October	August	June	May
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟡	🟡	⚪	🟡	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢
Comments						

April update:
The project is now complete. Suzy Fredrickson will attend the May 14, 2013 Tech Panel meeting to give a final report on the project. No further status updates until then.

February update:
Cutover to the new switch occurred on January 23, 2013.

Project milestones:
1. Establishing a Project Schedule – Complete
2. Development of Design Specifications – Complete
3. Receipt of Software Licensing – Complete
4. Server Installs – Compete
5. Implementation of Interfaces – Datamaxx developing interfaces for DMV, VTR, PO - Complete
6. Regression Testing – Complete
7. User Testing – Complete
8. Training – Complete
9. Documentation – Complete
10. Production Cut Over – Complete

Additional Comments/Concerns:
Cutover to the new switch occurred on January 23, 2013. Vendor was onsite to address issues as they were identified. The Nebraska State Patrol continues to have daily conference calls with the vendor to review reported issues and discuss troubleshooting initiatives. Reported issues are being tracked in a spreadsheet. The daily priorities are identified and assignments made. NSP receives a list of items for testing to verify resolution of issues.

On-Going Issues:			
Application	Issue	Report Date	Comment
Student Information System	ADA Compliance	June, 2012	None.

Color Legend		
	Red	**Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** **Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement.** Probable that item will **NOT** meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope.
	Yellow	**Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** **Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning.** Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed.
	Green	**Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality.
	Gray	**No report for the reporting period or the project has not yet been activated.**

NITC 5-202

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

NITC 5-202

Title	Blocking Email Attachments
Category	Groupware Architecture
Applicability	Applies to all state government agencies, excluding higher education

1. Purpose

It is important to take steps to protect the state's computing environment against the threat of viruses. Email attachments with certain extensions are often used in virus attacks because of their execution access and the amount of damage they can cause. Therefore, the State of Nebraska prohibits certain attachments from being transmitted through email.

2. Standard

2.1 Removing Prohibited Attachments Before Delivery

The SMTP gateway will remove any prohibited attachments before allowing the email to be delivered. If any of the blocked extensions are detected, the attachment will be deleted and a message stating that the attachment was blocked will be included in the email message.

2.2 List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

Attachment A, entitled "List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked," contains the current listing of attachments which will be blocked by the State of Nebraska.

2.3 Alternative Methods for Sending or Receiving Files

If an individual needs to send or receive a file with one of the blocked extensions, other alternatives for transmitting files should be considered, such as: Secure file transfers (sFTP / FTPS) or Web-based document retrieval.

Attachment A: List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

----
HISTORY: Adopted on November 13, 2003. Amended on November 12, 2008.
PDF FORMAT: http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/5-202.pdf

List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

Extension - Description	Internal [1]	Inbound
ade – Access Project extension (Microsoft)	X	
adp – Access Project (Microsoft0	X	
app – Executable Application	X	
asp – Active Server Page	X	
bas – Basic	X	X
bat – Batch	X	X
cer – Internet Security Certificate File	X	
chm – Compiled HTML Help	X	
cmd – Command	X	X
com – Command, executable	X	X
cpl – Control panel applet	X	X
crt – Certificate File	X	
csh – C Shell Script	X	
exe – Executable program	X	X
fxp – FoxPro Compiled Source (Microsoft)	X	
gadget – Windows Vista gadget	X	
hlp – Windows Help File	X	
hta – HTML application	X	X
inf – set up	X	X
ins – Internet communications settings	X	X
isp – Internet communications settings	X	X
its – Internet Document Set, Internet Translation	X	
js – JScript	X	X
jse – JScript encoded file	X	X
ksh – UNIX Korn Shell Script	X	
lnk – Shortcut	X	X
mad – Access Module Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maf – Access (Microsoft)	X	
mag – Access Diagram Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mam – Access Macro Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maq – Access Query Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mar – Access Report Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mas – Access Stored Procedure (Microsoft)	X	
mat – Access Table Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mau – Executable Media file	X	
mav – Access View Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maw – Access Data Access Page (Microsoft)	X	
mda – Access Add-in, MDA Access 2 Workgroup (Microsoft)	X	
mdb – Access Application, MBD Access Database (Microsoft)	X	
mde – Access MDE Database File (Microsoft)	X	
mdt – Access Add-in Data (Microsoft)	X	
mdw – Access Workgroup Information (Microsoft)	X	
mdz – Access Wizard Template)Microsoft)	X	
msc – Microsoft common console document	X	X
msi – Install Control file	X	X
msp – Windows installer patch	X	X

mst – Windows installer transform	X	X
ops – Office Profile Settings File	X	
pcd – Visual test (Microsoft)	X	
pif – Windows program information file	X	X
prf – Windows System File	X	
prg – Program file	X	
pst – MS Exchange Access Book File (Microsoft)	X	
reg – Microsoft registry	X	X
scf – Windows Explorer Command	X	
scr – Screensaver	X	X
sct – Windows script component	X	X
sh – Bash Shell Script	X	
shb – Document short cut	X	X
shs – Shell Script object	X	X
test – Test files		X
tmp – Temporary File / Folder	X	
url – Internet shortcut	X	X
vb – VBScript	X	X
vbe – VBScript encoded file	X	X
vbs – Visual Basic	X	X
vsmacros – Visual Studio .NET Binary-based Macro Project	X	
vss – Visio Stencil (Microsoft)	X	
vst – Visio Template (Microsoft)	X	
vsw – Visio Workspace File (Microsoft)	X	
ws – Windows Script File (Microsoft)	X	
wsc – Windows Script component	X	X
Wsf – Windows Script File	X	
wsh – Windows Scripting host settings	X	X
wma – Windows Media Audio		X
wmf – Windows Media File		X

Note:
1 – Microsoft Outlook strips these attachments when sending to another Exchange user within the State of Nebraska.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Blocking Unsolicited Bulk E-Mail / "Spam"

Category	**Groupware**
Title	**Blocking Unsolicited Bulk E-Mail / "Spam"**
Number	

Applicability	☑ **State Government Agencies** ☐ All..**Not Applicable** ☑ Excluding <u>Higher Education</u> ....**Guideline** ☐ **State Funded Entities -** All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document.................**Not Applicable** ☐ **Other:** _____ ....**Not Applicable** **Definitions:** **Standard** - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval of _____. **Guideline** - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	☑ Adopted ☐ Draft ☐ Other:_____
Dates	Date: November 13, 2003 Date Adopted by NITC: November 13, 2003 Other:

1.0 Guideline
Agencies shall be allowed to evaluate and implement methods for blocking Unsolicited Bulk Email (UBE) or spam in relation to their changing e-mail needs, even if some legitimate e-mail is blocked. State Agencies that choose to adopt UBE blocking methods should meet these minimum standards.

1. Agencies should periodically review blocked e-mail statistics to determine its effectiveness and to help reduce the non-delivery of legitimate e-mail.

2. UBE blocking methods should attempt to send notification to legitimate originators of blocked e-mail with the following information:
   a. The e-mail was blocked.
   b. Possible reasons for non-delivery and information on how to restore legitimate communications.
   c. List of alternate methods of communication that maintains reasonable levels of convenience and places no undue hardship on the sending or receiving party.
   d. Links to related state statutes, standards, or guidelines used.

Cost sharing - Where feasible, agencies should work to pool resources to reduce costs to Nebraska. Agencies seeking to purchase UBE-blocking tools should consult with IMServices.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives
This standard addresses the burden on state resources due to UBE and how state agencies may address the issue. Agencies cannot expect to "solve" all problems that arise from UBE, only mitigate them.

UBE creates a significant drain of technical and operational resources. In 2003, the state will receive an estimated 2 million UBE messages for approximately 12,000 employees using e-mail. These numbers will likely continue to rise. UBE needs to be reduced to the extent possible without adding excessive costs or exceptional risks to normal flow of legitimate e-mail.

2.1 Overview
The terms spam and Unsolicited Bulk E-mail (UBE) both refer to the mass receipt of e-mail messages that are usually inappropriate for state operations.

Any automated means of sorting out UBE from e-mail messages sent by the public, vendors, or other state agencies will typically result in the rejection of some valid e-mail. Agencies should take special effort to ensure that the public can conveniently contact state agencies for official business. Blocking legitmate e-mail communication with the state should be minimized.

2.2 Other Resources
The Internet Mail Consortium (IMC) has published several reports on the problem. "Unsolicited Bulk Email: Mechanisms for Control" (http://www.imc.org/ube-sol.html) lists the technical and legal solutions being discussed and how they affect Internet mail users. "Unsolicited Bulk Email: Definitions and Problems"

(http://www.imc.org/ube-def.html) provides precise definitions of UBE and spam issues.

The Coalition Against Unsolicited Commercial Email (http://www.cauce.org/).

The State of Nebraska UBE resource web site (http://www.ims.state.ne.us/ube/).

3.0 Definitions

3.1 Spam
A common term for UBE is "spam", although that term encompasses a wider range of intrusive transmissions. For instance, the term "spam" originated in the realm of Usenet news, not email. There, individuals cannot request or refuse bulk email, although some newsgroups explicitly permit or encourage its inclusion as a part of the group charter. For further information, see RFC2635 at the Internet Engineering Task Force, http://www.ietf.org.

3.2 UBE
Unsolicited Bulk Email, or UBE, is Internet mail ("email") that is sent to a group of recipients who have not requested it. A mail recipient may have at one time asked a sender for bulk email, but then later asked that sender not to send any more email or otherwise not have indicated a desire for such additional mail; hence any bulk email sent after that request was received is also UBE.

4.0 Applicability
Agencies with their own mail servers can utilize the standard UBE filtering methods provided by the State Internet email gateway. To reduce duplication costs, agencies should consider utilizing the State Internet email gateway before implementing their own.

5.0 Responsibility
Information Management Services Division may investigate and implement UBE filtering methods on the State Internet e-mail gateway, which IMServices supports. Other agencies may elect to share this service.

6.0 Related Documents
Nebraska Information Technology Commission, Individual Use Policy:
http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/security/policies/individual_use_policy.pdf

State of Nebraska Acceptable Use Policy of State Data Communications Network,
http://www.doc.state.ne.us/policies/datausage.html