

AGENDA
TECHNICAL PANEL
Nebraska Public Media - Board Room
1800 North 33rd Street
Lincoln, Nebraska
Friday, October 21, 2022
2:00 p.m. CT

NOTE: Use the NPM East entrance door.

- I. ROLL CALL; MEETING NOTICE; OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION
- II. PUBLIC COMMENT
- III. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 9, 2022, MEETING MINUTES (*Attachment III*) ***
- IV. REGULAR BUSINESS
 - A. PROJECTS
 - 1. Enterprise project status dashboard report. Andy Weekly. (*Attachment IV-A-1*)
 - 2. Recommendations to the commission on project proposals submitted as part of the 2023-2025 biennial budget process. (*Attachment IV-A-2*) ***
 - B. TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES
 - 1. Proposal 27. Amend mobile device and portable storage device provisions of the Information Security Policy. [Motion to recommend approval.] (*Attachment IV-B-1*) ***
 - 2. Proposal 28. Amend access control and minimum configuration provisions of the Information Security Policy. [Motion to recommend approval.] (*Attachment IV-B-2*) ***
 - 3. Proposal 29. Amend GIS data standards. [Motion to recommend approval.] (*Attachment IV-B-3*) ***
- V. OTHER BUSINESS
- VI. ADJOURN

*** Action item.

The Technical Panel will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda but reserves the right to adjust the order and timing of items and may elect to take action on any of the items listed. If you need interpreter services or other reasonable accommodations, please contact the Technical Panel at 402-471-3560 at least five days prior to the meeting to coordinate arrangements.

Meeting notice was posted to the [NITC website](#) and the [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on August 24, 2022. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 19, 2022.

[Nebraska Open Meetings Act](#) | [Technical Panel Meeting Documents](#)

Attachment III

TECHNICAL PANEL
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
Tuesday, August 9, 2022, 9:00 a.m. CT
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirk Langer, Chair, Lincoln Public Schools
Bret Blackman, University of Nebraska, ITS
Ed Toner, Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska
Ling Ling Sun, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jeremy Sydik, University of Nebraska

STAFF PRESENT:

Rick Becker, NITC Administrative Manager and Legal Counsel
Andy Weekly, OCIO Project Management Office, IT Supervisor

ROLL CALL; MEETING NOTICE; OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Langer called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. A quorum was present. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on June 30, 2022. The meeting agenda was posted to the NITC website on August 5, 2022. The Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall of the meeting room, and a link to the act was included with the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF JUNE 14, 2022, MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Blackman moved to approve the June 14, 2022, minutes as presented. Mr. Toner seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Blackman-Yes, and Sun-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

REGULAR BUSINESS

PROJECTS

Enterprise project status dashboard report.

Mr. Weekly reviewed the dashboard report and entertained questions from the panel members.

Budget system project.

Lee Will and Gary Bush, Dept. of Administrative Services - State Budget Division, provided an overview of the project and answered questions from the panel members.

Mr. Toner moved to recommend designating the New Budget Management and Request System project as an enterprise project. Ms. Sun seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Blackman-Yes, and Sun-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Biennial budget review timeline; October meeting date.

Mr. Becker reviewed the timeline for IT project reviews for the biennial budget. The panel's next meeting will be on October 21 from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Proposal 27. Amend mobile device and portable storage device provisions of the Information Security Policy.

Mr. Toner introduced Proposal 27.

Mr. Blackman moved to post Proposal 27 for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Blackman-Yes, and Sun-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Proposal 28. Amend access control and minimum configuration provisions of the Information Security Policy.

Mr. Toner introduced Proposal 28.

Ms. Sun moved to post Proposal 28 for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Blackman seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Blackman-Yes, and Sun-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Proposal 29. Amend GIS data standards.

Mr. Becker introduced Proposal 29.

Ms. Sun moved to post Proposal 29 for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Toner seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Blackman-Yes, and Sun-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

ADJOURN

With no further business and without objection, the Chair adjourned the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.

Minutes were taken by Mr. Becker.

Attachment IV-A-1

Projects Status Dashboard

October 2022

Enterprise Projects - Current

Agency/Entity	Project	NITC Designated
Nebraska Council of Regions	Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network	03/15/2010
Office of the CIO	Centrex Replacement	07/12/2018
Department of Health and Human Services	iServe Nebraska	11/12/2020
Department of Transportation	Financial Systems Modernization Project	07/08/2021
Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems	OPS Retirement Plan Management Transfer	11/04/2021

Note: Status is self-reported by the agency

Project Storyboard: Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)

Project Manager	Krogman, Sue	Status Report Date	10/4/22	Project Dates			Status Report Indicators		
Project Type	Major Project	Status	Approved		Start	Finish	Overall		
Stage	Build	Progress	Started	Plan	10/1/10	8/31/23	Schedule		
Total Estimated Cost	\$12,500,000.00	Estimate to Complete	83.24%	Baseline	10/1/10	8/31/23	Scope		
Actual Cost To Date	\$10,405,204.00			Days Late	0	0	Cost and Effort		
Project Description				Key Accomplishments					
The Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN) is a project that will connect a majority of the Public Safety Access Points (PSAP) across the State by means of a point to point microwave system. The network will be a true, secure means of transferring data, video and voice. Speed and stability are major expectations; therefore there is a required redundant technology base of no less than 100 mbps with 99.999% availability for each site. It is hoped that the network will be used as the main transfer mechanism for currently in-place items, thus imposing a cost-saving to local government. All equipment purchased for this project is compatible with the networking equipment of the OCIO.				Fiber has been installed from Hartington to the Center Dispatch and on to O’Neill Dispatch					
Status Report Update				Upcoming Activities					
UPDATE FOR OCTOBER 2022 – Fiber has been installed from Hartington to the Center Dispatch and on to O’Neill Dispatch. This will be a considerable help to that area where microwave is just not feasible because of the lack of usable towers and the long distance between. The Amelia tower is almost complete and the installation from Burwell to Amelia to O’Neill can be finished.				The Amelia tower is almost complete and the installation from Burwell to Amelia to O’Neill can be finished.					
UPDATE FOR AUGUST 2022 – Continue to work on the fiber installation in the NE Region. Other work being done on constructing a new tower in the NC Region as well as installation of all of the towers between Antelope County and Holt County.									
Issues by Priority		Risks by Priority		Current Issues					
<div></div>		<div></div>		No matching records were found					

Project Storyboard: Centrex Conversion

Project Manager		Weekly, Andy	Status Report Date	1/5/22	Project Dates			Status Report Indicators		
Project Type			Status	Approved		Start	Finish	Overall		
Stage		Launch	Progress	Completed	Plan	10/10/17	01/04/22	Schedule		
Total Estimated Cost		\$2,800,000.00	Estimate to Complete	100%	Baseline	10/10/17	12/31/22	Scope		
Actual Cost To Date		\$933,481.12			Days Late	0	0	Cost and Effort		
Project Description					Key Accomplishments					
To secure the most cost efficient Hosted Voice Over Internet Protocol Telephony (VOIP) Services. This solution will replace the State’s Centrex service throughout the State of Nebraska. The purpose of the project is to provide phone service that includes the most up-to-date VOIP features and functionality as a hosted service with equipment ownership, maintenance and service remaining with the Contractor.					Between December 3 and January 4, here is the progress; Ported 113 numbers Ported and Reserved 459 numbers Ported 88 Soft Phones Disconnected 5 Windstream numbers Disconnected 1 CenturyLink/Lumens numbers					
Status Report Update					Upcoming Activities					
It was a busy month for Allo and the OCIO Voice Team. The numbers as of January 4... 10,546 lines have been removed from Windstream and CenturyLink (Lumens). 666 lines in the month of December! Ported 113 numbers Port and Reserve 459 numbers Ported 88 Soft Phones Disconnected 5 Windstream numbers Disconnected 1 CenturyLink/Lumens numbers 10,000 lines were in the RFP to be taken off of the Centrex contracts from Windstream and CenturyLink territory. We have surpassed those numbers on this project. In parallel with this project, over 1000 softphones have been deployed using the same resources assigned to this project.					I recommend closing the project for Enterprise Reporting and begin the clean-up efforts.					
Issues by Priority		Risks by Priority		Current Issues						
<div></div>		<div></div>		No matching records were found						

Project Storyboard: iServe Nebraska

Project Manager		Agarwal, Ankush		Status Report Date		9/21/22		Project Dates			Status Report Indicators				
Project Type		Major Project		Status		Approved		<div>Start</div> <div>Finish</div>			Overall <div></div> <div></div>				
Stage		Design		Progress		Started		Plan <div>4/6/20</div> <div>12/30/22</div>			Schedule <div></div> <div></div>				
Total Estimated Cost		\$33,524,476.00		Estimate to Complete		93.13%		Baseline <div>4/6/20</div> <div>4/30/22</div>			Scope <div></div> <div></div>				
Actual Cost To Date		\$31,220,094.00						Days Late <div>244</div> <div>244</div>			Cost and Effort <div></div> <div></div>				
Project Description								Key Accomplishments							
<p>The Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) has embarked on the iServe Nebraska Program to improve access, outcomes, cost, accountability and quality of DHHS services through an integrated, consumer-centric model of practice, across all programs. DHHS intends the iServe Nebraska Program to be adaptive and incrementally deliver new business capabilities, enabling the state to move from a siloed and program-based business model, to an integrated service delivery model that is family and person-centered, focused on improving the overall health and well-being of all family members.</p>								<p>Ongoing Production Support for Launch 1 (L1). Completed Minor Prod Release 1.5, including fix from 1.4. Finalized and Socialized Program and Solution Roadmaps. Ongoing development and refactoring continues for Launch 2. iServe Bridge project is ongoing, PI-0 is complete and PI-1 is in progress. Benefit Discovery re-work is near completion. IBEEM Planning has commenced. Continued coordination with CMS and FNS on IAPD-U approval.</p>							
Status Report Update								Upcoming Activities							
<p>Work continues for upcoming iServe minor and major releases. Multiple minor releases have been incrementally deployed since Launch 1 (April 2022). Incremental delivery to Prod will continue with upcoming minor releases.</p>								<p>Continue iServe Launch 1 Production Support, as needed. Complete Testing, Prod Deployment of Releases 1.6 and 1.7. Complete estimation of refactoring work to finalize Launch 2 date. Continue iServe Bridge Project PI-1 development work. Obtain approval and/or answer questions on I-APD(U) from CMS and FNS. Continue IBEEM Planning work activities.</p>							
Issues by Priority				Risks by Priority				Current Issues							
<div></div>				<div></div>				No matching records were found							

Project Storyboard: NDOT Financial System Modernization

Project Manager		Lusero, Cody	Status Report Date	10/12/22	Project Dates			Status Report Indicators		
Project Type		Major Project	Status	Approved		Start	Finish	Overall		
Stage		Design	Progress	Started	Plan	4/11/22	6/28/24	Schedule		
Total Estimated Cost		\$5,945,871.00	Estimate to Complete	0.64%	Baseline	4/11/22	6/28/24	Scope		
Actual Cost To Date		\$37,984.60			Days Late	0	0	Cost and Effort		

Project Description		Key Accomplishments			
275056 - NDOT Financial System Modernization		Task 1.1 - Governance Team Meetings - DAS is creating committees and held initial User Committee to plan future meeting formats. Task 1.4 - TFE Development - NDOT system is in Production and in use, shutting down use of Mainframe RFE system. - Modifications made to more easily integrate with E1 cost screens being developed by DAS/OCIO. Task 1.6 - Transfer GL Functionality - GL gaps re-opened and reviewed again with NDOT, DAS and OCIO resources to identify new options in an attempt to keep project schedule intact. - Team was able to work through issues and solution new General Ledger which eliminates custom development by DAS/OCIO team. - NDOT database tables in E1 are being replicated to NDOT database which was a key component to GL solution and continued NDOT reporting. Task 1.7 - Transfer JV Functionality - NDOT nightly cost distribution solutioning has begun identifying tasks and resources who will be involved. User stories being built. - DAS/OCIO has given multiple demos to NDOT, continue development work on JV header and description screens. - NDOT is testing screens completed including Batch Management.			

Status Report Update		Upcoming Activities			
E1 Governance teams are being identified and meetings have begun. NDOT work on financial edit system is complete in terms of what is required for E1 integrations including edit logic updates. DAS/OCIO is close to completing the integration call and response to this system which is integral to our solution. General Ledger solution has been chosen and will fit inside already defined phase 1 project schedule. Solution will include a combination of E1 out of box general ledger functionality with a reporting solution built by NDOT in their data warehouse. DAS/OCIO continues to build and refine Journal Voucher screens which are being shown to NDOT resources through demo meetings. NDOT resources will begin testing these screens and closing out user stories. Journal Voucher is the key item in terms of us staying on schedule.		Task 1.4 - TFE Development - Begin work on nightly distribution which will involved edit validations being run against all cost records. Task 1.6 - Transfer GL Functionality - NDOT complete reporting queries to summarize GL data. - NDOT complete creation of combined cost table view which pulls together both mainframe and E1 cost records. - Extract GL information from E1 system and load to NDOT Data Warehouse for comparison reporting. Task 1.7 - Transfer JV Functionality - Continue refinement on JV header, description and detailed processes in E1. - Begin work on NDOT nightly cost distribution edit validations, PFS and B&R cost distributions. - DAS/OCIO will establish meetings to continue user role discussions and demos of JV system. Task 1.8 - Phase 2 Work Plan - Identify key resources for Phase 2 Implementation. - Create Work Plan Draft for Phase 2.			

Project Storyboard: NDOT Financial System Modernization

Issues by Priority

Risks by Priority

1

Current Risks						More Risks...
Risk	Probability	Impact	Priority	Status	Target Resolution	Owner
Resource Allocation	!	✖	!	Open		Lusero, Cody

Project Storyboard: OPS Retirement Plan Management Transfer

Project Manager		Deshpande, Jaydeep	Status Report Date	10/5/22	Project Dates			Status Report Indicators		
Project Type		Major Project	Status	Approved		Start	Finish	Overall	<div></div>	<div></div>
Stage		Requirements	Progress	Started	Plan	10/1/21	8/31/24	Schedule	<div></div>	<div></div>
Total Estimated Cost		\$4,200,000.00	Estimate to Complete		Baseline	10/1/21	8/31/24	Scope	<div></div>	<div></div>
Actual Cost To Date					Days Late	0	0	Cost and Effort	<div></div>	<div></div>
Project Description					Key Accomplishments					
NPERS OPS (Omaha Public School) project - data and document migration from the OPS environment to NPRIS and OnBase.										
Status Report Update					Upcoming Activities					
<div>1. RFP Development update:<div>a. Response sent for 1st of questions from vendors on September 16th</div><div>b. Response sent for the 2nd set of questions from vendors on September 30th</div><div>i. Response included notifying vendors on restrictions on access to data for consultants, data obfuscation and data migration requirements.</div></div> <div>2. Procurement Timeline:<div>a. Proposal Opening is on October 19th</div><div>b. Proposal Evaluation completion by NPERS November 10th</div><div>c. Vendor interviews will be in the week of November 14th</div><div>d. Intent to Award will be done on november 28th</div><div>e. Final contract negotiations completed by December 22nd</div><div>f. Implementation project start on January 9th</div></div>										
Issues by Priority		Risks by Priority		Current Issues						
<div></div>		<div></div>		No matching records were found						

Attachment IV-A-2

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

**2023-2025 Biennial Budget
Information Technology Project Proposals
Summary Sheets**

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission
2023-2025 Biennial Budget - Information Technology Project Proposals**

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2024	FY2025	Total†
09-01	SECRETARY OF STATE	Business Services Filing System		\$ 2,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
46-01	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	Electronic Health Records	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,500,000
46-02	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	Radio System Upgrade	\$ 3,324,469	\$ 2,576,523	\$ 5,900,992
65-01*	DEPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES; STATE BUDGET DIVISION	New Budget Management and Request System	\$ 210,230	\$ 172,308	\$ 1,209,574

Notes:

† Total may include prior year or future planned costs in addition to biennial budget request amounts.

* Not submitted as an agency budget issue. Project will not require additional appropriations.

(Full text of each project proposal: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2023-2025.html)

TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. Does the project: (a) create efficiencies; and/or (b) reduce or eliminate risks?
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

NITC TIERS:

- Mandate. Required by law, regulation, or other authority.
- Tier 1. Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency or the state.
- Tier 2. Recommended. Project with high strategic importance for the agency or the state.
- Tier 3. Other. Project with strategic importance for the agency or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.
- Insufficient Information. Insufficient information to make a recommendation.

09 - Secretary of State

Proposal Name: Business Services Filing System

NITC ID: 09-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Chad Sump

Agency: 09 - Secretary of State

NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing custom software utilized by the Business Services Division of the Secretary of State's Office. Our existing software has been unreliable and the vendor for this software has not been able to remedy the issues or provide adequate maintenance and support for the software. We are seeking to replace the software to prevent future outages and to enhance and increase the reliability and functionality of the system.

The business services software is used to file and generate large number of essential documents within the Secretary of State's Office. These documents include all Nebraska business filings and filings made pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), revised article 9. The software is also utilized to file federal and state tax liens, farm product security filings, trade names and trademarks, and a variety of other statutory filings. The software interacts with an image library and online filing services.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00

Comments: \$500,000 of Contractual Services requested in future years.

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00

Comments: \$500,000 of Cash Funds requested in future years.

PROPOSAL SCORE

		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	15	12	14
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	23	24
	Technical Impact (20)	20	20	19	20
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	10	8	9
	Risk Assessment (10)	8	9	9	9
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	20	10	17
	Total Score	98	99	81	93

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Modern interface with built in efficiencies for users and support staff

09 - Secretary of State

Proposal Name: Business Services Filing System

NITC ID: 09-01



Weaknessess:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Remove reliance on unreliable vendor that has not maintained updated code or made enhancements.

Enhanced reliability

Utilized by other states

Weaknessess:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Easy migration path and easily supported by OCIO and Sec of State

Weaknessess:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Well done plan with realistic timelines and expectations.

Weaknessess:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths:

Weaknessess: Possible dependency on existing vendor to transition existing data.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Business case is strong and realistic

Weaknessess:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Very clear and concise goals, objectives, and projected outcomes.

Weaknessess: None

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Good, clear justification. Ongoing un-resolved issues with the current system and recurring system failures a valid justifications for moving in a different direction for certain.

Weaknessess: None

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Clear and concise. Use of a proven solution, that is utilized in other states as well, is a good direction.

Cloud based solution makes solid technical sense.

Weaknessess: None

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Although aggressive, it's well thought out and clearly planned.

Weaknessess: None

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths: Good

Weaknessess: Taking a cloud solution approach invites some additional risk over traditional implementations.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Clear and concise.

Weaknessess:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The objective to replace the existing system is clear and the selection criteria aligns with expected outcomes. The project is included in the agency's comprehensive IT plan and leverages some existing resources.

Weaknessess: The measurement criteria of system testing and monitoring deliverables is vague and doesn't account for reconciling desired outcomes with actual user experience.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths: The business case includes clear examples of existing system deficiencies. In addition to the hardship and inconvenience system outages create for State employees and online users, the potential economic impact is considerable. A "love it or list it" analysis was performed and adequate time has been committed to migrate to a new system.

09 - Secretary of State

Proposal Name: Business Services Filing System

NITC ID: 09-01



Weaknesses: There is limited information about any gap analysis beyond a comparison of the existing system shortcomings and clear benefits of the new proposed system. This work may well have been done, however, there is no specific mention to verify what is an important consideration in any system replacement process.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 19/20

Strengths: The proposed system will provide the benefit of moving to a modern, supportable infrastructure, allow for role-based access, extricate the State from unsupported software, and provide an enhanced environment for online users without the need for a separate portal. The proposed environment is specifically designed and optimized for the desired use.

Weaknesses: No assurance that the updated UI meets accessibility standards. While this is presumably addressed as part of the procurement process, it is an important enough consideration to be included in a summary of the technology impact.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: An ostensibly experienced project team that includes IT and subject matter experts. Clear set of project milestones, and plans for staff training, knowledge transfer and ongoing system support.

Weaknesses: There is no mention of data migration and verification plans. It seems unlikely that there will be no ingestion of existing data and such plans would ordinarily be documented in any preliminary implementation plan.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths: Project risks have been considered and standard risk mitigation strategies are documented.

Weaknesses: Data migration risk is mentioned but specific related mitigation steps are not.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: Apparent total project cost is listed.

Weaknesses: There is insufficient information to render any analysis. This is not to say that the authors haven't carefully considered the budget but this reviewer can't make any analysis with what little is provided.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

See attachment (09-01 agency response.pdf) for agency response.

Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

Weaknesses Identified:

The measurement criteria of system testing and monitoring deliverables is vague and doesn't account for reconciling desired outcomes with actual user experience.

Response:

We recognize that significant system testing will be necessary to determine that all functional requirements of the system have been met. We anticipate that this will be an iterative process which will be ongoing during the implementation of the system. We also anticipate that the vendor will perform load and stress tests to determine that the system is reliable and performing efficiently. Because we know of other states that use this system, have spoken to those states, and have received favorable information regarding the system and vendor, we are confident that the system has a favorable user experience. We have also seen several demonstrations of the system, so we have seen the user experience firsthand. With respect to monitoring deliverables, we will have a detailed schedule with deliverables and payment milestones based upon acceptance of specified deliverables. Payment will not be made until the specified deliverable has been met.

Project Justification/ Business Case

Weaknesses Identified:

There is limited information about any gap analysis beyond a comparison of the existing system shortcomings and clear benefits of the new proposed system. This work may well have been done, however, there is no specific mention to verify what is an important consideration in any system replacement process.

Response:

We have a general sense of some of the areas where further gap analysis will be needed. We have discussed internally possible policy changes/legislation that may be necessary to further assist our office in processing filings and assist with system implementation. We are unable to complete this work until we have the vendor committed to the project and we begin in-depth gap analysis with the vendor. We feel it would be best to do this work in conjunction with the vendor so that we have the level of specificity and detail needed to make decisions regarding gaps that are discovered and determine the best path forward for any gaps identified.

Technical Impact:

Weakness Identified:

No assurance that the updated UI meets accessibility standards. While this is presumably addressed as part of the procurement process, it is an important enough consideration to be included in a summary of the technology impact.

Response:

We anticipate purchasing this system through a state contract which includes as part of the terms and conditions compliance with NITC standards including the accessibility policy to ensure accessibility and usability by individuals with disabilities.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Weakness Identified:

There is no mention of data migration and verification plans. It seems unlikely that there will be no ingestion of existing data and such plans would ordinarily be documented in any preliminary implementation plan.

Response:

Yes, data conversion will be a significant aspect of this project and is listed as a major milestone/deliverable in section 10 of the project proposal.

Risk Assessment

Weakness Identified:

Data migration risk is mentioned but specific related mitigation steps are not.

Response:

We will be continually auditing data migration as it occurs through the project. We will work with the vendor to develop a data conversion plan and mapping fields to the new system. The data will be available in the vendor's test application then staff will verify data, filings, and documents before moving into production.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Weakness Identified:

There is insufficient information to render any analysis. This is not to say that the authors haven't carefully considered the budget but this reviewer can't make any analysis with what little is provided.

Response:

The total amount requested, approximately \$3 million (over two bienniums), is based upon an estimate from the vendor we are considering for this project. As a predominately cash funded agency, our budget request reflects cash funds we believe will be available to use for this project over the next two bienniums. We believe our budget request is reasonable and justified based upon the estimate we have received.

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Chad Cole

Agency: 46 - Department of Correctional Services

NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority:

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

A fully integrated Electronic Health Records (EHR) system is a strategic priority of the Nebraska Department of Corrections (NDCS) in order to provide the highest quality health care to the inmates in our custody in an efficient manner at a reasonable cost to the Nebraska taxpayer. It will provide a secure and complete Health Services Case File, which allows for improved tracking and continuity of care in the areas of Medical Services, Behavioral Health Services, Substance Use and Sex Offender Services and Programming, and Social Work Services from intake through reentry back into the community.

Implementation of the EHR system began in 2019. However, shortly thereafter progress on the project was affected by COVID. Efforts are now well underway. To date, the main components completed are the Behavioral Health Intake Appraisal and the Update Appraisal, with the implementation of the Medical Intake Appraisal to occur soon. The behavioral Health Intake Appraisal and the Update Appraisal create the foundation upon which further E-HR components will be built. The Diagnosis Codes have also been completed. These efforts include 17 Behavioral Health screens, as well as Diagnosis and Document screens, which are shared by both Behavioral Health and Medical. Nine medical modules are either already in production or staged to go live in the next 60 days. Additionally, there are two Discharge Review screens included as part of the E-HR project already in production and two ADA related screens soon to be moved into production, and diagnosis codes have been updated to match current community standards.

The Nebraska Department of Corrections, working with OCIO staff, is building a tailored and efficient EHR in-house that will expand on functionality currently in the existing Nebraska Inmate Case Management System (NICaMS) to include Health Services appointment/resource scheduling and electronic charting for key clinical data and medical history. The system will be utilized by NDCS staff, telemedicine staff, and external providers who have contracted services with the department. Security protocols will be put in place to ensure confidentiality to an inmate's private health data.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00

Comments:

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	12	10	13	12
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	16	12	23	17
	Technical Impact (20)	13	10	20	14
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	5	5	8	6
	Risk Assessment (10)	6	5	9	7
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	13	10	20	14
	Total Score	65	52	93	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The project has merit and will achieve many of the objectives outlined for improvement.

Weaknesses: I want to see clinical assessments happen quicker than 30 days of intake. For many people with severe medical conditions, a lot can happen in 30 days.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 16/25

Strengths: The project will reduce paper documentation and medical error.

Weaknesses: Developing the product in-house will significantly increase the project timeline and risk, as in-house developers get tasked with other duties and responsibilities. How will the code be scanned for deficiencies and security flaws?

Technical Impact

Review Score = 13/20

Strengths: I have no doubt that NDCS has collected massive amounts of data and would want to continue to leverage that data.

Weaknesses: A modular and incremental approach to building the application will stretch the project timeline and increase risk.

Major hospitals are able to replace EHRs with COTS solutions with little to no patient care interruption. I don't see why NDCS can't. Any more COTS solutions are customizable to the environment they are being deployed in. By using an incremental approach and developing code in-house, what NDCS will save on COTS, they will pay for in time to complete the project. By developing a custom in-house solution, NDCS is also creating issues with long-term code supportability and future incompatibility, along with losing interoperability with local area hospitals for sharing and transferring of patient information as patients move in and out of local hospitals for care.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: I like the model NDCS uses in working with the OCIO staff.

Weaknesses: No funds or time is allocated for staff and end-user training on new software. This will significantly increase the risk of medical error due to untrained staff on new software being deployed.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 6/10

Strengths: Some risks were identified, however not complete.

Weaknesses: The downtime was a reason for not using a COTS solution, but what are the expected downtimes of in-house development? Not allocating any funds or time to staff training on new applications or modules deployed is a risk that should have been identified.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 13/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: This is going to take longer and cost more than NDCS thinks it will.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 10/15

Strengths: The goals of the project are clear within the context of the agency's service mission.

Weaknesses: The goals of the project within an IT context are vague. There are no project measurement and assessment methods defined.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 12/25

Strengths: The advantages of electronic record keeping are enumerated.

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



Weaknessess: It is unclear whether there is an existing system or if this is a migration from exclusively paper-based documentation. Regardless, in-house development of an EHR system is a considerable undertaking given the highly consequential nature of the data. Further, the information security considerations are paramount given the highly private nature of the data. The sole basis for the decision to build in-house is cost which leaves the reviewer to consider whether the true costs of in-house development have been adequately measured.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: Some consideration of the integration of the desired system with existing data sources is apparent.

Weaknessess: The technical elements of the existing environment and integration with a new system is not clear beyond the earnest desire to provide better service. The technical issues section is not completed. While the technical elements section does include some mention of issues, it does not enumerate technical issues with any degree of specificity.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: Closely working with the OCIO is a project strength.

Weaknessess: Key members of the project team are listed as TBD include subject matter experts. Only one section is completed.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: Some general project risks are enumerated.

Weaknessess: There are no risk mitigation strategies defined.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: The costs listed are distributed within the categories in credible overall proportions.

Weaknessess: The cost estimates are "high level" and it is not possible for the reviewer to make any meaningful assessment of the proposed budget. At the risk of putting too fine a point on this, the provided budget bears a striking resemblance to a tabular representation of "napkin math."

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 13/15

Strengths: Strong goal and sensible goals. Progress seems well in hand considering externalities over the prior biennium.

Weaknessess: Would prefer a richer description of measuring goal achievement as well as relationship to broader IT plan.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths: Reduction in paperwork requirements and improvement to patient outcomes through improved accuracy / clarity is clear and relative savings compare to commercial systems would seem to make sense.

Weaknessess: No discussion of relevant state or federal mandates.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: In house development permits leveraging of existing investments. Incremental approach seems to promise reduced downtime and improved integration

Weaknessess: None Noted.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Agile approach is a smart choice for development with strong needs for SME feedback and assessment.

Weaknessess: The agile iteration time feels surprisingly long, over twice as long as I would usually expect, but this may be necessary for an agile approach to fit well into the overall culture of this environment?

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths: Realistic risk assessment and understanding of potential confounds.

Weaknessess: Would like to see more detail on identified risks/potential responses to external interface issues.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknessess:

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

NITC COMMENTS

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Radio System Upgrade

NITC ID: 46-02



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Chad Cole

Agency: 46 - Department of Correctional Services

NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority:

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services has a need to update end-of-life radio equipment consisting of end-user radios, tower radios, and control radio consoles. This upgrade is vital to maintaining communications to keep inmates and staff safe while providing the ability to integrate with state/local first responders. Upgrading the radios and system infrastructure will allow standardized management and support that will provide long term upgradeability over the life of the equipment. This allows the department to align the radio communications strategy with the state radio system bringing the department up to the state standards of public safety radio communications.

The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services along with OCIO Public Safety Communications have worked together to integrate the new radio system with the state radio system giving centralized access for radios to work across the state at the respective facilities that can provide public safety radio access. The radio solution will be utilized by custody staff and maintenance staff who work within the facilities and are responsible for inmate transport outside of the facilities.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures			
	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00

Comments:

Funding			
	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	9	13	12
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	23	24
	Technical Impact (20)	20	15	18	18
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	8	5	9	7
	Risk Assessment (10)	8	10	10	9
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	18	18	18	18
	Total Score	94	82	91	89

REVIEWER COMMENTS

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Radio System Upgrade

NITC ID: 46-02



Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Aligning with, and connecting to, the Statewide Radio System using Project 25 digital standards provides clear and encrypted internal communications, and interoperability with first responders.

Communications are available across the state utilizing the Statewide Radio System. This is required when transporting inmates.

Leveraging the current system buildout reduces overall costs compared to building a completely new system. Additional capabilities of recording talkgroups using current State equipment ensures compliance with records retention laws.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Considering the age of the current system, a complete replacement of the equipment is necessary.

Adding encryption capable radios increases officer safety and security.

Utilizing the system logging recorder allows centralized management and distribution of information across facilities using the Statewide Radio System

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: The proposal leverages currently built-out and available repeaters and technology. It adds encryption and availability of multiple talk paths for increased security. The Statewide Radio System was built with sufficient capacity to provide the infrastructure necessary without detrimental impact to current users. The proposal includes state of the art standards based equipment.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Timelines are reasonable and achievable. Implementation of similar projects has been successful.

Weaknesses: Site preparation and remediation can be expensive and increase installation time. Equipment lead times could delay final implementation.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Current radio system is not supported by manufacturer.

Proposed system uses frequencies dedicated to Public Safety reducing the amount of interference. The higher frequency was chosen because of the increased ability to penetrate buildings.

Training has been included as a part of the implementation.

Cutover to the new system will utilize parallel operations between new and old increasing officer safety during that period and allowing a fall back position.

Weaknesses: Training should include a second session a few months after implementation.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Pricing is based on current State Contract #14534 OC with Motorola

Weaknesses: Increases to prices due to inflation may cause budget constraints.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 9/15

Strengths: Goals are clear. Projected benefits are clear.

Weaknesses: Incomplete responses.

Measurement and assessment methods that will verify the project outcomes would be helpful.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: Benefits of the standardization is clearly stated.

Weaknesses: Incomplete responses.

Narratives of technical elements of the project and their impact would be helpful.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Incomplete responses for training and staff development, ongoing support.

Include number of facilities that will be involved and timeframe for project completion aligning requested budget for each FY would be helpful.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Radio System Upgrade

NITC ID: 46-02



Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Unclear provided pricing (\$5,700,219), its relationship with the total funding request FY24 (\$3,324,469) and FY(2,576,523). An explanation would be helpful.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 13/15

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Aligns with statewide radio system

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Importance of a modern system that has parts/replacements available is important compared to current legacy solution.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: New Budget Management and Request System

NITC ID: 65-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Lee Will

Agency: 65 - Administrative Services

NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The State of Nebraska has used the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS) for the past 15 years. The State Budget Division seeks to take advantage of improvements in software and methodologies in budget management and request submission process of agencies, boards, and commissions of the state.

After reviewing seven different products, we have chosen Anaplan as the best product for a new budget management and request system. Additionally, the division has chosen Allitix as the company to implement the needed configuration of Anaplan.

The Division believes this new system will allow for the management of the state's budget from beginning to end.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$202,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$374,538.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$210,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$382,538.00

Comments: \$654,650 from FY22 Appr/Reappr

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$210,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$382,538.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$210,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$382,538.00

Comments: \$654,650 from FY22 Appr/Reappr

PROPOSAL SCORE

		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	15	15	15
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	25	25
	Technical Impact (20)	20	20	20	20
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	10	10	10
	Risk Assessment (10)	10	10	10	10
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	18	20	20	19
	Total Score	98	100	100	99

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Modern system eliminates manual work and reduces errors

Enhanced customer experience

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: New Budget Management and Request System

NITC ID: 65-01



Weaknessess:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Eliminates manual process that is subject to human error.

Weaknessess:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Minimal technical impact and risk.

Eliminates legacy systems

Weaknessess:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Realistic timelines and steps

Weaknessess:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Low risk. Current system will remain in place until new system has been fully tested.

Weaknessess:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths:

Weaknessess: Actual costs to be determined

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed and comprehensible.

Weaknessess:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed with convincing Justifications.

Weaknessess:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed including features come with the cloud based solution.

Weaknessess:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed. A well thought out preliminary implementation plan.

Weaknessess:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed.

Weaknessess:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: The proposal indicated no additional appropriation would be required.

Weaknessess:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths:

Weaknessess:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths:

Weaknessess:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknessess:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths:

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: New Budget Management and Request System

NITC ID: 65-01



Weaknessess:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths:

Weaknessess:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknessess:

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

Attachment IV-B-1

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Technical Standards and Guidelines

Proposal 27

A PROPOSAL relating to mobile device and portable storage device provisions of the Information Security Policy; to add definitions; to amend sections 8-205 and 8-506; and to repeal the original sections.

Section 1. Section 1-101 is amended by adding the following new subsections, and renumbering the existing subsections accordingly:

“Mobile device” means a portable computing device that has a small form factor such that it can easily be carried by a single individual; is designed to operate without a physical connection (e.g., wirelessly transmit or receive information); possesses local, non-removable data storage; and is powered on for extended periods of time with a self-contained power source. Mobile devices may also include voice communication capabilities, on-board sensors that allow the device to capture (e.g., photograph, video, record, or determine location) information, and/or built-in features for synchronizing local data with remote locations. Examples include smart phones, tablets, and e-readers. [Source: NIST SP 800-53, REV. 5]

“Portable storage device” means a system component that can communicate with and be added to or removed from a system or network and that is limited to data storage—including text, video, audio or image data—as its primary function (e.g., optical discs, external or removable hard drives, external or removable solid-state disk drives, magnetic or optical tapes, flash memory devices, flash memory cards, and other external or removable disks). [Source: NIST SP 800-53, REV. 5]

Sec. 2. Section 8-205 is amended to read:

1 **8-205. Portable ~~IT~~storage devices.**

2 (1) ~~CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED~~ data must not be stored on portable ~~IT~~
3 storage devices unless it has been encrypted using OCIO-approved technology ~~approved by~~
4 ~~the state information security officer or the agency information security officer.~~

5 (2) Portable storage devices must not be left in a vehicle unattended.

6 Sec. 3. Section 8-506 is amended to read:

7 **8-506. Minimum mobile device configuration.**

8 All mobile ~~computing~~ devices accessing the state network or containing state
9 information must be provisioned to meet these security policies and be approved by the Office
10 of the CIO. All devices that will be connected to the state network must be logged with device
11 type and approval date. The following are minimum mobile device configuration standards:

12 (1) Mobile ~~computing~~ devices must be shut down or locked when not in use. These
13 devices must not be left unattended in a public access area. They must be locked in a secure
14 cabinet or room, or kept on the person. Devices should not be shared;

15 (2) Mobile ~~computing devices and mobile storage devices~~ must not be left in a vehicle
16 unattended;

17 (3) Storing CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED information on any mobile device ~~or any~~
18 ~~removable or portable media (e.g., CDs, thumb drives, DVDs)~~ is prohibited unless
19 arrangements and mechanisms for securing the data has been explicitly approved by the state
20 information security officer. In those cases, ~~all mobile computing devices or portable media~~
21 ~~shall~~ the device must be encrypted using OCIO-approved technology ~~that is approved by the~~
22 ~~state information security officer;~~

23 (4) Personally owned mobile devices (e.g., smartphones and tablets) may be used for
24 approved state purposes, including email, when configured to access the state information
25 through a managed interface or sandbox only. Devices that are not configured to use the
26 authorized interface are prohibited from accessing any state information, including email;

1 (5) The device must have security settings that block users from changing mandatory
2 settings;

3 (6) Strong passwords are required, and passwords must change regularly per state policy
4 regarding passwords;

5 (7) The device must lock after no more than 5 minutes of inactivity and must require the
6 re-entry of a password or PIN code to unlock;

7 (8) After 10 unsuccessful password attempts, the device or the state container will be
8 erased. In the event that the device becomes lost or stolen, the Office of the CIO must have the
9 capability to remotely locate, lock, and erase the device;

10 (9) The device should have all data backed up at the state data center;

11 (10) Devices need to be cleared of all information from the prior user before being issued to
12 a new user;

13 (11) The device OS must be up to date and patched. New versions of the OS must be
14 vetted for security posture and supportability;

15 (12) Devices must be properly disposed of using mechanisms approved by the state
16 information security officer. State data must be cleared and devices properly disposed of or
17 recycled. The disposition process is required to be documented and periodically audited; and

18 (13) New devices are required to be configured and operate within established security
19 guidelines and help desk support must be established before these devices can be operational.
20 New devices need to be validated before being made available for users to request.

21 Sec. 4. Original sections 1-101, 8-205 and 8-506 are repealed.

22 Sec. 5. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.

Attachment IV-B-2

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Technical Standards and Guidelines

Proposal 28

A PROPOSAL relating to access control and minimum configuration provisions of the Information Security Policy; to amend sections 8-303, 8-304, and 8-504; to repeal the original sections; and to outright repeal section 8-505.

Section 1. Section 8-303 is amended to read:

8-303. Identification and authorization.

(1) All employees and other persons performing work on behalf of the state, authorized to access any state information or IT resources, that have the potential to process, store, or access non-public information, must be assigned a unique identifier~~State of Nebraska user ID~~ which resides in ~~the~~a State of Nebraska identity management system~~Active Directory domain~~ with the minimum necessary access required to perform their duties to align with the least privilege methodology.

(2) Staff are required to secure their user IDs from unauthorized use.

(3) Sharing user IDs is prohibited.

(4) To reduce the risk of accidental or deliberate system misuse, separation of duties must be implemented where practical. Whenever separation of duties is impractical, other compensatory controls such as monitoring of activities, increased auditing and management supervision must be implemented. At a minimum, the audit of security must remain independent and segregated from the security function.

Sec. 2. Section 8-304 is amended to read:

8-304. Privileged access accounts.

Privileged access accounts include administrator accounts, embedded accounts used by one system to connect to another, and accounts used to run service programs. These accounts are used by systems and personnel to access sensitive files, execute software, load and configure policies and configuration settings, and set up or maintain accounts.

Due to the elevated access levels these accounts typically have, the following standards and procedures must be followed to minimize the risk of incidents caused by these accounts:

(1) All privileged access accounts must be assigned to an individual with an approved business need for the privileged access. These accounts must not be shared;

(4)(2) All privileged access accounts must use OCIO-approved multifactor authentication where technically possible.

(2)(3) Service accounts must not be used to interactively log in to a system or resource;

(3)(4) Default administrator accounts must be renamed, removed or disabled. Default passwords for renamed or disabled default administrator accounts must be changed;

(4)(5) Default system account credentials for hardware and software must be either disabled, or the password must be changed. Use of anonymous accounts is prohibited, and unassigned accounts must be assigned to an individual prior to use. When no longer needed, the account must be disabled. At all times, the state requires individual accountability for use of privileged access accounts;

(5)(6) Privileged access accounts must have enhanced activity logging enabled and reviewed at least quarterly;

(6)(7) Privileged access through remote channels will be allowed for authorized purposes only and must include multi-factor authentication;

(7)(8) Passwords for these accounts must be changed every 60 days;

(8)(9) The password change process must support recovery of managed systems from backup media. Historical passwords should remain accessible in a history table in the event that they are needed to activate a backup copy of a system; and

(10) Privileged access accounts must be approved, provisioned, and maintained by the Office of the CIO.

Exceptions to this policy may be granted by the state information security officer.

Sec. 3. Section 8-504 is amended to read:

8-504. Minimum workstation configuration.

Improperly configured workstations are at risk to be compromised. Without proper adherence to these workstation security standards, the state is at increased risk to have data lost, stolen, or destroyed. This standard is necessary to protect the state from unauthorized data or activity residing or occurring on state equipment. It is also necessary to reduce the likelihood of malicious activity propagating throughout the state networks or launching other attacks. All managed workstations that connect to the state's network are required to meet these standards. The Office of the CIO is responsible for maintaining these standards and for configuring and managing the hardware, software, and imaging processes for all managed workstations. Workstation standards should be securely maintained and stored in a centralized documentation library. The degree of protection of the workstation should be commensurate with the data classification of the resources stored, accessed, or processed from this computer. The following are minimum workstation configuration standards:

(1) OCIO-approved endpoint security (anti-virus) software, ~~approved by the Office of the CIO,~~ must be installed and enabled;

(2) The host-based firewall must be enabled ~~if the workstation is removed from the state network;~~

(3) The operating system must be configured to receive automated updates;

(4) The system must be configured to enforce password complexity standards on accounts;

(5) Application software should only be installed if there is an expectation that it will be used for state business purposes. Application software not in use should be uninstalled;

(6) All application software must have security updates applied as defined by patch management standards and be of a vendor supported version;

(7) Web browsers settings should be selected or disabled as appropriate to increase security and limit vulnerability to intrusion;

(7)(8) CIS Level 1 Controls should be maintained on all state managed workstations, where technically feasible;

(8)(9) Shared login accounts are prohibited unless approved in advance and configured by IT. Shared login accounts are only acceptable if approved through the policy exception process and alternate mechanisms or access layers exist to ensure the ability to individually identify personnel accessing non-public information;

(9)(10) Shared login accounts are forbidden on multi-user systems where the manipulation and storage of CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED information takes place;

(10)(11) Users need to lock their desktops when not in use. The system must automatically lock a workstation after 5 minutes of inactivity;

(11)(12) Users are required to store all CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED information on IT managed servers, and not the local hard drive of the computer. Local storage may only be used for temporary purposes when the data stored is not sensitive, and where loss of the information will not have any detrimental impact on the state;

(12)(13) All workstations must ~~shall~~ be re-imaged with standard load images prior to re-assignment; and

(14) Equipment scheduled for disposal or recycling must be cleansed following agency media disposal guidelines.

Sec. 4. Original sections 8-303, 8-304 and 8-504 are repealed.

Sec. 5. The following section is outright repealed: Section 8-505.

Sec. 6. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.

Attachment IV-B-3

**State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Technical Standards and Guidelines**

Proposal 29

A PROPOSAL relating to the GIS data; to amend sections 3-203, 3-205, and 3-206; and to repeal the original sections.

Section 1. Section 3-203 is replaced in its entirety with the following:

3-203. Lidar standard.

The commission adopts by reference the current version of the Lidar Base Specification (LBS) standards released by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) [<https://www.usgs.gov/ngp-standards-and-specifications/lidar-base-specification-online>] for elevation acquisition using lidar.

Sec. 2. Section 3-205 is amended to read:

3-205. Street centerlines.

(1) The commission adopts by reference the current version of sections 2, 3, and 3.1 of the NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model released by the National Emergency Number Association [<https://www.nena.org/page/ng911gisdatamodel>] ~~(National Emergency Number Association, NENA STA-006.1-2018, June 16, 2018,~~
~~<https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/nena-sta-006-ng9-1-1-gis-dat.pdf>~~) for GIS data that consists of street centerlines.

(2) The following are optional additional attributes for street centerlines:

From Road Level	FromLevel	O	P	1
To Road Level	ToLevel	O	P	1

FromLevel: Specifies the 'elevation' of a segment FROM node (start point). This

field does not require actual elevation in terms of real-world measurements. The value is only used to determine whether a turn is allowed from one street to a street that intersects it in a 2-dimensional space, similar to floors in a building. Nodes at the lowest level would be assigned 0, with overlapping nodes representing additional level(s)/overpass(es) will be assigned the next sequential integer value accordingly.

ToLevel: Specifies the 'elevation' of a segment TO node (end point). This field does not require actual elevation in terms of real-world measurements. The value is only used to determine whether a turn is allowed from one street to a street that intersects it in a 2-dimensional space, similar to floors in a building. Nodes at the lowest level would be assigned 0, with overlapping nodes representing additional level(s)/overpass(es) will be assigned the next sequential integer value accordingly.

Sec. 3. Section 3-206 is amended to read:

3-206. Address points.

The commission adopts by reference the current version of sections 2, 3, and 3.2 of the NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model released by the National Emergency Number Association [https://www.nena.org/page/ng911gisdatamodel] ~~(National Emergency Number Association, NENA STA-006.1-2018, June 16, 2018, https://nrtc.nebraska.gov/standards/pdf/3-206_pages_from_nena_sta-006-ng9-1-1_gis-dat.pdf)~~ for GIS data that consists of address points.

Sec. 4. Original sections 3-203, 3-205, and 3-206 are repealed.

Sec. 5. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.