AGENDA
NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
AIM Institute
1905 Harney Street
Omaha, Nebraska
Thursday, July 12, 2018
10:00 a.m.

10:00 a.m.  1. Roll call; meeting notice; Open Meetings Act information.

2. Public comment.

3. Approval of the March 8, 2018 meeting minutes.* (Attachment 3)

4. Reports from the advisory councils and Technical Panel.
      i. Approval of membership nomination; assistive technology member.* (Attachment 4-a-i)
      ii. Approval of Proposal 18-01, agency information technology plans.* (Attachment 4-a-ii)
      iii. Approval of Proposal 18-02, information technology project proposals.* (Attachment 4-a-iii)
      iv. Approval of Proposal 18-03, revise existing documents for consistency.* (Attachment 4-a-iv)
      v. Enterprise project status dashboard report. (Attachment 4-a-v)
      vi. Designate the Office of the CIO’s Centrex Replacement project as an enterprise project.*
   b. GIS Council report – John Watermolen. (Attachment 4-b)
      i. Approval of membership nomination.*
      ii. Statewide and enterprise GIS updates.
   c. Community Council report – Anne Byers. (Attachment 4-c)
      i. Nebraska broadband data and blog. (Hyperlink)
   d. eHealth Council report – Anne Byers. (Attachment 4-d)
      i. Approval of membership nominations.*
   e. Education Council report – Tom Rolfes.
      i. Network Nebraska and digital education updates.
      i. CIO Roadmap update.

11:20 a.m.  5. Break.

11:30 a.m.  6. Presentation: Statewide Radio System – Mike Jeffres, Office of the CIO.

12:00 p.m.  7. Presentation: AIM Institute.

1:00 p.m.  8. Adjourn.

* Indicates an action item.
The Commission 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.

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on June 15, 2018. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on July 5, 2018.

Nebraska Open Meetings Act

Future Meeting Dates:

- November 8, 2018
- March 14, 2019
- July 11, 2019
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Ed Toner, Chief Information Officer, Chair
Senator Bruce Bostelman, Nebraska Legislature
Dr. Terry Haack, Bennington Public Schools
Dorest Harvey, US Strategic Command/J84
Randy Meininger, City of Scottsbluff
Dan Spray, Precision Technologies, Inc.
Walter Weir, University of Nebraska
Shane Greckel, Greckel Farms, LLC (via conference call for participation only)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dan Shundoff, Intellicom and Gary Warren, Hamilton Telecommunications

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; MEETING NOTICE; AND OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

The Chair, Ed Toner, called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. Roll call was taken. Five members were present. There was not a quorum at the time of roll call. The meeting continued with informational items until Commissioner Haack’s arrival.

The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on February 23, 2018. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on March 5, 2018. The Nebraska Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall of the room.

Commissioner Toner pointed out the OCIO 2017 Year in Review video which was being shown on the screens. It displayed the efficiencies and savings gained through consolidation.

Chair Ed Toner recognized Commissioners Randy Meininger and Dan Shundoff for their service on the NITC and presented Commissioner Meininger with an appreciation plaque. Commissioner Shundoff was not able to attend the meeting. His plaque will be sent to him.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

REPORTS FROM THE ADVISORY COUNCILS AND TECHNICAL PANEL

TECHNICAL PANEL REPORT
Kirk Langer, Chair

Enterprise project status dashboard report

Mr. Langer was acknowledged as the new chair of the Technical Panel. Mr. Langer provided an update on the status of the enterprise projects.

Dr. Haack and Senator Bostelman arrived. A quorum was present to proceed with official business.

Members discussed the need for additional information about the Oracle Fusion project. Commissioner Toner asked Commissioners Weir and Harvey to work with staff and the agency to get more information. If necessary, a special meeting of the Commission could be called to discuss the project.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 9, 2017 MEETING MINUTES
Commissioner Haack moved to approve the November 9, 2017 minutes as presented. Commissioner Harvey seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Haack-Yes, Harvey-Yes, Meininger-Yes, Spray-Yes and Weir-Yes. Results: Yes-6, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Technical Standards and Guidelines Request for Waiver 18-01; Dept. of Labor Appeal of Denial by the Technical Panel.

Mr. Langer provide background on the Technical Panel’s review of the request. The Nebraska Department of Labor (NDOL) requests a waiver from compliance with NITC 5-101: Enterprise Content Management System for State Agencies. NDOL has contracted for an information technology system provided by Geographic Solutions, Inc. (GSI) which includes multiple modules. This request is limited to the system provided by GSI. NDOL does not seek a waiver for any other program or agency function. The GSI system includes a document management program in its base system at no additional cost to the purchaser. The Technical Panel denied the waiver by a vote of 3-1.

John Albin, Commissioner of Labor, was present to discuss the request for waiver.

Commissioner Haack moved to grant the request for waiver until January 1, 2019. Commissioner Harvey seconded. Discussion followed.

Issues discussed included: time limiting the waiver; document sharing; security; user experience; purpose of the standard; multiple agencies with similar requests; and costs.

The Chair called for the vote on the motion.

Roll call vote: Toner-No, Haack-Yes, Harvey-No, Meininger-No, Spray-No, and Weir-No. Results: Yes-1, No-5, Abstained-0. Motion failed.

EHEALTH COUNCIL REPORT
Anne Byers

Commissioners received a written eHealth report in the meeting documents. Ms. Byers wanted to highlight the following:

Prescription Drug Monitoring Program. As of January 1, 2018, all dispensers are required to report all medications dispensed to the PDMP, improving patient safety as well as reducing opioid overdoses. There are 5,847 prescribers and pharmacists provisioned to access the PDMP as of February 2018. Additional enhancements have been implemented, including a Morphine Milligram Equivalent Alert. Nebraska’s PDMP is receiving attention nationally, with other states looking at Nebraska’s model.

Ms. Byers entertained questions from the Commission.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL REPORT
Anne Byers

Commissioners received a written Community Council report in the meeting documents. The Community Council met on February 28 and discussed the items included in the written report. Ms. Byers wanted to highlight the following:

Approval of Council Membership Nomination. The Community Council recommended Johnathan Hladik’s nomination to serve on the Council. Mr. Hladik is Policy Director at the Center for Rural Affairs. His work involves analysis and advocacy at the state and federal level. Focus areas include renewable energy, farm policy, economic development, and income inequality. Mr. Hladik holds a JD and Masters of Environmental Law and Policy from Vermont Law School, and a BS in Natural Resource Economics from the University of Nebraska.
Commissioner Weir moved to approve the Council Council’s membership nomination of Johnathan Hladik to serve on the council. Commissioner Spray seconded. Roll call vote: Meininger-Yes, Spray-Yes, Weir-Yes, Toner-Yes, Haack-Yes, and Harvey-Yes. Results: Yes-6, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

**Nebraska Broadband Partnership.** The Nebraska Broadband Initiative was formed to implement the planning component of the PSCs’ Broadband Mapping and Planning Grant from the NTIA. The partnership has continued since the end of the grant on a very part-time basis. It may be time to reenvision and re-energize the initiative by broadening the stakeholder base.

**Newsletter.** The new Broadband Nebraska newsletter will include articles about how two communities are addressing broadband development. One article highlights how Seward County has utilized public private partnerships to attract investments in broadband infrastructure. Seward County has utilized LB 840 and philanthropic funds to incentive investments in broadband infrastructure. The second article looks at Ravenna and Prairie Hills Wireless. Prairie Hills Wireless was recently recognized as Wireless Internet Service Provider (WISP) of the Year at the Wireless Internet Service Providers Association’s 2017 WISPALOOZA and is providing residential broadband of up to 150 Mbps down. Community leaders in Ravenna also understand the importance of broadband and the need to effectively use new technologies. The local economic development community is using social media marketing to attract visitors and to engage members of the community. Through social media marketing, Ravenna was able to draw an estimated 20,000-30,000 people to Ravenna for the solar eclipse.

Ms. Byers pointed out links to the FCC 2018 Broadband Report as well as the Public Service Commission’s 2018 Broadband Deployment Reports. She entertained questions from the Commission.

**EDUCATION COUNCIL REPORT**

Tom Rolfes

Mr. Rolfes thanked the Commission for approving the Network Nebraska and Digital Education action items at their November 9 meeting. The Education Council recently met on February 21, and will meet again on April 25, to continue to make progress with the action items.

**Approval of Council Membership Nomination.** Mr. Rolfes presented the two nominees for pro tem membership to the Education Council. Mr. Trent Kelly from Hastings Public Schools will succeed Dr. Mike Lucas from York, representing school administrators. Mr. Bret Blackman, UNO, will succeed Mr. Mark Askren from UNL, representing the University of Nebraska. They will complete the 7/1/2017-6/30/2019 terms.

Commissioner Haack moved to approve the Education Council’s nominations of Trent Kelly and Bret Blackman. Commissioner Weir seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Haack-Yes, Harvey-Yes, Meininger-Yes, Spray-Yes, and Weir-Yes. Results: Yes-6, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

**Network Nebraska and Digital Education Updates.** Mr. Rolfes provided the Network Nebraska update. RFP 5761 is being conducted by State Purchasing and it included 29 WAN Circuits to reach Network Nebraska. Intents to Award were sent to five of the eight bidders. RFP 2926-18-8116 is being conducted by UNL Purchasing to rebid statewide Internet access from Omaha, Nebraska. An Intent to Award has been sent to the lowest qualified bidder of the six companies that responded. The Internet unit price being offered is the lowest price that has ever been used by Network Nebraska, a potential decrease of 66%.

New prospective members for Network Nebraska starting 7/1/2018 include Creighton Prep High School and the Omaha Public Library. Additional briefings about Network Nebraska had been requested by Bellevue University and the Archdiocese of Omaha education office.

To help address the Digital Education Initiative’s action items related to equity of access and the homework gap for rural students, the Office of the CIO has partnered with the Nebraska Library
Commission in submission of a $25,000 grant to the Institute for Museum and Library Services. If funded by IMLS, the grant would provide microwave transmission equipment and two desktop computers to share the public school district’s superfast Internet with the public library. In addition, some education partners are interested in piloting TV White Space as an information service for disconnected rural students, as well as exploring cellular hotspots for students when away from a wired Internet connection.

Mr. Rolfes shared that the Nebraska Department of Education’s Future Ready Nebraska initiative contained several elements of the NITC Action Items and that the Digital Learning Plan was being developed for review by the State Board of Education in late spring or early summer. The Education Council also appreciates the collaboration that has been going on with the NITC Community Council. There were no questions or discussion following the Network Nebraska and Digital Education update.

GIS COUNCIL REPORT
John Watermolen, GIS Coordinator

Commissioners received a written GIS Council report in the meeting documents. Mr. Watermolen wanted to highlight the following:

**Nebraska Statewide Imagery Program.** Statewide Imagery Program-Business Plan: Because of the costs of flying an imagery program, we are looking at some subscription/licensing models such as Google and Digital Globe along with talking to aerial imaging vendors to get their thoughts on an imagery solution. The imagery working group met in January to start the discussion of how to deal with subscription based imagery because the horizontal accuracy does not meet the standards that are set in the Imagery business plan. From that meeting, we have surveyed state agencies and Natural Resource Districts (NRDs) on what their needs are regarding imagery. The survey found that many state agencies and NRDs use the USDA-NAIP imagery that is collected every other year. The USDA-NAIP program will be flying Nebraska in 2018, but after that there is a lot of uncertainty with the program.

**Administrative and Political Boundaries.** There has been very little progress on this and emailed the co-chairs with directions on how we think we need to proceed to get back on track. The main direction is to use the parcel data as a base and make adjustments to any federal or state boundaries that are based on the parcel. Some of the boundary data sets are waiting on how PSC is going to address NG-911 data issues and what data DOT has regarding boundaries and how they are reviewed and maintained.

This effort is very important to NG911. Stewardship of the data needs to be addressed. As this effort progresses, Mr. Watermolen indicated that he maybe be asking the NITC’s guidance regarding the issue of stewardship.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL REPORT
Ed Toner, Chief Information Officer

**CIO Roadmap Update.** Mr. Toner provided an update on the status of the CIO Roadmap. The consolidation phase is wrapping-up. The next phase will focus on agency IT plans and architecture for critical applications.

**APPROVAL OF STATEWIDE TECHNOLOGY PLAN**

The Commission has already approved the strategic initiatives and action items in previous meetings. This is the final draft of the complete plan. Commissioner Toner acknowledged Holly West, OCIO Public Information Officer, for her design and work on the plan.

Commissioner Harvey moved to approve the Statewide Technology plan as presented. Commissioner Weir seconded. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Spray-Yes, Meininger-Yes, Harvey-Yes, Haack-Yes, and Toner-Yes. Results: Yes-6, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT
Commissioner Haack moved to adjourn. Commissioner Weir seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by the NITC Managers, Office of the CIO/NITC.
Jeremy Sydik
Jeremy Sydik serves as Deputy 508 Coordinator and Director of Accommodation Resources at the University of Nebraska. His primary responsibilities involve development of policy regarding the accessibility of information and communication technology (ICT), evaluation of ICT accessibility of products in collaboration with procurement, and development of novel solutions for faculty, staff and student accommodation needs. Jeremy has a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science from as well as Master of Arts and Ph.D degrees in Educational Psychology from UNL. He has worked with digital accessibility for over 20 years, authored the book “Design Accessible Web Sites, Thirty-Six Keys to Creating Content for All Audiences and Platforms”, and has presented on accessibility topics at regional, national, and international level conferences.
A PROPOSAL to revise the agency information technology plan form.

Section 1. The form referenced in section 1-201 is revised as follows:
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
and the
Office of the Chief Information Officer

Agency Information Technology Plan

Due: September 15, 2018

Notes about this form:

1. **Requirement.** "On or before September 15 of each even-numbered year, all state agencies, boards, and commissions shall report to the Chief Information Officer, in a format determined by the [Nebraska Information Technology Commission], an information technology plan that includes an accounting of all technology assets, including planned acquisitions and upgrades." (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-524.01). This document -- prepared with input from state agencies and the Technical Panel -- is the approved format for agency information technology plans. This form should be treated as if it is a public record. Do not include information which would compromise information technology security.

2. **Deadline.** The Agency Information Technology Plan is due on September 15, 2018.

3. **Submitting the Form.** The form must be submitted online at https://cioapps.nebraska.gov/ITPlan.

1. Current Assets

1.1 Hardware

1.1.1 Hardware Assets
Complete the following tables. For “current” assets, enter the total number of each item currently owned or leased by the agency. For “planned” assets, enter an estimated number of each item at the end of the biennium on June 30, 2021-2023.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linux/Unix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Google Chrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Android</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Android</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Servers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linux/Unix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Servers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VMware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hyper-V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computers</td>
<td>Laptop Computers</td>
<td>Thin Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planned</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Linux/Unix</td>
<td>VMware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Servers</td>
<td>Virtual Servers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Narrative:

1.2 Applications Software

1.2.1 Commercial Off-the-Shelf Applications Software

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Suite</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Users/Licenses</th>
<th>Version(s) (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPerfect Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenOffice/StarOffice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endpoint Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft System Center Endpoint Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symantec/Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malware Bites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Messaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIO Lync/Skype for Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Web Conferencing
- OCIO WebEx / Spark
- OCIO Lync/Skype for Business
- Adobe Connect
- Other (Specify)

### Database Management (DBMS)
- IBM
- Oracle
- Microsoft SQL
- AS/400
- Other (Specify)

### Applications Development Tools
- Microsoft Visual Studio
- IBM Rational Application Developer
- Micro Focus COBOL
- Other (Specify)

### Business Analytics
- OBIEE
- SAP Crystal Reports
- Cognos
- Other (Specify)

### IT Service Management Suite
- Microsoft Service Manager
- Remedy
- iSupport
- Track-It
- ServiceNow
- Other (Specify)

### 1.2.2 Other Commercial Off-the-Shelf Applications Software

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Software Title</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Users/Licenses</th>
<th>Version(s) (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2.3 Software as a Service (SaaS)

List any applications software that are licensed on a subscription basis by the agency which are delivered over the Internet (sometimes called web-based software, on-demand software, or, hosted software):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Software Title</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2.4 Custom Applications

List custom applications used by the agency, including (a) the general purpose of the application; (b) the platform on which it is running; (c) application development tools used; and (d) how the application is supported.
Application:
Platform:
Development Tools:
How Supported:
Internet Accessible: Y/N

1.3 Data

1.3.1 Databases
List the significant databases maintained by the agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Data (PII, HIPAA, PCI, FTI, CJIS, SSA, None of the above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Classification (Highly RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIAL, MANAGED ACCESS PUBLIC, PUBLIC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Description</th>
<th>Other Entity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Is this exchange encrypted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.4 Network Environment

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

Description:

1.4.2 Network Devices
Complete the following table. For “current” devices, enter the total number of each item currently owned/leased by the agency. For “planned” devices, enter an estimated number of each item at the end of the biennium on June 30, 2024/2025.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firewalls (Hardware)</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load Balancers (Hardware)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Access Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS/IDS Appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-OCIO provided Switches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Delivery/Gateway (e.g. Citrix, Terminal Services appliances) (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide a brief narrative describing the reason/rationale for any significant change in the number of planned devices as compared to the number of current devices.

Narrative:

1.5 Server Rooms

1.5.1 Server Rooms
Many agencies have invested in dedicated space for housing servers and network equipment. This dedicated space provided close proximity of the equipment to an agency’s offices and support staff. During the early years of client/server technology, close proximity offered many advantages and was even essential in some situations. Changes in technology and higher network speeds have eroded the advantages of close proximity to the extent that separate server rooms often represent a duplication of costs and an impediment to good security, reliability, disaster recovery, and efficient operations. The trend in all large organizations is consolidation of servers and data centers.

The purpose of this section is to document the number and size of server rooms and encourage planning for use of shared services that would eliminate the need for most server rooms.

Please complete the following information:

1. Does your agency have servers in the OCIO data center (yes / no):
2. Does your agency have a server room (yes / no) [If no, proceed to Section 2.]
3. Where is the server room located (city, building, floor):
4. What is the size of the server room (square footage):
5. Does the room have special electrical power feeds (yes/no):
6. Does the room have special cooling capacity (yes/no):
7. Does the room have uninterruptible power supply (yes/no):
8. Does the room have backup power, such as a generator (yes/no):
9. Does the room have a separate fire suppression system (yes/no):
10. What equipment is located in the server room (number of servers, racks, network devices, etc.)?
11. What security is available for the server room?

Provide a brief narrative describing your agency’s plans to reduce or eliminate the server room or explain why it is still needed.

2. Staff and Training

2.1 Staff and Related Support Personnel
Identify staffing necessary to maintain your current IT environment, including contractor and OCIO staff supporting your agency specific environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approximate FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency IT Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIO Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 IT Related Training
Summarize the agency’s efforts to address training needs relating to information technology, including training for IT staff and users.
3. Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Security</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency implemented the NITC’s Security Policy?</td>
<td>Information Security Policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency implemented other security policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency designated a Security Officer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency performed an audit of all data under your control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency classified all data under your control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency schedule vulnerability scans of servers containing sensitive information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have regularly scheduled penetration tests?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency performed a penetration test in the last year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have a security awareness program in place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency allow the use of removable media such as flash drives, external hard drives, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity - For purposes of this document, the term "Disaster Recovery Plan" refers to preparations for restoring information technology systems following a major disruption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 Disaster Recovery Plan</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have a disaster recovery plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your answer to the previous question is YES, have you tested your disaster recovery plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency perform regular back-ups of important agency data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your answer to the previous questions is YES, does your agency maintain off-site storage of back-up data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Accessibility / Assistive Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Accessibility / Assistive Technology</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency include the Nebraska Technology Access Clause in contracts for information technology purchases? (See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 73-205. The Technology Access Clause is posted at <a href="http://itoc.ne.gov/standards/">http://itoc.ne.gov/standards/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have procedures in place to identify the information technology related requirements of users with disabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency provide training opportunities for management, procurement, and technical personnel on how to meet the accessibility needs of users with disabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency evaluated its website(s) to ensure accessibility to all persons with disabilities? If yes, what tools were used to evaluate accessibility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Projects and Future Plans

4.1 Projects Currently Active
List current IT projects, including a description of the project, the current project status, projected completion date and costs.
Sec.2. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
A PROPOSAL relating to information technology projects submitted as part of the state biennial budget process; to amend sections 1-101 and 1-202; to add a definition; to modify the requirements for submission of a project proposal; to modify the project proposal form; and to repeal the original sections.

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

"Information technology project" means an endeavor undertaken over a fixed period of time using information technology. An information technology project includes all aspects of planning, design, implementation, project management, and training related to the endeavor.

Sec.2. The following provisions constitute a revised section 1-202:

1-202. Project reviews; information technology projects submitted as part of the state biennial budget process.

This policy provides the format, minimum requirements, and review procedures for information technology projects submitted as part of the state biennial budget process. The requirements are as follows:

(1) Format. Budget requests for information technology projects that meet the minimum requirements set forth in subsection (2) must include a completed information technology project proposal form. The form provided in the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System is the approved format for information technology project proposals.
(2) Minimum Requirements for Project Submissions.

(a) Information technology projects that meet the following criteria are subject to the project review requirements of this section: (i) the estimated total project costs are more than $500,000, or (ii) the estimated total project costs are more than $50,000, and the project will have a significant effect on a core business function or multiple agencies.

(b) Exceptions. The following information technology projects are not subject to the project review requirements of this section and do not require the submission of a project proposal: (i) multi-year projects that have been reviewed as part of a previous budget submission; or (ii) projects utilizing the enterprise content management system identified in section 5-101.

(3) Technical Review Procedures. The technical review of information technology projects submitted pursuant to this section will consist of the following steps:

(a) Individual Technical Reviewers. Each project will be reviewed and scored by three individual technical reviewers using review and scoring criteria approved by the Technical Panel. Qualified reviewers include: members of the Technical Panel, members and alternates of the advisory councils chartered by the commission, and such other individuals as approved by the Technical Panel.

Assignment of Reviewers. Individual technical reviewers will be assigned to projects as follows: (1) staff will assign three reviewers for each project based on the subject matter of the project; (2) staff will notify Technical Panel members by email of the initial assignment of reviewers; (3) members will have 24 hours to object to any of the reviewer assignments, objections to be made by email to the other members noting the specific assignment for which there is an objection and the reason(s) for the objection; (4) if there are objections, reassignments will be made and communicated in the same manner as the initial assignment, or the Technical Panel chairperson may call a special meeting of the Technical Panel to assign
reviewers; (5) staff will provide the assigned reviewers with the project review documents; (6) in the event a reviewer is unable to complete an assigned review, a new reviewer will be assigned using the same process as the initial assignment; and (7) if for any reason less than three individual reviews are completed prior to the Technical Panel’s review referenced in subsection (3)(d), the Technical Panel may complete the project review without regard to the requirements of this subsection.

(b) Agency Response. The requesting agency will be provided with the reviewer scores and comments. The agency may submit a written response to the reviewer scores and comments. The deadline for submitting a response will be one week prior to the Technical Panel meeting referenced in subsection (3)(d).

(c) Advisory Council Review. Depending on the subject matter of a project, one or more of the commission’s advisory councils may review the project and provide recommendations to the Technical Panel and commission.

(d) Technical Panel Review. The Technical Panel will review each project including the reviewer scores and comments, any agency response, and any recommendations by the advisory councils. The Technical Panel will provide its analysis to the commission.

(e) Commission Review and Recommendations. The commission will review each project including any recommendations from the Technical Panel and advisory councils. The commission will make recommendations on each project for inclusion in its report to the Governor and the Legislature.

Sec.3. The form referenced in section 1-202(1) is revised as follows:
Project Proposal Form

Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

2017-2019-2021 Biennial Budget

IMPORTANT NOTE: Project proposals should only be submitted by entering the information into the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS). The information requested in this Microsoft Word version of the form should be entered in the NBRRS in the "IT Project Proposal" section. The tabs in the "IT Project Proposal" section coincide with sections contained in this Microsoft Word version of the form. Information may be cut-and-pasted from this form or directly entered into the NBRRS. ALSO NOTE that for each IT Project Proposal created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Entity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes about this form:

1. Use. The Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC") is required by statute to “make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel...” Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(3). "Governmental entities, state agencies, and noneducation political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions." Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(5). In order to perform this review, the NITC and DAS Budget Division require agencies/entities to complete this form when requesting funding for technology projects.


3. Completing the form in the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS). Project proposals should only be submitted by entering the information into the NBRRS. The information requested in this Microsoft Word version of the form should be entered in the NBRRS in the "IT Project Proposal" section. The tabs in the "IT Project Proposal" section coincide with sections contained in this Microsoft Word version of the form. Information may be cut-and-pasted from this form or directly entered into the NBRRS. ALSO NOTE that for each "IT Project Proposal" created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.

4. Questions. Contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at (402) 471-7984 or ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov
General Information

Project Title
Agency (or entity)

Contact Information for this Project:
Name
Address
City, State, Zip
Telephone
E-mail Address

Executive Summary

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

Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes (15 Points)

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

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

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

Project Justification / Business Case (25 Points)

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

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

6. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.
Technical Impact (20 Points)

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

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

Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10 Points)

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

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

11. Describe the training and staff development requirements.

12. Describe the ongoing support requirements.

Risk Assessment (10 Points)

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

14. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.
Financial Analysis and Budget (20 Points)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Exp</th>
<th>FY2019 Exp</th>
<th>FY2020 Request</th>
<th>FY2021 Request</th>
<th>Future Add Request</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecommunications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-user Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Project Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sec.4. Original sections 1-101 and 1-202 are repealed.

Sec.5. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
A PROPOSAL to revise existing Technical Standards and Guidelines documents for the purpose of improved document consistency.

Section 1. Staff shall revise the existing Technical Standards and Guidelines documents to improve consistency in format and structure.

Sec.2. Non-substantive revisions that may be made include the following: font, page layout, section numbering, capitalization, punctuation, sentence structure, use of defined terms, titles, section headings, and references.

Sec.3. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
Project Storyboard: Medicaid Eligibility & Enrollment System

Project Manager: Spaulding, Don

Status Report Date: 6/6/18

Status: Approved

Progress: Started

Estimate to Complete: 67.98%

Total Estimated Cost: $81,200,000.00

Actual Cost To Date: $55,200,000.00

Project Description

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) included numerous provisions with significant information systems impacts. One of the requirements was to change how Medicaid Eligibility was determined and implement the changes effective 10/1/2014. As a result of the lack of time available to implement a long-term solution, the Department of Health and Human Services implemented a short-term solution in the current environment to meet initial due dates and requirements. This solution did not meet all Federal technical requirements for enhanced Federal funding but was approved on the assumption that a long-term solution would be procured. An RFP was developed and procurement has been completed with Wipro selected as the Systems Integrator for the IBM/Curam software.

Key Accomplishments

Based on the new implementation approach, analysis was completed on the impact to interfaces. The team is now working on the design requirements from the change.

The project team has over 100 use cases in action. The use cases explain the system requirements in detail from a business perspective. Testing, development, change management and training will utilize the use cases.

State Policy team approved all MAGI Display rules design documents.

The team resolved 138 out of 250 economic assistance MAGI development defects.

Status Report Update

The Master Client Index (MCI) did not implement in April of 2018. After a thorough go/no go criteria review, the Project Board decided to not implement the MCI to allow additional time to refine the MCI design and address outstanding disaster recovery testing, service level agreements (SLA) and operations and maintenance procedures. The team has worked the issues to closure. The new MCI implementation date is August 12, 2018.

NTRAC is transitioning from a big bang project implementation to a phased implementation approach. The project Steering Committee approved a 2 phase approach to help reduce risk to citizen populations and overall impact to DHHS. The first implementation will focus mainly on MAGI populations and the second implementation will be non-MAGI populations.

Project leadership team is working toward hosting the NTRAC solution in the State data center. Currently the solution is hosted at the vendors (Wipro) data center. Impacts to the timeline to re-host are being evaluated. In addition, the State has been informed the solution hardware will be end of life in September 2019. The State is considering options for procuring a new platform.

The project Steering Committee is considering a change to the timeline based on the phased implementation and re-platform. The project team is developing the work plan and milestones. The next step is to present the project plan to the project Steering Committee.

Upcoming Activities

The project team is working on the master schedule based on a phased implementation and re-host / re-platform.

The Master Client Index (MCI) testing phase will begin June 15th.

Issues by Priority

Risks by Priority

Current Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project RAID Board (Risks, Actions, Issues, Decisions)</td>
<td>✈</td>
<td>✈</td>
<td>✈</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2/28/19</td>
<td>Znamenacek, Brad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Storyboard: Medicaid Management Information System Replacement Project (MMIS)

Project Description
Nebraska’s current Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) has supported DHHS Medicaid operations since 1977. Medicaid is an ever-changing environment where program updates occur quickly. The need for access to data is increasing and technological enhancements are necessary to keep pace with program changes. Recognizing the need to implement new technology, and with the support of the Legislature, DHHS embarked on the planning phase for replacement of MMIS functionality.

Key Accomplishments
- Completed business, technical and certification requirement validation sessions and documentation.
- Drafted DMA data source/interface framework organizing all primary, secondary and ancillary current state DHHS data sources and interfaces.
- Continued joint project management office (PMO) operations using the Deloitte Project Management Center (PMC) tool suite.
- Implemented “DMA Office Hours” concept, allowing users to facilitate questions of the Deloitte implementation team via use of the Health Interactive pilot environment, and in keeping with requirements, use story development and design.
- Commenced deliverable expectation document (DED) reviews for the Comprehensive Test Plan, Infrastructure and Solutions Lifecycle Management Plan, Data Management Plan, Data Modeling Plan and others.
- Completed a successful State handoff of R1 Certification activities to Deloitte Consulting, LLP and commenced R2-R3 efforts including Certification Plan deliverable collaboration.
- Conducted DMA MCE Kickoff and began outreach and planning efforts with other external project and system support teams where interface development and coordination are needed.
- Began organizational change management planning.

Status Report Update
The Data Management and Analytics (DMA) project formally kicked off 02/01/18 and has completed its initial discovery and requirements activities in concert with systems integration partner and vendor, Deloitte Consulting, LLP. The project has been divided into logical work tracks that align to the functions of the DMA and its associated systems. Each work track is now organizing sprint teams that will engage in design via joint application review (JAR) sessions and track-specific agile sprint sessions.

The project is underway. The scope of work being implemented in the original 16 month Design, Development and Implementation (DDI) schedule is being re-assessed and reallocated to the Maintenance and Operations phase of the project. The Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) deliverable will change to reflect these adjustments.

Upcoming Activities
- Garner scope change and IMS deliverable approval.
- Commence agile development sprints and initial design activities.
- Complete initial User Story and Epic development.
- Continue review of upcoming Deliverable Expectation Documents (DEDs) and Deliverables.
- Continue Medicaid Enterprise Certification Lifecycle (MECL) Review 2 (R2) certification planning and documentation efforts using CMS’s Medicaid Enterprise Certification Toolkit (MECT) framework.
- Commence initial Data Governance Program stand up activities.
- Complete the next stage of a rolling, monthly updated, 120 day forward-looking project plan window. This includes IMS updates to the details behind hybrid-agile design, build and test sprints needed to implement functionality that will ensue from requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claims Broker Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>11/30/16</td>
<td>Spaulding, Don</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Storyboard: Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Krogman, Sue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Report Date</td>
<td>6/7/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$12,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td>$10,405,204.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Dates
- **Plan**: 10/1/10 - 8/31/19
- **Baseline**: 10/1/10 - 8/31/19
- **Days Late**: 0

### Status Report Indicators
- Overall: ![ ]
- Schedule: ![ ]
- Scope: ![ ]
- Cost and Effort: ![ ]

### Project Description
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.

### Key Accomplishments
- Finalization and testing is being done in Cass County. Tecumseh Sheriff’s Office is getting the NRIN equipment installed. Path Calcs are being done from KRVN to Lexington Dispatch, from Minden to Axtell and from Grand Island to Hastings. They are also being processed to finish the layout of the line from Nebraska City to Falls City to Pawnee City. Mappings are being done from Saunders Co to Washington Co. Mappings and Structurals are also being done on 3 towers in the Valley and Custer County areas.

### Status Report Update
- Issues by Priority
- Risks by Priority

### Current Risks
- **Finding adequate towers to locate the NRIN system on**
  - Probability: ![ ]
  - Impact: ![ ]
  - Priority: ![ ]
  - Status: Open
  - Target Resolution: 5/6/16
  - Owner: Weekly, Andy

- **MOUs and Lease Agreements**
  - Probability: ![ ]
  - Impact: ![ ]
  - Priority: ![ ]
  - Status: Open
  - Target Resolution: 5/6/16
  - Owner: Weekly, Andy
# Project Storyboard: Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA - Reading, Math, Science and Writing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Mall, Swathi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Report Date</td>
<td>6/6/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$9,781,606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td>$1,940,416.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/17</td>
<td>12/31/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/1/17</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Late</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

Legislative Bill 1157 passed by the 2008 Nebraska Legislature required a single statewide assessment of the Nebraska academic content standards for reading, mathematics, science, and writing in Nebraska’s K-12 public schools. The new assessment system was named Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA), with NeSA-R for reading assessments, NeSA-M for mathematics, NeSA-S for science, and NeSA-W for writing. The assessments in reading and mathematics were administered in grades 3-8 and 11; science was administered in grades 5, 8, and 11; and writing was administered in grades 4, 8, and 11.

**Key Accomplishments**

1. Overall statewide summative testing went well.
2. Some issues with technology did occur with ACT. According to ACT, different factors affected online testing, including URLs that had not been white-listed, not having completed mock administrations, and not locking down the system after the system check was completed. Use of wireless can cause connectivity issues. NDE and ACT are having conversations about some changes or more specificity in the ACT Test Accessibility User Guide and/or the ACT Test Technical Guide.
3. Several districts did complete online ACT.
4. Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) had technology representatives in several districts across the state, and also located some so they could quickly get to districts who might have been experiencing any online issues. Several district indicated that the support was greatly appreciated.
5. All testing is complete for the 2017-2018 school year, and ACT, NWEA, and Data Recognition Corporation are exchanging data to provide final reports.

**Status Report Update**

**Upcoming Activities**

**Issues by Priority**

**Current Issues**

No matching records were found
Project Storyboard: Oracle Fusion (Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Rasmussen, Michael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Report Date</td>
<td>6/7/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$12,050,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate to Complete</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td>$3,821,782.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Dates

- **Plan**: 7/13/17 - 1/15/20
- **Baseline**:
  - Start: 7/13/17
  - Finish: 1/15/20
- **Days Late**: 0
- **Estimate to Complete**: 31.72%
- **Total Estimated Cost**: $12,050,000.00
- **Actual Cost To Date**: $3,821,782.10

### Status Report Indicators

- **Overall**:
  - Schedule: Green
  - Scope: Green
  - Cost and Effort: Green

### Project Description

Migrate five current disparate IT systems individually supporting human resource and benefit management, employee recruiting and development, payroll and financial functions, and budget planning to a cloud-based single enterprise platform. The migration will include implementation of two new modules: E-Procurement and Budget Planning. The end state would be the realization of operational, process, and expense synergies by moving to a single enterprise platform at the end of this migration.

### Key Accomplishments

#### For Program:

- Foresee Consulting onsite to align fuzioN and Unifier on 4/23 & 4/24
- Kronos onsite 6/4 – 6/7

#### For HCM:

- Completed CRP1 event on 4/13
- Working to resolve any issues found in CRP1 to prepare for CRP2
- Completed CRP-1a & -1b during the week of 5/21
- Continued CRP-1 issue resolution (55/57 defects resolved)
- Defined the CRP-2 scope and began creating the test plan & event configuration
- Continued data mapping exercises
- Began custom security role setups

#### For FCM:

- Finalized the MoSCoW List: State approved
- Initial draft of the Solution Design Document completed and under State review
- COA Crosswalk completed (with exceptions of UNL & state colleges)
- Defined the CRP-1 scope and began creating the test plan & event configuration
- Identified test scenarios for all work streams with input from various agency representation
- Began custom security role setups

#### For SCM:

- Final version of the Solution Design Document currently under State review
- Finalizing MoScow List
- Defining CRP-1 scope and creation of test scripts and scenarios
- Supplier communications sent out to receive updated information
- Began to utilize agency resources to assist with workload (Data Validation & Test Scripts)

### Status Report Update

- Project approved by NITC, Governor, and was briefed to the Appropriations Committee. Migration funding and appropriations were approved for the project with both funds being transferred and appropriations made available starting on July 1, 2017.

#### Overall Program status on track

- HCM completed CRP1 on 4/13/18, scheduled to start CRP2 on 7/16/18
- FCM scheduled to start CRP1 on 7/30/18
- SCM completed all CRP0 sessions 4/3/18; scheduled to start CRP1 on 8/6/18

#### Budget:

- Overall Program budget on track for KPMG, Oracle, and Civic

### Upcoming Activities

#### For Program:

- Foresee Consulting anticipated onsite beginning 6/18 (contract dependent)
- Phase 0 assessment on-site work estimated at 2 weeks with 4-6 weeks remote follow-up
- Obtain State sign-off for the Program Test Strategy
- Continue to populate tasks, resources, dependencies, and milestones for rest of the Program for all work streams
- Schedule the remaining Technical Security Meetings
- NDOT – Develop Phase 1 Integration Roadmap deliverable

#### For HCM:

- Finalize CRP-2 Test Plan
- Continue CRP-2 configuration (including updating workbooks and test scripts)
- Continue data mapping exercises with the Tech Team

#### For FCM:

- Finalize the Solution Design Document
- Complete CRP-1 Configuration
- Complete test scenario identification and begin updating test scripts
- Complete custom security role setups and start unit testing
### Current Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Time reporting</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>7/13/18</td>
<td>Rasmussen, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing concerns</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>✷</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>6/25/18</td>
<td>Rasmussen, Michael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Storyboard: Centrex Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Howard, Bob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td>5/31/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Report Date</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status Report Date

- **Status**: Approved
- **Progress**: Started
- **Days Late**: 4

### Project Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>10/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status Report Indicators

- **Overall**: 
- **Schedule**: 
- **Scope**: 
- **Cost and Effort**: 

### Project Description

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.

### Key Accomplishments

- Currently on-schedule. RFP bids are due on June 5 and then the OCIO will begin the evaluation process.

### Status Report Update

Currently on-schedule. RFP bids are due on June 5 and then the OCIO will begin the evaluation process.

### Upcoming Activities

No matching records were found

### Issues by Priority

- None

### Risks by Priority

- None

### Current Issues

- None

- No matching records were found
Project Storyboard: Novell to Netscaler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Status Report Date</th>
<th>6/6/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Estimate to Complete</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>2/19/16</td>
<td>10/31/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2/19/16</td>
<td>10/31/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Late</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status Report Indicators**

- Overall: 🟠 ➡️ 🟣
- Schedule: 🟠 ➡️ 🟣
- Scope: 🟠 ➡️ 🟣
- Cost and Effort: 🟠 ➡️ 🟣

---

**Project Description**

Combination of the Novell Sunset and Novell Stabilization project.

**Key Accomplishments**

First set of WCS URL's completed
5 sites moved, 51.5 to 52.4% complete
Discussion on Sunset

**Status Report Update**

AM3 Stabilization
P2V (physical to virtual) of AM3 backup is completed.
  - Virtual will not be running in the active mix.
  - Testing is not suggested due to possible issues with metadata sync.
  - Team suggests to focus to get off AM3 soon.

URL Prep for WCS (Worst Case Scenario)
  - Sets of 10-12 urls are getting sent to be established in NetScaler in case of WCS.
  - First set has been completed.

AM3 Premium Support
  - Premium Support ends July 31st.

AM3 to AM4 Progress
  - Increase of 51.5% to 52.4% has been moved to AM4 or Netscaler.
  - My.NE.Gov site move to AM4 postponed until 13th to allow better notification.
  - Team will try to get the 45 non-DHHS done by end of July.
  - Discussion with leadership on placing a sunset date on AM3. Suggested July 31st.
  - Request to have communication from leadership to DHHS.

AM4 to NetScaler Progress
  - Centurion Blue development is going well, performing tests. Development will slow until August.
  - NetScaler upgrades to 11.1 are at 50%.

**Upcoming Activities**

My.NE.Gov move 6/13
5 more site planned to move to AM4
Another set of WCS URL’s is being sent
Decisions on Sunset
Communication on Sunset

---

**Current Risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NetScaler Support</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>4/23/18</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netscaler compatibility to replace Access Manager</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2/19/16</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication software choices</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2/19/16</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Issues by Priority**

1. AM3 Stabilization
2. AM3 to AM4 Progress
3. AM4 to NetScaler Progress

---

**Risks by Priority**

1. NetScaler Support
2. Netscaler compatibility to replace Access Manager
3. Authentication software choices
July 5, 2018

To: NITC Commissioners

From: John Watermolen, State GIS Coordinator
       Currently Vacant, Chair, GIS Council
       Kea Morovitz, Vice-Chair, GIS Council
       Jon Kraai, Past-Chair, GIS Council

Subject: GIS Council Report

Committee Approval
We had a member leave the council- Ms Meyers, who is one of the 2 NACO representatives on the council. NACO has nominated John McKee, Emergency Manager for Jefferson/Saline County as a replacement. I am asking for approval of Mr. McKee for the GIS council.

GIS Council Updates
At the May 1st GIS council meeting, the council provide comments on the addendum to the Imagery standards. The council members are reviewing the strategic goals to make sure that they are still relevant and ways to measure the progress the council is making towards the strategic goals.

We had some turn around with the leadership of the GIS Council- At the beginning of the year, Ms. Dunn was the vice chair, then took a position with OCIO/NSP. Ms. Morovitz from PSC filled her position. In June, Mr. Ponnappan from Games and Park, left state service and took a job in the private sector. The next GIS council will solicit nominations for a new a new chair and possible vice chair, if Ms. Morovitz becomes the chair.

Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) Updates

Nebraska Statewide Imagery Program
At the last GIS council, I received feedback on the proposed addendum to the Imagery standards. At the August GIS council meeting, we should be voting on acceptance of the addendum to the standard.

Administrative and Political Boundaries
This work group met before the last GIS council.

Nebraska Street Centerline and Address Program
OCIO has worked with PSC to merge all county street centerline data together. We will be looking at these standards more closely with the continued progress of next generation 911
Nebraska Statewide Elevation Program
The state has complete coverage of LiDAR data and NRCS is in the process of recollecting data to bring it up to the same quality level as most of the state data that has recently been collected. The OCIO, state agencies, local governments and the university is participating in surveys to help Federal agencies involved in terrestrial, ocean and coastal mapping are gathering information to improve the availability and consistency of 3D elevation data (topographic and bathymetric) for the United States and its territories. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) are sponsoring the study. The results of the study will help agencies develop and refine future program alternatives for better 3D elevation data to meet many federal, states, and other national business needs.

Geodetic and Survey Control Inventory and Assessment
OCIO and the State Surveyor have a signed MOU with Bureau of Land Management for PLSS data, the data steward responsibilities, and document how the data will be shared between the entities.

OCIO and State Agency GIS Consolidation/Integration:
Below is a brief update on several ongoing work. I will also be providing a presentation during the meeting to show how GIS is used by several agencies.

GIO Infrastructure:
The CAT portion of the infrastructure has been online since mid-June after many learning opportunities. We are testing and configuring the new infrastructure. OCIO is creating standard operating procedures for the new infrastructure. Once we feel comfortable, we will spin up our production environment.

Standard Software:
GIO has a proposed standard for GIS software that is in the 30-day comment period and will be brought to the state government council for approval, then technical panel approval, then to the NITC for approval in the November meeting.

Meeting with agencies:
I continue to visit with state agencies every few months to continue discussions and any GIS needs. I have sent all the agencies a training score card to assess the needs of GIS users statewide.

Department of Transportation- Consolidation and Integration:
This is an ongoing process. We are making progress. We are testing with DOT on an enterprise geodatabase solution for the agency and the enterprise. DOT just hired a new GIS manager and I think she will do a great job at DOT.

OCIO Public Service Commission Agreement:
Are working with PSC to see where the GIO can help with Next Generation 911.
Census:
Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA). We are working on validating data for the counties that did not participate. So far we have, validated or added over 600 new address points for 10 counties.
June 27, 2018

To: NITC Commissioners
From: Anne Byers
Subject: Community Council Update:

**Nebraska Broadband Blog.** In order to better understand broadband availability and adoption in Nebraska, the NITC Community Council has started a blog series exploring rural broadband data. The blog is available at [http://www.nitc.nebraska.gov/news/community/index.html](http://www.nitc.nebraska.gov/news/community/index.html)

**Digital Readiness Survey.** In April the University of Nebraska Extension, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, the Nebraska Public Service Commission, and Nebraska Library Commission partnered with the Purdue Center for Regional Development to conduct a statewide Digital Readiness survey. Information on the survey was primarily distributed via e-mail and social media. Over 700 Nebraskans participated in the survey. Thank you to everyone who completed the survey and/or helped spread the word.

The team has begun analyzing the results. Results will be shared with the NITC, NITC Community Council and through the Nebraska Broadband blog. The information may also potentially be shared with the Rural Broadband Task Force.

**Nebraska Rural Poll.** The annual Nebraska Rural Poll included several questions on broadband. The data has been analyzed and a report has been drafted. Results will be shared with the NITC, NITC Community Council and through the Nebraska Broadband blog. The information may also potentially be shared with the Rural Broadband Task Force.
June 27, 2018

To: NITC Commissioners
From: Anne Byers
Subject: eHealth Council Update

Retirements. Deb Bass has retired as CEO of NeHII. Jaime Bland has been named as the new CEO. Marsha Morien, who has worked on both federal health information exchange grants from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and served as the eHealth Council’s co-chair, has retired from UNMC.

New Members. Three new members have been nominated to serve on the eHealth Council:

- Gary Cochran
- Ashley Newmyer
- Mary Devany

Their bios are on the following page. I will be asking you to approve their nominations.
eHealth Council Nominees

Gary Cochran

Dr. Gary Cochran is an Associate Professor at the University of Nebraska Medical Center (UNMC). He received a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from the University of Nebraska in 1991, a Doctor of Pharmacy degree from UNMC in 1997, and a Master of Science in Epidemiology from the Harvard School of Public Health in 2004. He completed a pharmacy practice residency and pharmacoconomics and outcomes research fellowship at UNMC in 1998 and 2000 respectively.

Dr. Cochran’s research objective is to improve the safety and quality of rural healthcare through the advancement and dissemination of knowledge that will impact both clinical care and health policy. His current research evaluates the effectiveness of medication use systems and health information technologies to improve healthcare safety and quality.

Ashley Newmyer, MPH, CPH
Injury Epidemiologist
Epidemiology and Informatics
Division of Public Health
Department of Health & Human Services
Lincoln, Nebraska

Ms. Newmyer is the Injury Epidemiologist for the Division of Public Health at the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services.

Ms. Newmyer graduated from the University of Nebraska Medical Center with an MPH in Biostatistics. Ms. Newmyer oversees the Nebraska Injury Surveillance System which includes the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program, the Nebraska Violent Death Reporting System, the Trauma registry and the Traumatic Brain Injury registry data coordinator, the Crash Outcomes Data Evaluation System and the Nebraska EMS data quality project. She has worked for the Division of Public Health for 7 years.

Mary DeVany

Mary DeVany is the Director of Telehealth for Nebraska Medicine in Omaha. Prior to this, Mary served as the Director of the Great Plains Telehealth Resource and Assistance Center (gpTRAC), one of 14 federally-designated telehealth resource centers around the country, housed within the University of Minnesota. She continues to serve on their Program Advisory Council, providing input and support to their regional efforts and activities. Involved with telemedicine since 1993, she has served as the state-wide telemedicine coordinator for the State of South Dakota and then as the leader for telehealth activities in two different South Dakota-based healthcare networks. She has been a member of the American Telemedicine Association since 1994 and has served in various leadership roles within the organization. Additionally, she served as a board member for the Center for Telehealth & eHealth Law for approximately 10 years. She was selected as a Rural Health Fellow through the National Rural Health Association in 2012.