

**NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION**

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-08  
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	\$281,600.00	\$477,000.00

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Vital Records unit is charged with maintaining the official records for all birth, death, marriage, divorce, and fetal death events that occur in Nebraska. The new system will support the automation of on-line registration of events, use electronic signatures in issuance of vital records, provide standardization, integration of databases, efficient management and rapid responses to citizens, governmental agencies, businesses and others requesting vital event information. The proposed project is an upgrade to the current Vital Records system already in place.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
5. Training	\$ 69,000.00	\$ 22,800.00	\$ 36,000.00			\$ 127,800.00
<b>8. Capital Expenditures</b>						
8.1 Hardware	\$ 72,000.00	\$ 148,800.00	\$ 346,000.00			\$ 566,800.00
8.2 Software	\$ 975,300.00	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 95,000.00			\$ 1,180,300.00
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	<b>\$ 1,116,300.00</b>	<b>\$ 281,600.00</b>	<b>\$ 477,000.00</b>			<b>\$ 1,874,900.00</b>
Cash Funds	100%	100%	100%			
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>						

**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	13	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	22	19	21	20.7	25
V: Technical Impact	15	14	16	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	9	6	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	5	8	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	14	15	14.0	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>76</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The goals are achievable and represent a benefit to both the agency and the public.</li> <li>- Clear statement of expected outcomes and assessment methods; identifiable/measurable benefits; benefits are widespread</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment does not include any indication of user feedback to determine the impact of improvements.</li> <li>- A listing of the major functions and requirements of a "comprehensive information system" for vital records would provide a better understanding of the project.</li> <li>- Project appears to be driven in part by federal mandates, not always the best reason to do something but something that can't be ignored; without reviewing entire agency IT plan, it is difficult to assess how this project rates in the</li> </ul>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The review provides a succinct high-level list of the benefits of proceeding with this project.</li> <li>- Business process improvements are clearly identified; potential for increased federal reimbursement based on performance is a strong point.</li> </ul>	<p>overall agency plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The review does not include any detail as to the nature of the "shrink-wrapped" applications that were assessed nor does it provide insight as to the primary reason for the selected application.</li> <li>- How much money could be generated by improving the timeliness of data submitted to the Federal government? Is there a penalty for not complying with the federal mandate for reporting additional information in 2005? How much staff time and other costs will be saved by eliminating paper processes and having to scan documents? Will hospitals and other major users benefit by eliminating paper?</li> <li>- Federal mandate as a project driver is unfortunate but real; it appears that a sole-source contract may be anticipated, which must be done properly under state contracting procedures and is likely to be scrutinized if a bid process is not pursued.</li> </ul>
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The narrative provides an indication that the solution is consistent with existing technology requiring no additional training for staff.</li> <li>- Improved performance for hospitals and others submitting data is stated, although not in great detail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The narrative provides no indication of the scalability of the solution nor is security addressed.</li> <li>- Describe the technical elements of the project, including hardware, software, and communications requirements. What changes in technology are required. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution? Is the system customizable?</li> <li>- "Using a modem" to submit data implies lower network speed but does not indicate whether data must then be entered manually. Statement that data would be input directly implies that manual data entry currently exists, but this is not stated.</li> </ul>
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The narrative provides a satisfactory overview of intent with some indication of how training will be provided.</li> <li>- Phasing the project with standalone deliverables is a good strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The narrative provides no indication of how the intent to change will be disseminated in advance of the implementation date. Given the importance of buy-in by end users this would seem to be a significant oversight.</li> <li>- Apparently the solution has already been chosen, in order to meet the January 1, 2005 implementation date for Phase I. What is the solution?</li> <li>- Not clear how 1/1/05 milestone will be met, although it seems to be driven by federal mandate. Very difficult to assess how reasonable other time frames are with little technical information. Would appear to be very challenging.</li> </ul>
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The narrative clearly indicates the basic mission critical task that must be performed and the need to limit the scope of the implementation given the timelines.</li> <li>- Accurately describes the greatest risk, since the project not only involves technical upgrades but also a vast amount of training.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No contingency plans are listed or suggested.</li> <li>- A project with this many aspects and stakeholders probably has a much longer list of risks. It is essential to identify risks and develop mitigation strategies. For example, what steps will be taken to insure cooperation of all of the stakeholders listed in Phases II, III, and IV? Are there any technical barriers to connecting these entities to the system?</li> </ul>
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of figures is satisfactory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The cost of the "system" is high based on the relative specificity of its scope. Without some indication of the alternatives such a cost is not easily justified. For example, are there web-based packages that could provide equal functionality without a premium in the way of Microsoft licensing?</li> <li>- What is the basis for the budget? Other than training, will there be any consulting costs for</li> </ul>

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-08  
Page 3 of 3

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		customization of the system? - Very difficult to assess without details. And, if the federal government provides reimbursement based on performance, wouldn't there be some dollar amount allocated to federal funds?