

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #37-01
Page 1 of 5

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	\$ 55,900	\$ 56,290

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Vocational Rehabilitation section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources. This project will also provide the court with programming specific contract programmer(s) to work during development phases.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.2 Programming	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 55,125.00	\$ 57,881.25	\$ 60,775.31	\$ 276,281.56
2.4 Other	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 3,190.00	\$ 3,349.50	\$ 3,516.98	\$ 3,692.82	\$ 16,649.30
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.2 Software	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 690.00	\$ 793.50	\$ 912.53	\$ 5,996.03
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 55,900.00	\$ 56,290.00	\$ 59,164.50	\$ 62,191.73	\$ 65,380.66	\$ 298,926.88
Cash Funds	\$ 55,900.00	\$ 56,290.00	\$ 59,164.50	\$ 62,191.73	\$ 65,380.66	\$ 298,926.88
TOTAL FUNDS	\$ 55,900.00	\$ 56,290.00	\$ 59,164.50	\$ 62,191.73	\$ 65,380.66	\$ 298,926.88

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	11	12	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	16	18	17.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	18	16.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	8	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	6	7	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	18	12	17	15.7	20
TOTAL				74	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - This proposal describes technologies to be adopted in support of the Worker's Compensation Court's strategic plan. The specific project seeks to implement document creation, storage, retrieval within the court, and the subsequent transfer of documents to participants in the case.	- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good statement of benefits - The two components of the project, enhanced e-files and message management, are necessary to meet the court's strategic plan of a paperless court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assume final statement on page 4 should be "will NOT achieve" - As described in the commentary, prior requests for document management were turned down by the legislature. The proposal makes no mention of any hardware requirements necessary to support the storage of the documents created within the system. The proposal is for a system that will stand alone within the IT systems of the Worker's Compensation Court. Since alternatives exist for both storage and messaging systems, the benefit analysis should include a comparison of the cost for an internal system when compared to IMS alternatives for both storage and message management.
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The key technologies have been tested within the operational environment of the Worker's Compensation Court. These "proof-of-concept" tests greatly reduce the possibility of failure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third party word processing solution seems to be moving to more "closed" rather than open architecture. - From the dialog, the reviewer must assume that existing hardware and operating software are sufficient to meet the needs of the expanded capabilities contemplated in the proposal.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project staff and key components of the project are listed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IT staffing on project may be too light. Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - The proposal contemplates an in-house developed solution, but the narrative only addresses implementation of message management, and message management deliver. Key milestones leading to implementation are not discussed.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project narrative indicates that "proof-of-concept" testing has been completed. This will substantially reduce the risk associated with the project. If the technology is secure, the management of business implementation is correctly identified as the risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project. - Electronic document creation is listed as the first year project, while delivery of these documents is scheduled for the second year. This means that the court will continue to rely on the delivery of paper documents in the first year. Since messaging technology is available, perhaps the court should include electronic messaging in the first year of implementation.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquisition, custom programming, and hosting fees are listed in the budget. Reviewers must assume that software licensing fees are correctly stated, and that programming fees are within the range of services necessary to achieve the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would expect hardware requirements in a project of this nature. This project probably needs at least part-time project management resources assigned. - This reviewer believes that electronic storage, enhanced backup procedures and hardware, and messaging components may add additional costs not reflected in the budget form.

APPENDIX**AGENCY RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS****37-01 -- Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation****Reviewer(s) Comments**

- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

WCC Response:

The goals are : Enhanced E-Files (document management) and Message Management (letter and document). Further elaboration was provided in Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case of the document. These objectives were set from analysis that has been completed and will be further explored by an outside consultant. This re-engineering initiative has been in process for several years. There are over two dozen documents that are available for review. Two major documents are Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Certification Notification and Assignment and Vocational Rehabilitation Case Management System.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Assume final statement on page 4 should be "will NOT achieve"

WCC Response:

Correct. The sentence should read "By doing nothing the court will **NOT** achieve its goal of being paperless." The CIO will correct before submission to the NITC.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- As described in the commentary, prior requests for document management were turned down by the legislature. The proposal makes no mention of any hardware requirements necessary to support the storage of the documents created within the system. The proposal is for a system that will stand alone within the IT systems of the Worker's Compensation Court. Since alternatives exist for both storage and messaging systems, the benefit analysis should include a comparison of the cost for an internal system when compared to

IMS alternatives for both storage and message management.

WCC Response:

The court had only submitted on project request for a document management system. The court currently has excess storage capacity in its current hardware to accommodate the increase in storage needs to store the digital objects for several years into the future. The court has an equipment replacement cycle in place in its continuation budget and assumes that there will be the normal increase in capacity at current levels of cost.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Third party word processing solution seems to be moving to more "closed" rather than open architecture.

WCC Response:

The statement is correct. The third party word processing components are specific to the Borland Delphi development environment. There is a continual debate as to whether closed or opened architectures is the best. Each has its pros and cons. Our current testing shows that this is the appropriate solution for our development environment.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- From the dialog, the reviewer must assume that existing hardware and operating software are sufficient to meet the needs of the expanded capabilities contemplated in the proposal.

WCC Response:

That is correct and is why they are not included in the request.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- IT staffing on project may be too light.

WCC Response:

This section should have included a resource line for contract programming. The Funding Summary does include dollars for such. In addition, a reading of our Comprehensive IT Plan does explain that the majority of our IT Staff is development resource. We plan and schedule our projects within the constraints of those existing resources.

Reviewer(s) Comments

-Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. Key milestones leading to implementation are not discussed.

WCC Response:

The two major milestones are defined. Any further project detail is speculative at this point and only definable as the project progresses.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- The proposal contemplates an in-house developed solution, but the narrative only addresses implementation of message management, and message management deliver.

WCC Response:

Do not fully understand this comment. The court has structured its technology environment as such that it normally builds custom solutions that meet its needs and purchases those items that meet can be integrated into those custom solutions. There are specific times where purchased solutions make sense.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project.

WCC Response:

The consultant is being funding out of existing continuation dollars. The court has tentatively identified several candidate consultants who already have a proven track record in the work that is being requested.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- Electronic document creation is listed as the first year project, while delivery of these documents is scheduled for the second year. This means that the court will continue to rely on the delivery of paper documents in the first year. Since messaging technology is available, perhaps the court should include electronic messaging in the first year of implementation.

WCC Response:

Paper delivery will always need to be an option and it incurs the least risk for the initial deliverable. When the project begins, all current assumptions and preliminary plans will be re-evaluated based upon the changes in the environment.

After the proposal was completed and submitted, technology available through IMServices has come on-line. The court is currently working with IMServices to define and implement the first phase of a concept called MyFiles.From.NE.GOV through the Enterprise Directory / State Portal. Phase One of MyFiles.From.NE.GOV will allow for manual upload and delivery of digital objects in secured way. Phase Two will include electronic acknowledgement of receipt and integration with other computer systems through web services to such systems as the courts planned message management system. The court is already into eFax delivery and plans to incorporate that into system.

Reviewer(s) Comments

- I would expect hardware requirements in a project of this nature. This reviewer believes that electronic storage, enhanced backup procedures and hardware, and

messaging components may add additional costs not reflected in the budget form.

WCC Response:

As stated earlier in this response, the court has adequate capacity for the next several years. The court has built into system replacement dollars for backup replacement systems. The court has already begun discussions with Department of Communications - Server Support on the possible use of the centralized "gator" backup system if enhancements can be made to the system that will accommodate our needs, specifically in the area of records management.