Project #	Agency	Project Title
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	WCC Internet Enhancement and Security

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html]

This project is a multi-year project that will procure, develop, install, and support Court enhancements in base technical infrastructure in preparation for an expanded Internet presence and provide enhanced levels of security.

In this phase of the project, the court will address:

- Internet Server Redundancy and Load Balancing
- Application Security Assessments

FUNDING SUMMARY

WCC Internet Enhancement and Security

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total		
1. Personnel Costs							$ -		
2. Contractual Services									
2.1 Design							$ -		
2.2 Programming							$ -		
2.3 Project Management							$ -		
2.4 Other		$ 46,000.00					$ 46,000.00	$ 46,000	2.4 Other
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -	$6,000	Load Balancing equipment setup and configuration
4. Telecommunications							$ -	$40,000	Application Security Assessment
5. Training							$ -		
6. Travel							$ -		
7. Other Operating Costs		$ 4,600.00	$ 4,600.00	$ 4,830.00	$ 5,071.50	$ 5,325.08	$ 24,426.58	$ 4,600	7 Other
8. Capital Expenditures								$2,500	Load Balancing Lease 2nd Internet Server
8.1a Hardware - One Time		$ 10,000.00			$11,500		$ 21,500.00	$2,100	Footprint
8.1b Hardware - Cont			$ 1,700.00	$ 1,785.00	$ 1,874.25	$ 1,967.96	$ 5,359.25		
8.2a Software - One Time		$ 3,000.00					$ 3,000.00		
8.2b Software - Cont		$ 150.00	$ 157.50	$ 165.38	$ 173.64	$ 182.33	$ 828.84		
8.3 Network							$ -	$10,000	8.1a Hardware - One Time
8.4 Other							$ -	$10,000	2nd Internet Server
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 63,750.00	$ 6,457.50	$ 6,780.38	$ 18,619.39	$ 7,475.36	$ 103,082.63		8.1b Hardware - Cont
General Funds							$ -		Maintenance and Support
Cash Funds		$ 63,750.00	$ 6,457.50	$ 6,780.38	$ 18,619.39	$ 7,475.36	$ 103,082.63		
Federal Funds							$ -	$ 3,000	8.2a Software - One Time
Revolving Funds							$ -	$3,000	Internet Server Software
Other Funds							$ -		8.2b Software - Cont
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 63,750.00	$ 6,457.50	$ 6,780.38	$ 18,619.39	$ 7,475.36	$ 103,082.63		Upgrade and Support
		Biennium Total	$ 70,207.50						

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	13	14	12.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	20	22	23	21.7	25
5: Technical Impact	15	18	20	17.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	9	10	8.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	8	9	9	8.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	18	20	20	19.3	20
			TOTAL	**89**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clearly linked to agency technology plan. Stakeholders clearly identified. Measurements reasonably articulated. - Clear objectives are identified for the Court's Internet applications: availability (98% plus), security (no "holes"), responsiveness (<5 sec, 95% of transactions). A technical approach has been selected to achieve the goals. - The inclusion of application assessments are a positive step in determining the gaps in data flows, and processes pre-production.	- Goals and Objectives are still, by this reviewer's opinion, stated too generally. - Measurement methods for availability and responsiveness are not identified. It is unclear if the availability and responsiveness measures meet the business needs of the beneficiaries. For example, 98% availability implies over three hours of downtime per week. - More detail on how the Internet servers will be redundant. Will they be clustered? Mirrored? I understand that all these questions and more will need to be answered and will be as the project moves along.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- The need for a stable and secure infrastructure is reasonably well articulated. - Intangible customer service benefits are described. Since this is an infrastructure project, it is indirectly related to the ultimate business benefits that will be associated with the application it supports. Contextual information about related projects is also included. - The court has done many things to improve their security posture and should be commended for such.	- Justification is presented essentially as a technical explanation, without a great deal of documented business impact. - Descriptions of several related efforts are included however they do not include descriptions of other solutions for this project. Alternatives for a second server are discussed; however a decision is premature at this time. - Section 4 asks for other solution that were evaluated and rejected and I could not find any solution that fit that description. I read about many items that are moving forward either under the courts purview or at an enterprise level, and I agree that doing nothing is not an option. I was looking for solutions that either didn't fit or were found to be prohibitively expensive.
5: Technical Impact	- General statement of desired outcomes is clearly articulated. Technical approach is reasonably well documented. - The proposed technical approach appears to be reasonable for an infrastructure project. The project is directed at improving reliability and security. - Again, I commend the courts for looking at performing application security testing.	- Information remains very general and seems to lack details. This may be due to the project still being in a proposed, or very early, status. - Strengths and weaknesses are not addressed, nor is scalability. Consideration should be given to the Court's disaster recovery plan when selecting a location for the second Internet server.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project Team appears to have ample experience. - The project has a modest scope that appears to be adequately addressed pending the outcome of the prerequisite server re-engineering design.	- Milestone and/or deliverable descriptions are very general and lack specific details. - No milestones are presented other than the completion of the activities.
7: Risk Assessment	- Risks appear to be relatively minimal, and are adequately addressed. - Testing is a reasonable risk mitigation strategy before implementing new	- Please examine the risks associated with specification error (i.e. the availability and responsiveness goals may not be stringent enough to meet the business need).

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	technology. Offloading tasks to more specialized resources in the Office of the CIO is also an appropriate strategy. -Relatively low risk in implementing a proven technology.	
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Budgetary estimates seem reasonable, and seem to be conservatively (that is, overstated) presented. - Costs appear to be reasonable for this project scope.	

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	UNK	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.	✓			
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.	✓			

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The State Government Council recommends this project be categorized as [Tier 3].

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 3 (Other. Significant strategic importance to the agency and/or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.)