M E E T I N G A G E N D A

State Government Council
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Thursday, October 19, 2006 - 3:30 p.m.
Executive Building - Lower Level Conference Room
521 S 14th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents: Click the links in the agenda
or click here for all documents (xx Pages, x.x MB).

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes* - September 14, 2006

4. Standards and Guidelines - Recommendation to the Technical Panel and NITC*
- Remote Access Standard (revised since the last meeting)
- Web: Location of Disaster Documentation

5. Project Proposals - FY2007-2009 Biennial Budget - Recommendation to the NITC*
- Project summary sheets (meeting document - 45 Pages, 1.8 MB, PDF file)
- Full text of the projects (additional information)

6. Agency Reports

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting Date

9. Adjourn

* Denotes action items.

(The Council will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda, but reserves the right to adjust the order of items if necessary and may elect to take action on any of the items listed.)

NITC and State Government Council Websites: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/
Meeting notice posted to the NITC Website: 22 SEP 2006 (Rescheduled 5 OCT 2006)
Meeting notice posted to the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar: 22 SEP 2006 (Rescheduled 5 OCT 2006)
Agenda posted to the NITC Website: 18 OCT 2006

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Thursday, September 14, 2006, 1:30 p.m.
Executive Building - Lower Level Conference Room
521 S 14th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dennis Burling, Department of Environmental Quality
Randy Cecrle, Workers' Compensation Court
Tom Conroy, Information Technology Services
Josh Daws, Secretary of State's Office
Brenda Decker, Chief Information Officer
Pat Flanagan, Private Sector;
Dick Gettemy, Department of Revenue;
Dorest Harvey, Private Sector
Lyn Heaton, Governor's Policy Research Office
Bill Miller, Supreme Court
Jim Ohmberger, Health and Human Services
Jayne Scofield, Information Technology Services
Bob Shanahan, Department of Labor
Bill Wehling, Department of Roads
George Wells, Correctional Services
Joe Wilcox, Budget Office

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Beecham, NDE Support Services ; Mike Behm, Crime Commission;
Mike Calvert, Legislative Fiscal Office; Rex Gittins, Department of Natural Resources; Lauren Hill, Governor's Policy Research Office; Bev Neth, Department of Motor Vehicles; Gerry Oligmueller, Department of Administrative Services; Rod Wagner, Library Commission; and Scott McFall, State Patrol

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Ms. Decker called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. There were 14 voting members at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC Website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar websites on August 10, 2006. The meeting agenda was posted to the NITC Website on September 8, 2006. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was located on the front table.

Mr. Hartman informed the council that the public service announcements for Cyber Security Awareness month have been received. Information for Nebraska citizens is available on the web.

Mr. Wells arrived at the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES JUNE MINUTES

Mr. Harvey moved to approve the June 8, 2006 minutes as present. Mr. Flanagan seconded. Roll call vote: Burling-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Daws-Yes, Decker-Yes, Flanagan-Yes, Gettemy-Yes, Harvey-Yes, Heaton-Yes, Miller -Yes, Ohmberger - Yes, Scofield-Yes, Shanahan-Yes, Wehling-Yes, Wells-Yes, and Wilcox-Yes. Results: Yes-15, No-0. Motion carried.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - RECOMMENDATION TO THE TECHNICAL PANEL AND NITC - REMOTE ACCESS STANDARD*
Steve Hartman, Security Officer

The draft document will go before the Technical Panel for the 30-day public comment. The recommended wording changes were reviewed. The Security Work Group recommended to change the document from a guideline to a standard. The overall goal of Appendix A is to have a narrow list of secure products that will be allowed. The Security Work Group is meeting on Monday to finalize the document and appendix.

Enforcement of the standard will be discussed at a future meeting. The Office of the CIO will have ITS staff available to provide assistance to agencies.

No action taken. This item will be on our next agenda.

DISCUSSION: SECURE E-MAIL
Steve Hartman
Within State Government - Mr. Hartman noted that the estimated cost for 3,000 users will be approximately $120K - $150K, which equates to $40-$50 per user for the first year. Anticipated annual maintenance fees will be $8-$10 per user thereafter.
Survey of existing External partners - Mr. Hartman indicated that they would like to work with agencies to send out a brief survey to all the external partners they do business with to determine the following:

- If they use a Secure Email product, what product is it?
- Do they allow gateway-to-gateway TLS in their infrastructure?
- Comments (Perhaps another email related question)

DISCUSSION: BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUESTS - IT PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM REVIEW PROCESS
Rick Becker, Government I.T. Manager

Timelines are similar to the past process. Reviewers will receive approximately 2-3 projects to score. Agencies will have an opportunity to address concerns and/or reviewer questions. The Technical Panel & NITC Advisory Councils will make their recommendations to the NITC.

A Portfolio Management tool is being used for the first time. As project proposals are received, they will be entered into the software. Reviewers will score them online. After all scores have been entered, the tool will render a visual bubble chart as to how the projects are rated.

AGENCY REPORTS

Reports were given by the following agencies: Department of Revenue (a written report was distributed), Department of Labor, Department of Roads, Workers Compensation Court, and OCIO–Enterprise Computing Services

OTHER BUSINESS

Mike Beach, NET, has resigned from his position for a new opportunity in Atlanta. His last day will be September 22nd.

NEXT MEETING DATE & ADJOURMENT

Mr. Flanagan moved to adjourn. Mr. Gettemy seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Remote Access Standard

Category	**Security Architecture**
Title	**Remote Access Standard**
Number	

Applicability

☑ State Government Agencies
- ☐ **All**.....Not Applicable
- ☑ **Excluding higher education institutions**.....Standard

☐ State Funded Entities - **All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document**.....Not Applicable

☑ Other: **All Public Entities**.....Guideline

Definitions:
Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval as outlined in section 3.2
Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	☐ **Adopted** ☑ **Draft** ☐ **Other:**_____
Dates	**Date: Draft October 5, 2006** **Date Adopted by NITC:** **Other: Previous Guideline adopted by the NITC on September 30, 2003.**

Prepared by: Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/

1.0 Standard

It is the responsibility of all State of Nebraska agencies to strictly control remote access from any device that connects from outside of the State of Nebraska network to a desktop, server or network device inside the State of Nebraska network and ensure that employees, contractors, vendors and any other agent granted remote access privileges to any State of Nebraska network utilize one of the approved secure remote access products listed in Appendix A. (Approved Remote Access products).

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

As employees and organizations utilize remote connectivity to the State of Nebraska networks, security becomes increasingly important. Accompanying and contributing to this trend is the explosive growth in the popularity of broadband connections and other technologies for remote access. These standards are designed to minimize the potential exposure from damages which may result from unauthorized use of resources; which include loss of sensitive or confidential data, intellectual property, damage to public image or damage to critical internal systems, etc. The purpose of this document is to define standards for connecting to any State of Nebraska agency from any host.

Objectives include:

- Provide guidance to State of Nebraska agencies for employees, contractors, vendors and any other agent that requests remote access to any State of Nebraska network.
- Provide a high level of security that uses standardized technology and remains adaptable in the face of changing technology products.
- Ensure a solution that is scalable to meet the current and future needs of state agencies, their employees, clients and customers, and business partners.
- Meet federal security requirements for remote access control.

3.0 Applicability

3.1 State Government Agencies

All State agencies, boards, and commissions are required to comply with the standard listed in Section 1.0. All existing Agencies utilizing non-standard remote access applications must convert to the standard listed in Section 1.0 as soon as fiscally prudent, unless the application is exempt.

3.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC Technical Panel upon request by an agency.

3.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a “Request for Exemption” to the NITC Technical Panel. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the NITC via e-mail. The NITC Technical Panel will consider the request and grant or deny the exemption. A denial of an exemption by the NITC Technical Panel may be appealed to the NITC.

4.0 Responsibility

4.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6))

4.2 State Agencies

Each state agency will be responsible for developing a policy that ensures that secure remote access to State resources is maintained, and/or implemented, including but not limited to selecting appropriate technologies, software, and tools in a manner consistent with this standard and other state agency security policies.

Each state agency will be responsible for ensuring that the computers connected to State resources contain an Anti-Virus program with current signatures and that the computer is free from Spyware, Adware, and rootkits that would place State resources in jeopardy.

4.2.1 Remote Access from Non-State Owned and/or Managed Devices

All Remote Access Users must sign and renew annually an agreement with the agency which addresses at a minimum the following:

- Remote access users are responsible for all actions incurred during their session in accordance with all State of Nebraska and agency standards and policies.
- All home networks connected to the Internet via a broadband connection should have a firewall installed, updated and operational.
- Web browsers settings should be selected or disabled as appropriate to increase security and limit vulnerability to intrusion.
- Operating systems should contain the most current security patches.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 NITC Security Officer Handbook (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/security/so_guide.doc)
5.2 NITC Network Security Policy (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html)
5.3 NITC Incident Response and Reporting Procedures for State Government (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html)
5.3 Appendix A
5.4 NITC Acceptable Use Policy (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/network/aup_20040309.pdf) and applicable Agency acceptable Use Policies

6.0 References

6.1 National Institute Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication, 800-46, “Security for Telecommuting and Broadband Communications”. (http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/index.html).

Appendix A
Approved Remote Access Products

Product	Version
nFuseCitrix	
State-sponsored VPN solution	
SSH	Version 2 (SSHv2) and above

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Web: Location of Disaster Documentation

Category	**E-Government Architecture**
Title	**Web: Location of Disaster Documentation**
Number	

Applicability

- ☑ **State Government Agencies**
  - ☐ All ..... **Not Applicable**
  - ☑ Excluding Higher Education ..... **Guideline**
- ☐ **State Funded Entities -** All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... **Not Applicable**
- ☐ **Other:** _____ ..... **Not Applicable**

Definitions:
Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document.
Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	☐ Adopted ☑ Draft ☐ Other:_____
Dates	Draft Version Date: October 12, 2006 Date Adopted by NITC: Other:

Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/

1.0 Guideline

This guideline establishes the recommended location of disaster documentation on State of Nebraska agencies, boards and commissions websites.

1.1 Document Name

1.1.1 The name of the document should be 'disaster.html' in all lowercase. This web page my contain links to other disaster documentation.

1.2 Document Location

1.2.1 The disaster document should be placed in the top level directory of the entities website. Example –'http://www.mydomain.com/disaster.html'. NOT 'http://www.mydomain.com/docs/disaster.html'

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this guideline is to establish a standard location and document name that entities (defined in section 4) shall use to disseminate public disaster information via the Internet. This guideline does not regulate the contents of the above-mentioned disaster document itself.

3.0 Definitions

3.1 Web Page

A document stored on a server, consisting of an XHTML file and any related files for scripts and graphics, viewable through a web browser or the World Wide Web. Files linked from a web page such as Word (.doc), Portable Document Format (.pdf), and Excel (.xls) files are not web pages, as they can be viewed without access to a web browser.

3.2 Web Site

A set of interconnected web pages, usually including a homepage, generally located on the same server, and prepared and maintained as a collection of information by a person, group or organization.

4.0 Applicability

This guideline shall apply to all State of Nebraska agencies, boards and commissions.

5.0 Responsibility

Compliance with this standard is voluntary but strongly recommended.

Agency Information Technology Projects
FY2007-2009 Biennial Budget

State Government Council Meeting
October 19, 2006

NEBRASKA
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
COMMISSION

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
State Government Council - October 19, 2006

FY2007-2009 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Project #)

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2007-08	FY2008-09	Total Project Costs
05-01	Supreme Court	E-Filing in JUSTICE	$ 150,000	$ 150,000	$ 605,000
05-02	Supreme Court	Digital Audio Recorders	$ 100,375	$ 210,375	$ 495,440
27-01	Department of Roads	Expansion of Falcon DMS to Agencywide Use	$ 494,250	$ 253,733	$ 1,509,182
27-03	Department of Roads	Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) Enhancement			
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	WCC Internet Enhancement and Security	$ 63,750	$ 6,458	$ 103,083
37-02	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication	$ 164,200	$ 78,750	$ 970,520
37-03	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	$ 94,400	$ 43,450	$ 204,177
47-01	NET	Satellite Reconfiguration Project	$ 247,500	$ 222,500	$ 1,259,500
47-02	NET	Public Media Archive and Distribution Project	$ 249,700	$ 305,205	$ 1,219,895
47-03	NET	Public Media at the Capitol	$ 1,111,800	$ 337,500	$ 2,139,815
47-04	NET	Final DTV Transmitter Conversion Project	$ 147,650	$ 1,415,000	$ 2,641,450
85-01	Retirement	Migration of PIONEER to the jClarity Platform	$ 6,523,000		$ 6,523,000

Project #	Agency	Project Title
05-01	Nebraska Supreme Court	E-Filing in JUSTICE

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]

The E-Filing in JUSTICE project will be the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) attempt to introduce Electronic Filing or E-Filing into Nebraska's Trial Court system. JUSTICE is the case and financial management system used for District and County Courts in Nebraska. Currently 185 trial courts utilize JUSTICE. By adding the E-Filing application for the trial courts we are able to provide 24x7 services to citizens of Nebraska.

Electronic filing works by replacing the traditional method of filing, serving, storing, and retrieving court documents with a more efficient electronic process. Instead of duplicating, packaging, and manually delivering copies of documents to the court and service parties, you send them electronically over the Internet.

Documents are then stored electronically. Any time a judge, attorney, or other party on the case needs a copy of the document; they conveniently retrieve the document from a web site. The service is always available; although cases filed after court work hours are time-stamped the following business day. The court can now move documents around in a matter of minutes as opposed to hours in the conventional mode.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Section 8: Financial Analysis and Budget

(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	$ 27,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00		$ 127,000.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming	$ 25,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00		$ 45,000.00
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00		$ 50,000.00
6. Travel	$ 2,500.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00		$ 22,500.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware	$ 10,500.00	$ 105,000.00	$ 105,000.00	$ 70,000.00	$ 70,000.00		$ 360,500.00
8.2 Software							$ -
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 75,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ -	$ 605,000.00
General Funds		$ 125,000.00	$ 125,000.00	$ 90,000.00	$ 90,000.00		$ 430,000.00
Cash Funds	$ 75,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00		$ 175,000.00
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 75,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 150,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ 115,000.00	$ -	$ 605,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	13	12.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	17	17	23	19.0	25
5: Technical Impact	15	15	19	16.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	9	10	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	7	10	9.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	15	20	18.3	20
			TOTAL	**84**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Three objectives are clearly stated.	- Expected outcome is not measurable. What does “successful implementation” mean and who is the judge of that? How can I measure that success in what time frame? How much of a decrease in staff time will result from working with e-file vs. paper and what is the value of that time? - Measurement and assessment should be strengthened. How will productivity improvements be measured? Perhaps "hours saved" could be tracked. The reduction in physical storage should be quantified. A satisfaction survey could be used to measure "better experience for attorneys". Measurable targets should be established that will define the criteria for success of the pilot sites. The criteria should be achieved before expanding the system.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Intangible service benefits (convenience, concurrent use, speed) are important. - good depiction of benefits - both tangible and intangible	- How do they know 24x7 filing is a need and has an economic return on investment? What is that ROI? The case states this will result in a “more productive court staff”, but how much more productive? Will this result in a ____% increase in filings processed with same staff? What are the benefits of using ACH besides lost or stolen money and what are the costs of ACH transactions? Reasons for not using US Bankruptcy E-Filing system--training, payment, and proprietary software (the ESP’s software will be proprietary also) are weak and need to be developed. - Tangible benefits include staff savings, space savings and less money lost or stolen. Each of these can be expressed in dollars but are not included in the justification.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		There is no description of solutions that were considered and rejected. The Federal system that was described is proprietary, not an alternative to what has been proposed. - project is valuable, but not mandated
5: Technical Impact	- The outsourcing approach offloads training to the ESP and avoids the expense of building our own custom code. The proposed system conforms to a credible subject-relevant XML standard recommended by the National Center for State Courts.	- Need to develop the security, document integrity, and business continuity areas besides reliance on ESP. What is the Court going to do if there is a problem (i.e., ESP is not available, network interruption, etc.) How will the system validate user identity—am I really who I say I am? How will non-repudiation of filing be handled—did I really file something? How will document integrity be handled—is this really what I filed? Need a long-term technical strategy if the pilot is successful (will it stay at ESP or move in-house) and if the pilot is not successful (return to old system?) - Little information is presented about the software interfaces. What are the "great security features" offered by the ESP? Specifics would allow for an evaluation of their adequacy. How does the ESP propose to conform to State standards for accessibility and authentication/authorization?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Pilot, learn, adjust then deploy is a sound strategy as is installing in both courts for a county at the same time. Team membership seems appropriate except that judges do not appear to be represented.	- Are they using the same business processes they use now or will new processes be developed or current ones changed? Using a new technology the same way as the old process? - Judges have considerable power and influence -- they appear to be left out. Stakeholder acceptance in general is an area of weakness. What technologists perceive as "good" may well conflict with how attorneys and court personnel view the system. Please pay more attention to building support among those who will use the system most! Many would rather live with problems they understand and have been coping with than use a system they don't understand. Ongoing support should include provisions for maintaining the new scanners and the PCs they presumably attach to. Training for newly hired court staff should also be included.
7: Risk Assessment	- The ESP that has been selected has been successful in other jurisdictions. The subcommittee that has drafted rules for the Court's consideration appears to include the key stakeholders.	- Funding is explicitly identified as a risk that is highly important yet no mitigation strategy is proposed. The mitigation of the staff training risk appears to be that people have been

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		assigned. No information about how those people will address the risk is included.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- What is the financial plan if this project is a huge success and the need to escalate deployment arises?	- Ongoing maintenance and support costs for the new scanners are missing. It's likely that scanner models and features will change over the five year purchasing cycle. It is unclear how long it will be before the court must replace the scanners with new models. It's unclear if the $3,600 of AS/400 disk storage is required for one or for 93 AS/400s. Scanned images require more storage than native documents. Detailed personnel costs are not included. It is unclear if the costs that are listed are net of expected personnel cost savings. It's difficult to evaluate the adequacy of the programming cost estimate without more detailed information. $25,000 implies a seven to ten week effort -- is that enough? I can find no reference to how the ESP is to be compensated.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
05-02	Nebraska Supreme Court	Digital Audio Recorders

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 intended to replace aging analog tape recorders in Nebraska County Courtrooms with digital audio recorders. This is a multi-year project that was started in FY 2007. All courtroom proceedings are recorded on analog tape recorders. The tapes are either stored or transcribed depending upon the requirements of the case or proceeding. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was notified in June 2006 by Lanier Corporation that Lanier will no longer produce the analog recorders after 2007 and all remaining support will cease approximately five years later.

The AOC tested three digital audio recorders in April –June 2006. The tests proved very successful and the audio quality was superior to that of the analog recording devices. The AOC then worked with State Purchasing to bid the digital audio recorders. The bid was awarded in August 2006. The AOC is presently replacing 21 analog recorders in FY 2007 using a deficit appropriation of $29,000 and shifting some $55,315.00 in existing internal funds (the reason there are some internal funds available was due to an error in NIS which did not show receipt of funds received from Nebraska.gov for several months in FY 2006, going forward those monies will be used to provide additional personal computers to trial court staff.) to cover the cost. Going forward the AOC intends to replace all of the analog recorders over the next three years at a total cost of $495,440.00.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Digital Audio Recorders

FY2007 Existing Dollars

Costs for DAR's	**Each**	**21 Units**
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$ 37,695.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$ 13,545.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$ 210.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$ 525.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$ 1,575.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$ 5,565.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$ 59,115.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$ 25,200.00
Total	$4,015.00	**$ 84,315.00**

Deficit Appropriation	$29,000.00
AOC Internal Funds	$55,315.00
	$84,315.00

FY2008 New Funding		
Costs for DAR's	**Each**	**25 Units**
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$ 44,875.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$ 16,125.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$ 250.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$ 625.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$ 1,875.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$ 6,625.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$ 70,375.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$ 30,000.00
FY 2008 Total	$4,015.00	**$ 100,375.00**

FY2009 New Funding		
Costs for DAR's	**Each**	**25 Units**
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$ 44,875.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$ 16,125.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$ 250.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$ 625.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$ 1,875.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$ 6,625.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$ 70,375.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$ 30,000.00
Total	$4,015.00	**$ 100,375.00**
Douglas County Court System (centralized)		**12 Units**
Budget estimate		$ 100,000.00
Annual Maintenance		$ 10,000.00
		$ 110,000.00
FY2009 Total		**$ 210,375.00**

FY2010 New Funding		
Costs for DAR's	**Each**	**25 Units**
Liberty Court Recorder Software	$1,795.00	$ 44,875.00
6 - Port Mixer	$ 645.00	$ 16,125.00
Roxio CD Software	$ 10.00	$ 250.00
Headset	$ 25.00	$ 625.00
Foot Pedal	$ 75.00	$ 1,875.00
Annual Maintenance	$ 265.00	$ 6,625.00
Sub Total	$2,815.00	$ 70,375.00
Laptop (Lease from OCIO)	$1,200.00	$ 30,000.00

FY 2010 Total	$4,015.00	**$ 100,375.00**

Total County Courtrooms for DAR Units **108 Units**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	14	13.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	24	22	23	23.0	25
5: Technical Impact	19	14	19	17.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	8	8.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	7	10	9.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	15	17	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**86**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The objectives and outcome are clearly defined. Appears to be a replacement system.	- Assessments methods were not clear
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Tangible benefits were very clear.	- Manufacture and model number for 6-Port Mixer not listed - Central location of equipment and bandwidth requirements are not addressed. Do not give an estimated cost for training transcribers.
5: Technical Impact	- Project described well.	- Weakness not stated is computer reliability and durability - The bandwidth requirements of an MP3 format being transferred was not addressed. Backup procedures were not addressed regarding off site, etc.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The implementation plan is well defined.	- Experience of Project Team not listed.
7: Risk Assessment		- No contingency plan outlined if the new system goes down. New security risks that come with digital media are not addressed in risk assessment.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget		- In FY 2009 the Douglas County Court System (centralized) cost are more than twice as expensive per unit as the others with no explanation. Ongoing Laptop lease and Annual Software Maintenance costs are not explained. - Initial support is addressed but on-going cost and support is not addressed. Cost of technology refresh is not addressed. Cost allocation of lease program is totaled by year instead of the cost being spread out for the life of the lease. No estimated expense for training. Annual maintenance shows 21 units the first year but those 21 units are not

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		accruing into FY08. FY08 shows annual maintenance charges just on 25 units and does not include the 21 from FY07.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-01	Department of Roads	Expansion of Falcon DMS to Agencywide Use

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]

To expand the Falcon Document Management System license to cover all agency (NDOR) employees and acquire the Automate Program Interfaces (APIs) to allow interfacing to in-house developed applications.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(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							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							$ -
8.2 Software							$ -
8.3 Network		$ 494,250.00					$ 494,250.00
8.4 Other			$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,014,932.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 494,250.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,509,182.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds		$ 494,250.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,509,182.00
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 494,250.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 253,733.00	$ 1,509,182.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	9	14	10	11.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	15	20	20	18.3	25
5: Technical Impact	10	17	16	14.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	6	8	6.3	10
7: Risk Assessment	5	8	7	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	12	16	15	14.3	20
			TOTAL	**71**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Identifies specific objectives - It is clear at a basic level what the desired outcome is expected to be. The product is already in use within the agency.	- Think they confused Automate Program Interface with Application Program Interface. Not sure if they have to increase the number of licenses they need. Not very clear on how important this system

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		really is from the information provided. The writer assumes we already understand what the system is all about. - Objective 3 (expand to all agency documents) doesn't identify specific additional business areas for implementation - Weakness may be in the cost to expand this solution and the technical requirements to implement and maintain this software.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Goals of reducing storage space for documents and eliminating multiple copies are valid. The fact that the software is already in use and this would be an expansion of current use is a strength. Other solutions were evaluated in 2000 when this product was selected is mentioned.	- Justification is based on the fact that they already spent a lot of money on this and retraining costs would be too high. However they do not provide any evidence of that. - Does not address implications of doing nothing ...
5: Technical Impact	- Enhancement of current capabilities seems straightforward - Strength is that this is an expansion of existing technology.	- Comments like - "I would hazard a guess..." and "To the best of my knowledge..." do not give this reviewer the confidence to say that the author has met the requirement of this part. What is the existing infrastructure? I have no knowledge of that the "in-house" applications are that will interface with this system. That being the case one can't say if this will continue to work they way they want it to. Very limited detail provided. - Implementation of new API's could present technical challenges that aren't addressed. I wonder if an imaging solution such as this also presents scalability issues - if so they aren't addressed. - Weakness is that the impact of expanding this software in terms of technical impact and is not well defined. An example of technical impact would be any issues related to all documents being stored centrally and making them available to office locations across the state. Will the current network and hardware configuration support this change?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- At least one new area (ARMS) appears to be ready to utilize the new capability planned in this proposal. - The strength is the expanded use of current software.	- Once the API's are provided a lot of programming work still has to take place. The author does not provide any detail on how that will progress and to what time schedule. Training requirements are glossed over. Not even a little detail. - Doesn't identify sponsor, timelines, or roles required to implement. - The plan to implement does not provide much detail on how this software will be implemented. It appears to be a minor upgrade, but the goals of agency wide use are not clearly addressed.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
7: Risk Assessment	- Strength is that software is already installed; this project only expands current use.	- Again very little detail. One could assume this is a very easy thing to do and yet it could be rather complicated. In that they have had this project for at least six years there must be some positive things to say about it in terms of cost savings already experienced. What has been the training experience been already? How many hours? Is there on-line help built in the system? What about accessibility standards? - The possibility of impact to current technical environment is not described. If scope of project is to retrieve existing stored documents into existing applications, risk should be minimal. The expansion of this solution to other document types and multiple locations could add addition risk. If these issues have not been considered, then stated goals of project may not be achieved without additional costs.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Expansion of existing software.	- Sketchy at best. Are there hardware costs with this upgrade? Training costs? Costs to modify existing applications?? - The numbers seem reasonable, but I'm having difficulty matching the Financial Analysis and Budget form with the detailed costs listed in item 16. - Software is offered with multiple options, if the requirements have not been correctly identified the cost to implement may be greater than budgeted.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-03	Department of Roads	Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) Enhancement

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]

Enhance the existing Highway Condition Reporting System (HCRS) application to automate the exchange of road condition and incident/event information with the new Nebraska State Patrol (NSP) Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System and with other State Departments of Transportation Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS). Build a training version of HCRS to provide a system for training internal users without impacting the live data which feeds to the public 511 Advanced Traveler Information System. Provide 511 data to handheld device users and at Interstate rest area kiosks in a streamlined format. Improve the appearance of the existing HCRS/TIP public website map. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Earmark funds have already been approved by the Federal Highway Administration, allocated and obligated to NDOR with the intent of offsetting half of the enhancement costs.

FUNDING SUMMARY

$200,000 has been contributed by the FHWA as an element of the FY-02 approved Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Earmark work plan, $200,000 is the State's required match to the ITS Earmark and $200,000 has been set aside for system administration, operation and maintenance throughout the five-year contract.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	15	10	13.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	23	24	23	23.3	25
5: Technical Impact	13	19	10	14.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	7	8.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	7	0	5.3	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	8	10	12	10.0	20
			TOTAL	**74**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The outlined goals and objectives related to enabling the updating, enhancing and sharing data between multiple users of street/highway centerline data are laudable and if done correctly has the potential to benefit a wide range of users of this data and therefore should be aggressively pursued.	- A major concern with this proposal is the relative absence of any significant discussion of the geospatial base map upon which this system will be based (see Section 5). While not discussed in this proposal, is my understanding that at the present time the planned NSP CAD system will be based on a different roads centerline base map than that currently used by the Nebraska NCRS system. It is also my understanding that neither the current NCRS geospatial base map, nor the proposed NSP base map is comprehensive (local roads?) or, in the case of the NSP data, complete statewide. Is movement to a common base map anticipated or planned? Is such a change in base map reflected in NDOR's

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		comprehensive information technology plan? Has the NDOR GIS division/section been involved in any discussion related to a possible change of centerline base maps? If there is not currently a plan to move to a common road centerline database, it is likely that these factors will introduce significant hurdles in arranging for data exchange, translation, and maintenance between these systems. These hurdles would appear to be significant enough to merit an explicit delineation of objectives related to resolving these issues. The absence of any objective related to these issues raises questions about how well this aspect of the project has been explored.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- There are a wide range of benefits to be gained from enhancing the ability to harvest and integrate information on the highway, road and street conditions and increasing the ability to provide this enhanced data to a broad range of users in a broad range of formats. Based on the potential benefits, this reviewer rates this aspect of the proposal highly.	- Other solutions are vague. - Appears to be an enhancement to a current system. Other solutions were not considered, but it's possible this project could be replaced following upcoming District Operations Center software selection. It's unclear when the DOC selection is planned, if it's very soon, it might make sense to delay implementation until it's determined if DOC software will replace the HCRS, and how quickly that might happen. - It would appear to this reviewer, that a key to efficient and reliable harvesting, integrating and disseminating road condition data, from multiple sources, would be the development of either a common base map and/or common data translation standards. Unless this project incorporates significant coordination efforts in this area, instead of helping to achieve the potential data sharing benefits outlined in this project justification section, this proposal may actually result in the development and/or perpetuation of yet another non-compatible system that would place hurdles in the way of efficient data exchange that could benefit us all (see Section 5 for additional comments).
5: Technical Impact	- Enhancement to an existing, reliable system. - The proposed enhanced system is to be built on a hardware, software, and communications system that has proven reliability track record.	- No technical elements and no weaknesses. - Access for visually impaired (although the current system has a NITC exemption on this point). - The major thrust and benefits of this proposed project are directly related to developing systems to efficiently facilitate data exchange, integration and sharing. However, as noted before in this review, a major concern with this proposal is the relative absence of any significant discussion of the geospatial base map upon which this system will be based. While it is possible that issues related to base map incompatibility have been considered, it is

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		not at all apparent in this proposal, as submitted. While not discussed in this NDOR proposal, is my understanding that at the present time the planned NSP CAD system will be based on a different roads centerline base map than that currently used by the Nebraska NCRS system. It is also my understanding that neither the current NCRS geospatial base map, nor the proposed NSP base map is comprehensive (local roads?) or, in the case of the NSP data, complete statewide. Is movement to a common base map between the NCRS system and the NSP CAD system anticipated or planned? Is such a change in base map reflected in NDOR's comprehensive information technology plan? Has the NDOR GIS division/section been involved in any discussion related to a possible change of centerline base maps or if not the translation and integration of data between these two base map systems? The proposal also refers to this project as being a possible transition to a new District Operations Center (DOC) software solution. What will be the roads centerline base map for this new system? If there is to ultimately be a base map change, will this proposal facilitate that change? Have communications related to this base map issue been initiated with either the Nebraska Public Service Commission (the primary developer of NSP data) and/or the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee. If there is not currently a plan to move to a common road centerline database, it is likely that these factors will introduce significant hurdles in arranging for data exchange, translation, and maintenance between these systems. The absence of any significant discussion related to these data issues raises questions about how well this core aspect of the project has been explored. Also not discussed in this proposal is the scope of this proposed project, specifically relative to local road systems. Is it the plan to ultimately integrate local roads into this NCRS system? It is my understanding that the current NCRS system includes only a limited subset of local roads. If local roads are to be integrated into the system, how will location of an incident or road condition be referenced? Unlike state highways, most local roads do not have mile marker post for

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		locational reference. The most readily available locational reference for local road incidents are street addresses. It is my understanding that current the NDOR NCRS roads base map system does not currently have any street address information. How would an incident reported by the NSP CAD system (which will have street address information reference) be translated into the NDOR NCRS system? A central component of this proposal is the exchange of data with the NSP new CAD system. However, there is also no information in the proposal as to whether the new NSP CAD system has a built-in data exchange system or whether the NSP will need to contract for the development of a data exchange subsystem for their CAD in order to facilitate this data exchange.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- No Project Team experiences listed - Project Sponsors should be identified by name. - Question # 10 makes reference to three (3) and possibly four (4) GIS Map Updates, but there is no milestone reference to adoption of geospatial base map standards or data transfer standards.
7: Risk Assessment	- SLA agreement with consultant seems strong, and includes financial penalties for non performance	- Barriers and risks listed are vague. Upgrades always have risks. - A project that includes multiple agencies, and multiple state partners, likely involves communication and coordination of activities risks that are not recognized here. - As has been outlined before (Section 5), this reviewer sees the greatest potential risk to this proposed data exchange and integration project to be that of data incompatibility. Data incompatibility between the NSP CAD and current NCRS system could create major hurdles to the efficient exchange and integration of street centerline condition data between these two systems. While the project planners may have made provisions to address these potential data incompatibility problems, there is little reference to that in the proposal as submitted. The proposal also refers to this project as being a possible transition to a new District Operations Center (DOC) software solution. If these potential data incompatibility/data exchange problems are not addressed as a part of the current proposed project, they will likely become even more difficult to resolve in later projects as various agencies and

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		agency subsections become increasingly invested in overlapping, incompatible data structures and processes.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No financial information, No hardware information, No on-going and replacement cost information, No non-stated funding sources and funds information. - Section 6, question 12 identifies 700 hours of project management requirements annually, but doesn't seem to be included in the responses to question 16. - While the answers to two of the questions in this section of the Project Proposal Form refer to “Included in the attached spreadsheet”, there appears to be no attached spreadsheet. Therefore it is difficult for this reviewer to comment on or assess the appropriateness of the budget.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

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	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
37-02	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering – Adjudication

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 is a multi-year project that will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Adjudication section of the court. These enhancements will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendations from a consultant engaged in Fiscal Year 2006-07.

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 projects key technology is Computer Managed Workflow.

Project Update
An RFP was issued and awarded for a workflow consultant. With the assistance of the consultant, court will issue an RFI and RFP for the purpose of selecting and procuring workflow software by the end of the biennium. The court will have also started the initial installation and training on this software with the goal of having completed a pilot implementation.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Adjudication Re-engineering

(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)	FY2010-11 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other	$ 25,000.00	$ 75,000.00					$ 100,000.00
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training	$ 16,000.00	$ 10,000.00					$ 26,000.00
6. Travel	$ 8,000.00	$ 4,000.00					$ 12,000.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1a Hardware - One Time	$ 30,000.00				$ 30,000.00		$ 60,000.00
8.1b Hardware - Cont	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ 25,200.00
8.2a Software - One Time	$ 355,000.00						$ 355,000.00
8.2b Software - Cont		$ 71,000.00	$ 74,550.00	$ 78,277.50	$ 82,191.38	$ 86,300.94	$ 392,319.82
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 438,200.00	$ 164,200.00	$ 78,750.00	$ 82,477.50	$ 116,391.38	$ 90,500.94	$ 970,519.82
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds	$ 438,200.00	$ 164,200.00	$ 78,750.00	$ 82,477.50	$ 116,391.38	$ 90,500.94	$ 970,519.82
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 438,200.00	$ 164,200.00	$ 78,750.00	$ 82,477.50	$ 116,391.38	$ 90,500.94	$ 970,519.82
		Biennium Total	$ 242,950.00				

2.4 Other

Professional Contract Services to assist in the completion of the installation, configuration, etc. of purchased software

8.1a Hardware - One Time **$30,000**

Servers & Server Replacements (Prod & Test) $30,000

***

8.1b Hardware - Cont **$4,200**

CIO Data Center Footprint $4,200

***

8.2a Software - One Time **$355,000**

Workflow Software $355,000

***

8.2b Software - Cont **$71,000**

Annual License Renewals, Subscriptions, Maintenance Agreements $71,000

***

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	11	11	11.7	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	21	21	18	20.0	25
5: Technical Impact	18	16	16	16.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	5	6	6.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	8	7	8.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	15	18	16.0	20
			TOTAL	**78**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Good description of workflow benefits. Good description of metrics. Clearly tied to agency technology plan. - Application of workflow management on activities of court. Properly applied, activity should result in productivity gains. Continuation of long term improvements to overall system.	- Still a bit unclear as to what the specific goals of this specific project proposal are... - Desired outcomes not expressed in measurable terms. Limits ability to develop cost/benefit analysis. Workflow directed at adjudication. No mention of reusability of workflow manager on other tasks. - Until the consultant completes the work on the RFI and RFP for the workflow software it will be difficult at best to fully answer this section.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good explanation of the reasons to consider moving to some new technology solution. - Identification of weaknesses of current system processes. Workflow manager should improve those processes. Strong narrative description of desired outcomes.	- Limited explanation, at least in any detail, of specific benefits that will be attained from this project - especially given the significant financial investment for this project. Overly general description of options reviewed in the course of formulating this project. - Outcomes described in generic terms. Implied redesign of current system without impact analysis of other processes. No measures for return on investment. - Again, this reviewer feels that without the actual workflow software known, the benefits are very weak or questionable at best.
5: Technical Impact	- Good description of how new technology must fit within existing environment. Evidence of "good faith" efforts to consider and meet all appropriate standards and guidelines. - Describes incorporation of workflow manager into existing environment. Describes benefits within computing environment. - This section part 7 was done very well.	- Not much available detail, since the project is still early - "pre-RFP results".... - Describes desired outcomes, but does not address detailed requirements to achieve outcome. Financial request appears to support hardware/software purchase. This reviewer cannot find estimates, other than training, for the level of programming and business analysis necessary to achieve described outcome. - In this section part 8 was again limited and weak as the actual workflow software is unknown and the statement reads "Computer Managed Workflow must prove

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		to be highly reliable..." . How can one know that when the software has not been selected?
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good general description of what needs to occur in the overall project. Appears to be a solid project team. - RFI/RFP process correctly described after analysis and evaluation of architectural requirements. Courts project team identified.	-Still early in project to provide specific and/or detailed project plan information. - This section scored low because budget request and narrative is for purchase of workflow manager, but implementation section appears to address alternative technologies. The reviewer would assume that alternatives would have been evaluation before decision to purchase workflow manager. While court project team has been identified, no estimates for contract resources appear in the document or budget request. - Project Plans are tentative and may be revised based on a consultant's recommendations.
7: Risk Assessment	- Thorough identification of both technical and people-based risks - along with approaches to mitigate those risks. - General risks identified and response appropriate.	- Two general risks are inherent in project. First is risk associated with the selection of product on which to build workflow managed solution. This seems to be addressed. The second is risk associated with the process of reengineering the adjudication process. Since the request seems to document the selection process, the risk associated with development has scant documentation. - This reviewer had a difficult time understanding the format of the barriers/risks and the strategies to minimize the risks. The format used consisted of bullet points and sub-bullet points.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Reasonable financial estimates. - Budget is well documented for software/hardware acquisition and training. Costs over time are identified. - Not requesting General Fund dollars.	- Still early in project - financial estimates could still vary significantly - Budget is for hardware/software and training. Contract services are not identified, and the level of service required is not documented in narrative nor budget. Other than hardware/software, no budget information for cost or impact for development.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
37-03	Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering – Vocational Rehabilitation

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 continuation of a multi-year project that 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. 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's additional key technologies are:

- Adhoc Message Composition, Secured Message Delivery, and Electronic Message Reception

This project will also provide the court with monies for contract programming during development phases.

Project Update

Phase 1, VRS Counselor Certification Notification & Assignment System, is in the final stages of development, testing, and conversion. This phase introduced electronic document management and the outgoing message management (programmatic communications by email, efax, and letter). This phase was scheduled to be completed in the 1st Qtr of FY2005-06, but because of higher priority projects and introduction of new technologies is now projected to be completed in the 1st Qtr of FY2006-07.

Phase 2, VRS Case Management will focus on VRS Case Management and re-engineer data, programs, and processes associated with managing Workers Compensation Rehabilitation Cases.

This phase will also introduce to the court integrated adhoc outgoing message composition which will allow staff to compose free-form communications that will be programmatically rendered to PDF, saved in the integrated Case/Document management repository, and then delivered by email, electronic fax, or letter. It will also address Secured Message Delivery, and Electronic Message Reception It will also address Secured Message Delivery, and Electronic Message Reception.

FUNDING SUMMARY

VR Re-engineering

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	Request for FY2009-10 (Year 3)	Request for FY2010-11 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming	$ 10,000.00	$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00				$ 70,000.00
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs		$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$ 12,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1a Hardware - One Time		$ 20,000.00					$ 20,000.00
8.1b Hardware - Cont			$ 3,000.00	$ 3,450.00	$ 3,967.50	$ 4,562.63	
8.2a Software - One Time	$ 5,000.00	$ 35,000.00					$ 40,000.00
8.2b Software - Cont		$ 7,000.00	$ 8,050.00	$ 9,257.50	$ 10,646.13	$ 12,243.04	$ 47,196.67
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 15,000.00	$ 94,400.00	$ 43,450.00	$ 15,107.50	$ 17,013.63	$ 19,205.67	$ 204,176.79
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds	$ 15,000.00	$ 94,400.00	$ 43,450.00	$ 15,107.50	$ 17,013.63	$ 19,205.67	$ 204,176.79
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 15,000.00	$ 94,400.00	$ 43,450.00	$ 15,107.50	$ 17,013.63	$ 19,205.67	$ 204,176.79
		Biennium Total	$ 137,850.00				

2.2 Programming
Represents use of contract programming to develop specific applications and interfaces to Office of the CIO systems

7. Operating Costs **$2,400**
Secured Email Transaction Fees $2,400

***

8.1a Hardware One Time
File transfer applicance $20,000

8.1b Hardware Cont
Maintenance, support, replacement costs

8.2a Software One Time **$35,000**
Message Composition Software $5,000
Electronic Message Reception Software $30,000

***

8.2a Software Cont
Support,upgrades, etc.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	14	12	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	22	19	19	20.0	25
5: Technical Impact	16	14	17	15.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	8	8	7.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	7	6	6.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	17	18	17.0	20
			TOTAL	**79**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clearly identifies beneficiaries. Measurement and assessment techniques reasonably well documented. - Continuation of VRS information management and re-engineering to include ad hoc message composition, secure message delivery, and message reception.	- In this reviewer's opinion, goals and objectives are lost in extended narrative about other parallel activities. More precise, explicit statement of goals and objectives would have been helpful. - Acquisition is for secured mail and file transfer capabilities and for new software for message composition and attachment of incoming messages to individual cases. Presumption is that out-going and in-coming messages contain machine readable metadata in order to integrate with management systems. For this to occur there must be standards between the sending and receiving systems that understand the metadata. PDF does not provide the metadata. Secured e-mail allows for receipt of unstructured and unsolicited communications. Without metadata standards, the requirement to integrate e-mail messages with the case management system may not be obtainable. Out going message formatting also requires metadata and could probably be developed without a requirement for additional 3rd party software. - Expected outcomes section is lacking in what exactly are the beneficial outcomes? Are they speed to process, ease of use, lower cost per transaction?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Reasonable explanation of additional services/capabilities that will be gained by virtue of implementing this project. Reasonable recounting of solutions under evaluation. - Describes life-cycle data management requirements. Describes intelligent document composition requirements. States requirement for secured message delivery.	- By some elements of the description, parts of this project are still in preliminary phases and cannot be described in precise detail. - Although this reviewer understands the need for life-cycle data management, I fail to understand how the key technologies apply to this requirement. Secured message delivery can be secured as an application instead of requiring secured e-mail. As part of an application, the integration of metadata

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		incorporated into a message as described would make more sense. Assuming e-mail is for ad-hoc messages that are external to electronic filing; this reviewer can understand the initiation of secured e-mail from the court. I'm unsure about the process to receive secured e-mail from outside the court. Electronic scanning of FAX or documents to create the metadata described in the request seems problematic without standards for the content of the document or standards for sending and receiving secured e-mail. - In part 5 of this section the writer fails to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the solution.
5: Technical Impact	- Reasonably good inventory of technical elements that will make up the environment. - Describes a vision for message management, secure mail, file transfer, and electronic filing. - The project is trying to work with the Office of the CIO for the Secure Email component of the project. The project is working with the OCIO on several fronts on this project.	- Reasonably good inventory of technical elements that will make up the environment. - Seeks to enhance current environment by procuring additional software, the general functionality of which is achievable without a requirement for additional software. Unsure as to what this additional software provides, unless required by the Borland Delphi/Oracle/Windows application. Unsure of the duplication of the file transfer appliance/Domino requirement since those requirements exist in current environment. References to ad-hoc message conversion to metadata are suspect without standards to define the data.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project team appears to have ample experience and skills. - Describes process for implementation.	- Descriptions of milestones are very general, without much detail. Significant training requirements are mentioned, but without much detail as to an exact approach or curriculum of courses. - Three key acquisitions and deployments are inherent in process. Implementation of message creation. Secured e-mail for message delivery. Programmatic redirecting of FAX and e-mail into integrated manager. All are to be implemented in a year. Given prior slippage, and other projects, the implementation may slip. In addition, a question about which problem to solve first comes to mind. Should the court address standards, and then acquire technology. Or acquire technology, and then address standards. - Reads like major training activities will be necessary.
7: Risk Assessment	- Both technical and organizational risks are identified. - Describes risks associate with project.	- Mitigation strategies are only generally described. - Risks are defined from an implementation perspective. The greater risk appears to be in the development. The question of receiving secured e-mail from without the

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		agency would require all suppliers of information to agree to a set of standards. Those standards do not exist in the WWW. - Very weak on discussion of barriers/risks and strategies to mitigate the risks.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Elements within budget seem plausible. - Budget has both procurement and cost over time identified. - No General Funds being requested.	- Both in other sections of this project proposal, and specifically here in the documentation of budget information, more information on hardware would have been useful. - Budget document is for hardware and software necessary for message management and e-mail. Training is identified. Document refers to contract program services, but aren't reflected in the budget. If they are, they are not identified to the extent it would seem necessary to implement the life-cycle management system, the message system, the secure e-mail system, and the integration of unstructured data into a structured data management system. Would predict that the project will slip due to lack of resources for development and implementation.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-01	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Satellite Reconfiguration Project

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]

For the past 16 years, satellite systems established by the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) have delivered distance learning across the state. Nebraska, with its large geographic size (77,354 square miles) and low population density (1,747,214 residents) has been well served by this satellite network. From bringing classes to remote corners of the state to making possible a wide range of two-way communication, Networks 1, 2 and 3 have helped transform the educational landscape of Nebraska. While current technology in Networks 2 and 3 efficiently delivers video and audio signals, technology upgrades to these systems would add even greater value to the State's investment.

The proposed satellite reconfiguration would upgrade Networks 2 and 3 from audio/video-based channels to Internet Protocol (IP). This reconfiguration would also provide improved integration with Network Nebraska and would comply with NITC-adopted statewide standards for communications and for video and audio requirements. This will enable NET to directly connect with Education and Telehealth videoconferencing networks and with Network Nebraska, maximizing the State's investment in satellite transponders and relieving traffic in the Network Nebraska system. There are locations in the state where Network Nebraska has difficulty supplying sizable bandwidth cost effectively. Coordinating with the State Division of Communications and the University of Nebraska, specific locations (identified by bandwidth need) will be able to access existing satellite bandwidth passing IP data just as they would through the terrestrial portion of Network Nebraska. State agencies need to move a great deal of non-Internet data files every day that are not immediately time sensitive. IP connectivity through the satellite would allow delivery of these files reducing traffic over the terrestrial connection. This would allow Internet and non-Internet data to move faster where the terrestrial path is insufficient.

NET proposes to upgrade Network 3 (two-way), in FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 (Phase 1), with Network 2 (one-way) undergoing a technology upgrade in FY 2009-2010 and FY 2010-2011 (Phase 2). This project is being done in consultation with the Division of Communications and the partners managing of Network Nebraska.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(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							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials		$ 187,500.00	$ 222,500.00	$ 338,500.00	$ 411,000.00		$ 1,159,500.00
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training		$ 10,000.00					$ 10,000.00
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							$ -
8.2 Software		$ 50,000.00		$ 40,000.00			$ 90,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 247,500.00	$ 222,500.00	$ 378,500.00	$ 411,000.00	$ -	$ 1,259,500.00
General Funds							$

	Item	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	Total
Phase 1	Modem (DMD 20 Radyne)	$ 33,000.00	$ 198,000.00			
Phase 1	IP Switch (Cisco 3750)	$ 6,000.00	$ 6,000.00			
Phase 1	Packeer Packet Shaper	$ 5,500.00	$ 5,500.00			
Phase 1	Firewall (Cisco PIX 525)	$ 13,000.00	$ 13,000.00			
Phase 1	Video Conference Bridge Upgrade	$ 95,000.00	$ -			
Phase 1	Multiplexer (TMX 2010 Motorola)	$ 35,000.00	$ -			
Phase 1	Management System (Radyne-ILC)	$ 50,000.00	$ -			
Phase 1	Training	$ 10,000.00				
Phase 2	Encoders SE 4000			$ 120,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	Server DELL 2850			$ 5,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	Multiplexer (TMX 2010 Motorola)			$ 35,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	DVB Modulator Miteq DVM 100			$ 8,500.00	$ 8,500.00	
Phase 2	Software			$ 40,000.00	$ -	
Phase 2	Satellite Receive Systems (DOC)			$ 14,000.00	$ 21,000.00	
Phase 2	ATSC Receive Systems (DOC)			$ 6,000.00	$ 6,500.00	
Phase 2	Receivers			$ 150,000.00	$ 375,000.00	
		$ 247,500.00	$ 222,500.00	$ 378,500.00	$ 411,000.00	$ 1,259,500.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	9	14	11.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	18	10	24	17.3	25
5: Technical Impact	16	12	19	15.7	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	5	9	7.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	13	19	16.3	20
			TOTAL	**77**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Move to IP network. Building on past expenditures. Ability to pass traffic other than video/audio, i.e. just data. Common Ticket system - The project, as described, would bring great benefit to Nebraska education as well as other sectors.	- I think there needs to be more testing or a pilot to determine the true usefulness of the technology. I don't think the State Agencies will be able to use this technology. Network Nebraska Design could mean just 3-4 sites across the state for 2 way. - Beneficiaries are somewhat vague "current and future users". No documented need for switching to IP. What does this project solve as there is no identified problem. - The goals and objectives fail to mention the potential usage of delivering rich media content to many locations around the State without incurring terrestrial transport bandwidth.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Greater integration with Network Nebraska. IP network support. Trying to meet the requirements of the NITC for IP video support. Will need to do something to continue supporting video network.	- Probably won't be used in the common State and University data networks. Pilot of the actual usefulness would be helpful Yet to be determined how to integrate in to the Network Nebraska network.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	Could be useful if there were a lot static content to be delivered - Would meet the standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing but other solutions might meet this also. - The business case and project justification is well constructed. The cost/benefit ratio is favorable and would allow Nebraska more integrated options for its IP traffic.	- What are the future bandwidth costs they are defraying? For the amount of money being requested there is not a good economic return on investment outlined. Who are the specific customers that are asking for this. Hard to understand what the definable benefits are to the State of Nebraska.
5: Technical Impact	- Moves NET network to support video standards set by the NITC. Satellite's have been reliable for their video networks - Project is described well. - The technical advantage of IP over satellite needs to happen; it's only a question of when. With satellite transponder leases through 2012, the sooner the conversion, the sooner that this bandwidth can be employed for utilitarian or specialized purposes. The increased interoperability with Network Nebraska is advantageous.	- If purpose is to increase IP bandwidth, number of sites may be able to be reduced to a much lower number, due to design of Network Nebraska. System will have limited IP bandwidth. - Latency delays not addressed. Not much detail given for security or reliability.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Plan can be accomplished as listed. - Implementation plan is reasonable. - With the LB 1208 implementation and upgrade of over 300 education entities by August 2009, this satellite digitization upgrade plan will match the timeline for the terrestrial upgrade.	- Concern over number of sites that need upgraded. - Would it not be possible to accelerate the Phase 2 Net 2 upgrade timeline so that more post-conversion use will be gained before the transponder lease expires?
7: Risk Assessment	- Converting from an RF skill set to IP skill set will assist in the availability of support and maintenance functions for the satellite network.	- Concern over actual use of system in real applications, including one way data. - Does not address any risk specific to this project. These are general technical risks for any project.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The four-year implementation and budget plan is doable.	- Costs listed as "supplies and materials". In actual breakout, it doesn't give quantity, so it is difficult to determine. - Do not see any on-going maintenance costs. Return on investment to the State are not clearly defined. - Funding stretches over 3 biennial budgets.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-02	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Public Media Archive and Distribution Project

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]

Technologies and trends are fundamentally reshaping the media landscape. Transition from analog to digital technologies presents a great challenge and a momentous opportunity. Consumers are demanding content that can be accessed anytime and anywhere, on a growing variety of platforms and devices at mind-boggling speed. There is tremendous potential to enhance public service through digital media in education, civic engagement, health care and other important public needs. The “push” of scheduled programming is steadily being replaced by the “pull” of more diverse content selected by consumers – media on “my time” that is also segmented and formatted for delivery not only on television and radio, but also on computers, cell phones, PDAs, iPods and other increasingly portable devices.

More and more Nebraskans are expanding their use of new media “spaces” to access information important to them as citizens and as individuals. New media venues such as Cable Video on Demand, Internet Video and Audio on Demand, Podcasting, Vodcasting, and mobile platforms such as cell phones and PDA’s are becoming as important to Nebraskans as traditional broadcast and cable.

To reach Nebraskans on all current and emerging media platforms, it is necessary to increase public access to the existing media created not only by NET but by other government, educational, and non-profit organizations across the state. To maximize the content produced currently and in the past by NET, it is also necessary to rethink and retool routine production and distribution tasks including capture, logging, editing, transcoding, asset management, administration and archiving content.

A public media Content Management System will optimize the State’s investment in digital technology, creating a more effective repository and distribution system of information important to Nebraska’s civically and culturally-engaged individuals and organizations. The enhanced capabilities will allow "mission-similar" partners interested in adapting the best of their content for widespread distribution across NET’s multicast and broadband services. NET’s broadcast and broadband distribution capacity has the potential to raise the profiles of the presenting organizations and extend the reach of their programs, making them more cost-effective to the presenters and broadening their service to the citizens of Nebraska.

To develop this public media archive and expand its distribution, NET proposes to implement two integrated systems: enterprise content management (ECM), which embraces all the content of an organization, from print documents and images to multimedia and audio and video files; and Web content management (WCM), including all content made available via the Internet, broadband and portable services.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Pulbic Media Archive and Distribution Project

	Item	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	Project Total
Archive						
	Avid Unity ISIS Storage Chassis		$115,000			
	Avid Interplay graphics hardware and software interface		$30,000			
	Xiotec Server Storage for AVID Interplay		$30,205			
	Xiotech Magnitude 3d 3000 e storage			$78,000		
	Storagetek SL-500 LTO tape archive			$89,000		
	Catalyst 6500 firewall/switch with blades and supervisor unit			$100,000		
	Xiotech SATA Raid expansion for radio storage			$39,000		
	Dell Server Poweredge 6850			$14,000		
	Cable and Labor			$36,000		
	ISIS storage expansion				$239,990	
	Cicso License and Maintenance				$14,000	
Broadband Distribution						
	Avid Transcode for multiple media hardware and software		$75,000			
Production						
	Ikigami tapeless field acquisition	$55,000	$55,000	$55,000		
Radio Traffic Management						
	Protrack Software Upgrade	$16,000				
Web Content Management						
	VMWare server memory	$6,000				
	Consultation regarding product specificiation	$8,000				
	OS licenses	$700				
	Web Content Management System (CMS) software	$125,000				
	Training in use of purchased software	$12,000				
	Server licenses	$2,000				
	Consultation regarding migration of existing website	$25,000				
	FY Totals	$249,700	$305,205	$411,000	$253,990	$1,219,895

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	12	13	13.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	23	21	20	21.3	25
5: Technical Impact	18	15	15	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	6	6.7	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	5	5	5.7	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	15	16	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**78**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very good "common language" description of what the project is intended to accomplish. Clear statement of goals. - Good description of NET's needs for content management	- No detail on other providers of content and whether they have agreed to this concept/initiative.
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good review of options considered. - Again, good description of NET's needs to digitize NET content and make it available on demand. Good descriptions of content	- Ideally, more tangible benefit would have been documented. - No detail on non-NET content that would be made available.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
5: Technical Impact	- Good explanation of how the technical environment might work. - Good descriptions of "content mgmt". Strong emphasis on standards.	- Not much comment or information on technical requirements or strategies. - Current NET organization has created the need to improve content management. Not sure I see the detailed description of the system.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Relatively good identification of milestones. - Good Team definition	- Relatively little information about ongoing staff requirements for support - Little detail, but ok since this is preliminary
7: Risk Assessment		- Information provided seems slow to acknowledge the possibility of risk from undertaking something of this size. - There are more risks than those identified.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Plenty of information regarding equipment and software.	- Costs for possible external assistance and/or consulting seem quite low.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-03	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Public Media at the Capitol

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]

"The salvation of the state is watchfulness in the citizen." To serve Nebraskans by keeping pace with today's rapidly evolving technology, NET proposes a communications technology redesign that will dramatically increase the public's access to legislative floor debate, committee hearings, Judiciary proceedings, and communications from the Executive branch, bringing the multimedia technology of the Capitol to current standards. Radio and television technologies will be provided that will replace outmoded systems currently in place, which will guarantee many years of public broadcasting coverage and better access by the state's commercial radio and television stations. Nebraska citizens will have simultaneous access to Internet streams from the floor of the senate, Capitol conference and hearing rooms, the Supreme Court, and the Governor's office, and to a searchable on-line archive of all legislative proceedings. This project is being done in consultation with the State CIO, the Legislative Council, the Office of the Capitol Commission, and the State Judiciary branch. It has the support of the Legislative Council, the Office of the Capitol Commission and Supreme Court.

The proposed equipment upgrade would give the people of Nebraska and beyond greater access to both real-time and archival proceedings originating from all branches of state government. This investment will generate far more coverage of the deliberative workings of the state, available through multiple delivery methods, than ever before.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Item	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11
Judicial				
Appellate Court		$ 32,700.00		
Supreme Court	$ 41,400.00			
Legislative				
Legislative Chamber	$ 131,500.00			
Hearing Room 1510		$ 48,900.00		
Hearing Room 1507		$ 48,900.00		
Hearing Room 1524	$ 48,900.00			
Hearing Room 1525	$ 48,900.00			
Hearing Room 1003			$ 41,400.00	
Hearing Room 1113			$ 41,400.00	
Hearing Room 2102			$ 41,400.00	
Executive				
Governor's Hearing RM	$ 47,100.00			
OCC				
Press Room 1224		$ 152,000.00		
Rotunda	$ 15,400.00			
Warner Chamber				$ 120,000.00
Exterior Access			$ 78,000.00	
Wire Installation	$ 35,000.00			
Custom Camera mount	$ 10,000.00			
Exterior horizontal boring		$ 15,000.00		
Control room renovation	$ 105,000.00			
Room 1224 renovation		$ 40,000.00		

NET				
Control Room	$ 410,600.00			
Bldg Wire Infrastructure	$ 200,000.00			
NET Radio RM 1504.1	$ 18,000.00			
IT software				$294,000.00
IT Encoding hardware				48,605.00
IT Archive hardware				$25,710.00
	FY Totals	$ 1,111,800.00	$ 337,500.00	$ 202,200.00	$ 488,315.00
Project Total	2,139,815.00			

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	14	14	14.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	19	23	17	19.7	25
5: Technical Impact	17	15	16	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	8	6	7.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	6	5	6.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	13	16	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**78**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- High degree of collaboration. Upgrade appears will overdue. - Clearly defined the goals for each branch of government.	
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Most justifications are appropriate. - The benefit to the public would be good. The project is a good one the only concern is would putting in a unified infrastructure be more cost effective than putting in a separate dedicated video infrastructure like is being proposed.	- No intangible benefits listed. Not sure DTV conversion is necessarily tied to this update of the Capitol's video equipment. -Not much detail or justification given for cost of providing temporary technical hardware and labor as opposed to this permanent solution. It would appear no other solutions were evaluated. Not a lot of detail on the overall economic return on investment. No clear understanding on whether the scope of this is larger than it needs to be. Should address the existing infrastructure in the building so we don't end

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		up with separate ones -- need a unified approach.
5: Technical Impact	- Technical impact description is very good	- Detail on equipment technology is lacking, other than what ever it is, it is robust and meets "standards". - Adequate video solution but not a progressive solution -- should be integrated with the existing data infrastructure in the building. Because of the structure of the Capitol and historic integrity, multiple independent infrastructures are not desired. Not much detail on strengths or weaknesses. No alternative solutions or even migration plans using some of the existing equipment in the rooms.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Team well defined - Well defined milestones.	- Details lacking, but this appears to be an initial plan. - Not much detail on roles of the project team.
7: Risk Assessment		- Initiative of this magnitude probably has more risks than those listed. Technology issues, funding issues, building issues. - Not much detail given regarding the historical requirements of the Capitol and how new infrastructure and equipment fits into that building.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Very detailed list of equipment needed. -Good detail and a good project.	- Some items not defined well. - Excellent project for the Capitol if a unified infrastructure was addressed in this proposal. Alternative proposals might have a larger benefit for a lesser cost if other technology needs were combined into this request (voice, data).

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-04	Educational Telecommunications Commission	Final DTV Transmitter Conversion Project

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

NET has met DTV conversion deadlines established by the FCC and now simulcasts in both legacy analog NTSC and in DTV. Federal regulations demand that analog transmission ceases at the end of the simulcast period in February 2009. This requirement for NET to shut down its analog broadcasts will mean changing or replacing some transmitters, antenna systems, and associated equipment not covered by prior state appropriations.

For each transmission site, NET has selected one of the two current simulcast channels for digital-only broadcast by February of 2009, with the other channel then being abandoned to the FCC. At some sites the final selection will be the present DTV channel, requiring less upfront cost, while most will retain the present analog channel number. Long-term savings will result in the latter cases due to the reduced electrical power needed to broadcast at the lower channel frequencies now associated with analog. In each case, however, capitol costs will be associated with analog shut-down. NET will incur these expenses in FY 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, with the removal of obsolete transmitters and antennas occurring in FY's 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Capitol Expenditure Projects Draft Budgets Page 1

Analog Shutdown

	Item	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	Project Total
KHNE Hastings	Upgrade chnl 29 transmitter to digital				$120,000		
KLNE Lexington	Remove chnl 3 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
KMNE Bassett	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 7 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 15 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
KPNE North Platte	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 9 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 16 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Culbertson Translator	Translator replacement	$56,100					
	DTV mask filter	$3,500					
Max/Benkelman Translator	Translator replacement		$56,100				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Wauneta Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
KRNE Merriman	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 12 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Detailed tower analysis			$20,000			
	Top-mount chnl 12 antenna			$250,000			
	1100 ft of 4 inch transmission line			$180,000			
	Install antenna & transmission line			$150,000			
	Remove chnl 17 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
KTNE Angora	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 13 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 24 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Chadron Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Crawford Translator	Translator replacement		$15,500				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Harrison Translator	Translator replacement		$15,500				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
KUON Lincoln	Convert Harris Platinum from NTSC to DTV			$120,000			
	Chnl 12 DTV filter			$35,000			
	Remove chnl 40 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Beatrice Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Blair Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Falls City Translator	Translator replacement	$56,100					
	DTV mask filter	$3,500					
Pawnee City Translator	Translator replacement	$56,100					
	DTV mask filter	$3,500					
KXNE Norfolk	Tune chnl 16 exciters to chnl 19			$5,000			
	Chnl 19 DTV filter			$35,000			

Capitol Expenditure Projects Draft Budgets Page 2

	Item	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	Project Total
	Upgrade chnl 19 transmitter to digital				$60,000		
	Remove chnl 16 antenna & transmission line					$50,000	
Decatur Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Neligh Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Niobrara Translator	Digital exciter		$1,000				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
Vertigre Translator	Translator replacement		$15,050				
	DTV mask filter		$3,500				
KYNE Omaha	Detailed tower analysis				$20,000		
	Top-mount chnl 17 antenna				$250,000		
	Antenna installation				$100,000		
	FY Totals	$ 178,800.00	$147,650	$1,415,000	$550,000	$350,000	$2,641,450
	USDA Federal Grant	$ 178,800.00	$ 116,150.00				
	FY Totals with grant applied		$ 31,500.00	$ 1,415,000.00	$ 550,000.00	$ 350,000.00	$ 2,346,500.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	14	14	14.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	24	24	24.3	25
5: Technical Impact	20	19	16	18.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	10	9	6	8.3	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	17	16	17.7	20
			TOTAL	**92**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Excellent description, all questions answered. Mandated change. - Well defined with specific goals	- A little more detail on the current users of educational services would be useful. How many classrooms/teachers actually use the programs provided by this service. What are the benefits to these users?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- All very appropriate. - Clearly defined mandate for federal compliance. Tangible benefits for a large section of Nebraska. - Federal Mandate is cited.	
5: Technical Impact	- Again well described - Plan leverages existing investment.	- Since they are getting rid of the analog completely, the customers are being forced to either get a digital TV or a digital tuner for their analog TV. Mandated timeline from the feds does not leave NET any flexibility. -Not all technology items have a life of three years, this is broadly misstated. The NITC does have video and audio standards that may apply to some of the systems being discussed here. No mention of the satellite interconnections to this distribution system and that truly is a single point of failure.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Implementation plan is clear and addresses federal mandates. - Appropriate planning is listed for this project.	
7: Risk Assessment	- Great description of risks.	- If FCC would change any mandates or extend them a second time that could affect the project. - No discussion of satellite interconnections and potential risk from that aspect of the project. Finding qualified radio engineering staff will be a risk going forward.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The possibility of getting matching federal funds.	- This reviewer could not tell if all funds being requested were from the General Fund or the NebSat Cash Fund.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist				Technical Panel Comment
	Yes	No	N/A	
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.				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
85-01	Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems	Migration of PIONEER to the jClarity Platform

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 for the migration of the PIONEER application to the Sabre jClarety framework based on J2EE technology and written in Java. The jClarety framework is a functionally rich solution with very stable and robust architecture specifically developed for public retirement systems. The need for this project to be implemented at this time is due to the fact that Forte (the language PIONEER was written in) was purchased by Sun Microsystems. Sun is a big proponent of Java and has decided to completely stop support of Forte. This leaves NPERS and our software system in a potentially dangerous situation not having software support.

FUNDING SUMMARY

PIONEER Migration to JAVA

Services	5,751,000.00
Hardware/Software	772,000.00
Total	**6,523,000.00**

Month	Service Fees	Delivery	Payment Due at Delivery	HoldBack	Cumulative HoldBack
1					
2				$0.00	$0.00
3	$48,107.12	On-line Application - I: Requirements Documentation	$43,296.40	$4,810.71	$4,810.71
4	$221,292.73	On-line Application - I: Detailed Design	$199,163.46	$22,129.27	$26,939.98
4	$221,292.73	On-line Application - I: Integrated and Tested Code	$199,163.46	$22,129.27	$49,069.26
5	$386,000.00	Hardware/Software for Testing	$386,000.00	$0.00	$49,069.26
5	$471,449.73	On-line Application - I: Acceptance Testing	$424,304.75	$47,144.97	$96,214.23
6	$386,000.00	Hardware/Software for Production	$386,000.00	$0.00	$96,214.23
7	$124,422.89	On-line Application - II: Requirements Documentation	$111,980.60	$12,442.29	$108,656.52
8	$572,345.27	On-line Application - II: Detailed Design	$515,110.74	$57,234.53	$165,891.05
9		Hold back on services: On-line Application I	$96,214.23		$69,676.82
10					$69,676.82
11	$572,345.27	On-line Application - II: Integrated and Tested Code	$515,110.74	$57,234.53	$126,911.34
12	$115,020.00	Batch Application: Requirements Documentation	$103,518.00	$11,502.00	$138,413.34
13	$1,219,344.27	On-line Application - II: Acceptance Testing	$1,097,409.85	$121,934.43	$260,347.77
14	$529,092.00	Batch Application: Detailed Design	$476,182.80	$52,909.20	$313,256.97
15					$313,256.97
16					$313,256.97
17		Hold back on services: On-line Application II	$248,845.77		$64,411.20
17	$529,092.00	Batch Application: Integrated and Tested Code	$476,182.80	$52,909.20	$117,320.40
18	$1,127,196.00	Batch Application: Acceptance Testing	$1,014,476.40	$112,719.60	$230,040.00
19					$230,040.00
20					$230,040.00
21					$230,040.00
22		Hold back on services: Batch Application	$230,040.00		$0.00
	$6,523,000.00		**$6,523,000.00**	**$575,100.00**	**$0.00**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	10	10	11.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	20	16	20.3	25
5: Technical Impact	18	12	13	14.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	6	5	6.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	7	5	7.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	17	12	14.7	20
			TOTAL	**74**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Way back at the September 2003 SunNetwork Conference held in San Francisco, Sun Microsystems announced that the Forte/UDS platform will go into maintenance mode starting in 2004. From 2004 to 2008, support for Forte will reduce until it is completely phased out in 2008. During this period, licensing and support costs are expected to rise and minimal new functionality is expected to be added. - Modernization of code is clearly due, and is probably an overriding need. - The steps are described, but very limited information is provided.	- No description of measurement/assessment methods, or of relationship to IT plan. One of the goals seems to be to maintain current vendor relationship ... possibly that's an appropriate goal, but it is a little unusual. - The goal is to migrate to JAVA, because of dropped support for FORTE, using their current vendor. What other options have been considered?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	- Good discussion - Strong description of the criticality of need. - The project is described at a very high level and gives the reader a sense of the impact this system has on the agency and clients.	- No description of other solutions evaluated. Unclear if the architectural benefits mentioned in this section (reduction of support time and effort, use of multi threading batch processes, etc.) have been realized in other implementations of this product. -Because NPERS is working with existing vendor it doesn't appear that many solutions were considered. This recommendation is based on what the current vendor recommended. Has current vendor performed satisfactory to this point?
5: Technical Impact	- Movement to N-tier architecture described. Seems to be an appropriate modernized architecture. - Describes changes when moving from thick client to thin client.	- No discussion about security. Will Explorer be the only browser allowed? What about Firefox or the Mac Safari browser? - No description of specific technology changes included. No description of changed hardware requirements, or of changes to data tier. Reliability, security, scalability, and compliance with NITC standards not addressed. - The impact of moving from client server to web based architecture is not a small undertaking. This change may require rewriting the majority of the application. The

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		impacts to existing interfaces such as NIS are not addressed other than to say it will not change? It is likely that the current hardware used to support PIONEER will not be adequate nor will the skills required to support this environment be similar to the existing solution.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Phased approach with multiple implementations will reduce risk. - Mentions review by CIO staff.	- Did not see any discussion regarding the use of automated migration tools. From what I read it seems we are looking at a total manual re-write of the system. I could not tell if that was the case given the proposal. There are commercially available migration tools that can automate the Forte to Java translation. Has this been explored?? Most Forte projects have taken months and years to develop. If the translation were done manually, then it too would take approximately the same amount of time. A translation tool always generates the same code. This can eliminate programming and typographical errors that may be introduced by manual translation. - No timelines identified. Ongoing support requirements not identified. Technical staffing seems low if goal is to bring any significant portion of the maintenance in-house. Generally, a multiple rollout implementation will require bridging or scaffolding between the new functionality, and the remaining legacy functionality. That is not addressed in this plan. Data migration, or changes to the data tier are not addressed in the project plan. Non functional requirements (usability, security, performance, etc) should be identified early. They don't seem to be addressed in the preliminary plan. Project sponsor and agency project manager not identified. - Project estimates for work without knowing the scope of work to be accomplished seem unrealistic. A demo by Sabre should not be the deciding factor on choosing a vendor or software solution. NPERS current IT staffing seems inadequate based on the size to this project. There is no mention of project management staffing or executive oversight structure or steering group on NPERS side of project. A project of this size requires significant

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		resources from staff to complete. The vendor cannot be relied upon to provide project management alone. There needs to be a check and balance between NPERS and the vendor.
7: Risk Assessment	- The migration of a Forte application to Java, though complex, can be managed successfully with the early adoption of a migration strategy in the lifecycle of a project. - The Iterative development approach proposed should reduce risk and lead to improved quality during the course of the project. - Describes a phased implementation of new solution.	- This is a large project that, by virtue of its size, will bring with it a fair amount of risk. I'm not familiar with the "jClarety Methodology", and can't speak to whether it provides sufficient rigor for a project of this size. I suspect staffing and supportability are risks with this project. It's unclear whether the Agency Business Systems Analyst and IT Staff (6-7 people?) will be assigned full time to this project. If they are not, I suspect there will be a high risk of missed requirements and/or inability to support. The timeline seems very short, introducing schedule risk. The need to scaffold between a legacy and new system in a iterative project also introduces some risks. - Without analysis to existing solution how can we be sure that new solution and old will function along side of each other. This approach requires both old and new applications to be supported at the same time. This approach will add a burden to the development and business staff to maintain and test both solutions as the project moves forward. Moving from client server to web based development and not having current experience in this area is a risk. Not looking at alternate solutions and taking current vendors recommendation is a risk. No evidence of strong project management or oversight by NPERS staff is a risk.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Deliverables based funding, and "holdbacks" are great approaches. - Looks like a price quote.	- Not a lot of detail from my point of view. Does the cost include design and development of the cost by a contractor or does the development actually take place with staff in the IMS department or staff in another state department? Is there funding for migration tools? - As noted earlier, there are a number of items (data migration, non-functional requirements) that should be included in a deliverables based funding plan. It does not appear that this budget includes Agency staff who will be participating in the project.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- Estimates without requirements are dangerous. Is this a fix price quote? What assumptions has the vendor placed on these estimates? If NPERS can not perform to the vendors assumptions are the quotes still valid? The small technical staff at NPERS is not adequate to support an application of this size even with the addition of a developer FTE.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	N/A	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.				