

# MEETING AGENDA

## State Government Council of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Thursday, August 14, 2008  
1:30 p.m. - 2:30 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)

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes\* - [May 8, 2008](#)
4. Standards and Guidelines
  - Recommendations to the Technical Panel and the NITC\*
    - [NITC 5-202](#): Blocking Email Attachments (Revised)
  - Discussion
    - Project Status Reporting - [Example](#)
    - Enterprise Projects - [Statutes](#)
5. Shared Services
  - Email - [Draft Records Retention Policy for Disaster Recovery Back-ups](#)
  - Active Directory
6. Other Business
7. Agency Reports
8. Next Meeting Date - September 11, 2008
9. Adjourn

\* Denotes Action Item

(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.)

Meeting notice was posted to the [NITC website](#) and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on July 2, 2008. The agenda posted to the NITC website on August 10, 2008.

**State Government Council  
of the  
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
Thursday, May 8, 2008, 1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.  
Nebraska State Office Building - Conference Room 6Z  
301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, Nebraska  
**PROPOSED MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Brenda Decker, Chief Information Officer, Chair  
Dennis Burling, Department of Environmental Quality  
Randy Cecrle, Workers' Compensation Court  
Tom Conroy, OCIO-Enterprise Computing Services  
Josh Daws, Secretary of State's Office  
Keith Dey, Department of Motor Vehicles  
Pat Flanagan, Private Sector  
Rex Gittins, Department of Natural Resources  
Joe Kellner, Department of Roads  
Gerry Oligmueller, Budget Office  
Terry Pell, State Patrol  
Doni Peterson, Department of Administrative Services  
Jayne Scofield, OCIO-Network Services  
Len Sloup, Department of Revenue  
Rod Wagner, Library Commission

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bob Beecham, NDE Support Services; Mike Calvert, Legislative Fiscal Office; Dorest Harvey, Private Sector; Lauren Hill, Governor's Policy Research Office; Jeanette Lee, Department of Banking; Butch Lecuona, Department of Labor; Jim Ohmberger, Health and Human Services; Janice Walker, State Court Administrator's Office; Mike Overton, Crime Commission; and Robin Spindler, Department of Correctional Services

**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 present 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](#) on April 15, 2008. The agenda posted to the NITC Website on May 6, 2008. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was located on the front table.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES\* - APRIL 10, 2008**

Mr. Conroy moved to approve the [April 10, 2008](#) minutes as presented. Mr. Dey seconded. Roll call voted: Burling-Yes, Cecrle-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Daws-Yes, Decker-Yes, Dey-Yes, Flanagan-Yes, Kellner-Yes, Oligmueller-Yes, Pell-Yes, Peterson-Yes, Scofield-Yes, Sloup-Yes, and Wagner-Yes. Results: Yes-14, No-0, Abstain-0. Motion carried.

**STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - RECOMMENDATION TO THE TECHNICAL PANEL AND THE NITC  
- [NITC 1-201](#): AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PLAN**

By statute, all agencies are required to submit an information technology plan, and the NITC is responsible for adopting the form that agencies are to use.

Members discussed the draft form. Members suggested adding a separate column for the estimated number of hardware devices the agency will have by the end of the next biennium, and information on the agency's hardware replacement cycle. Members also suggested changes to the network section.

Ms. Scofield left the meeting.

Mr. Cercle moved to recommend approval of NITC 1-201. There was no second.

**Mr. Dey moved to table action on the NITC 1-201: Agency Information Technology Plan. Mr. Pell seconded. Roll call vote: Kellner-Yes, Wagner-Yes, Pell-Yes, Oligmueller-Yes, Dey-Yes, Cecrle-Yes, Daws-Yes, Flanagan-Abstain, Sloup-Yes, Decker-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Peterson-Yes, and Burling-Yes. Results: Yes-12, No-0, Abstain-1. Motion carried.**

Mr. Becker stated that the suggested changes would be made to the form and posted for the 30-day comment period. Members can review the revised version on the NITC website and submit comments or suggested changes prior to final approval.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - RECOMMENDATION TO THE TECHNICAL PANEL AND THE NITC - NITC 1-202: PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS**

The form is the same as has been used for several years. However, the form is now incorporated into the new web-based budget request system, and is to be submitted with the agency's budget request. Agencies no longer have to submit the Word version of the form.

**Mr. Conroy move to recommend approval of [NITC 1-202](#): Project Review Process. Mr. Cercle seconded. Roll call voted: Burling-Yes, Cecrle-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Daws-Yes, Decker-Yes, Dey-Yes, Flanagan-Yes, Sloup-Yes, Kellner-Yes, Oligmueller-Yes, Pell-Yes, Peterson-Yes, and Wagner-Yes. Results: Yes-13, No-0, Abstain-0. Motion carried.**

Mr. Oligmueller left the meeting.

#### **GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY COLLABORATION FUND**

##### **[Suggested Uses](#)**

Members had an opportunity to review the GTCF Ideas submitted to the OCIO. There is approximately \$175,000 of unobligated funds available to fund projects.

**Mr. Pell moved that the Council pursue an email archiving project utilizing the grant funds. Mr. Cecrle seconded. After discussion, Ms. Decker offered a friendly amendment to establish a work group to develop a proposal for the council's review. Mr. Pell and Mr. Cecrle accepted the amendment. Roll call vote: Burling-No, Peterson-Yes, Conroy-Yes, Decker-Yes, Sloup-Yes, Flanagan-Yes, Daws-Yes, Cecrle-No, Dey-Yes, Pell-Yes, Wagner-Yes, and Kellner-Yes. Results: Yes-10, No-2, Abstain-0. Motion carried.**

Members volunteering to serve on the work group: Terry Pell, Keith Dey, Randy Cecrle. Mr. Henderson suggested that, as the proposer, Jim Ohmberger should be involved. Mr. Burling stated he voted "no" due to the lack of a records management component. He was invited to be part of the work group.

Members discussed allowing other projects to be submitted for review by the council. Mr. Becker stated that a Word version of the grant application form will be added as a link to today's agenda for anyone wanting to submit a project proposal.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

## **AGENCY REPORTS**

Members were given an opportunity to provide agency reports.

## **NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the State Government Council will be held on June 12, 2008, 1:30 p.m. The location will be announced at a later date.

**Mr. Pell moved to adjourn. Mr. Dey seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

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

**NITC 5-202 DRAFT****State of Nebraska  
Nebraska Information Technology Commission  
Standards and Guidelines****NITC 5-202 (Draft)**

Title	Blocking Email Attachments
Category	Groupware Architecture
Applicability	Applies to all state government agencies, excluding higher education

**1. Purpose**

It is important to take steps to protect the state's computing environment against the threat of viruses. Email attachments with certain extensions are often used in virus attacks because of their execution access and the amount of damage they can cause. Therefore, the State of Nebraska prohibits certain attachments from being transmitted through email.

**2. Standard****2.1 Removing Prohibited Attachments Before Delivery**

The SMTP gateway will remove any prohibited attachments before allowing the email to be delivered. If any of the blocked extensions are detected, the attachment will be deleted and a message stating that the attachment was blocked will be included in the email message.

**2.2 List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked**

Attachment A, entitled "List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked," contains the current listing of attachments which will be blocked by the State of Nebraska.

**2.3 Alternative Methods for Sending or Receiving Files**

If an individual needs to send or receive a file with one of the blocked extensions, other alternatives for transmitting files should be considered, such as: Secure file transfers (sFTP / FTPS) or Web-based document retrieval.

**[Attachment A](#): List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked**

-----

VERSION DATE: DRAFT - August 6, 2008

HISTORY: Original version adopted on November 13, 2003.

PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

-----

**List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked**

<b>Extension - Description</b>	<b>Internal <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Inbound</b>
ade – Access Project extension (Microsoft)	X	
adp – Access Project (Microsoft)	X	
app – Executable Application	X	
asp – Active Server Page	X	
bas – Basic	X	X
bat – Batch	X	X
cer – Internet Security Certificate File	X	
chm – Compiled HTML Help	X	
cmd – Command	X	X
com – Command, executable	X	X
cpl – Control panel applet	X	X
crt – Certificate File	X	
csh – csh Script	X	
exe – Executable program	X	X
fxp – FoxPro Compiled Source (Microsoft)	X	
gadget – Windows Vista gadget	X	
hlp – Windows Help File	X	
hta – HTML application	X	X
inf – set up	X	X
ins – Internet communications settings	X	X
isp – Internet communications settings	X	X
its – Internet Document Set, Internet Translation	X	
js – JScript	X	X
jse – JScript encoded file	X	X
ksh – UNIX Shell Script	X	
Ink – Shortcut	X	X
mad – Access Module Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maf – Access (Microsoft)	X	
mag – Access Diagram Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mam – Access Macro Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maq – Access Query Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mar – Access Report Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mas – Access Stored Procedure (Microsoft)	X	
mat – Access Table Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mau – Executable Media file	X	
mav – Access View Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maw – Access Data Access Page (Microsoft)	X	
mda – Access Add-in, MDA Access 2 Workgroup (Microsoft)	X	
mdb – Access Application, MBD Access Database (Microsoft)	X	
mde – Access MDE Database File (Microsoft)	X	
mdt – Access Add-in Data (Microsoft)	X	
mdw – Access Workgroup Information (Microsoft)	X	
mdz – Access Wizard Template (Microsoft)	X	
msc – Microsoft common console document	X	X
msi – Install Control file	X	X
msp – Windows installer patch	X	X

mst – Windows installer transform	X	X
ops – Office Profile Settings File	X	
pcd – Visual test (Microsoft)	X	
pif – Windows program information file	X	X
prf – Windows System File	X	
prg – Program file	X	
pst – MS Exchange Access Book File (Microsoft)	X	
reg – Microsoft registry	X	X
scf – Windows Explorer Command	X	
scr – Screensaver	X	X
sct – Windows script component	X	X
shb – Document short cut	X	X
shs – Shell Script object	X	X
test – Test files		X
tmp – Temporary File / Folder	X	
url – Internet shortcut	X	X
vb – VBScript	X	X
vbe – VBScript encoded file	X	X
vbs – Visual Basic	X	X
vsmacros – Visual Studio .NET Binary-based Macro Project	X	
vss – Visio Stencil (Microsoft)	X	
vst – Visio Template (Microsoft)	X	
vsw – Visio Workspace File (Microsoft)	X	
ws – Windows Script File (Microsoft)	X	
wsc – Windows Script component	X	X
Wsf – Windows Script File	X	
wsh – Windows Scripting host settings	X	X
wma – Windows Media Audio		X
wmf – Windows Media File		X

Note:

1 – Microsoft Outlook strips these attachments when sending to another Exchange user within the State of Nebraska.



# Project Status Form

General Information			
Project Name			Date
Sponsoring Agency			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Key Questions			Explanation (if Yes)
1. Has the project scope of work changed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
2. Will upcoming target dates be missed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. Does the project team have resource constraints? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
4. Are there problems or concerns that require stakeholder or top management attention? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

Project Metrics		
Measure	Numbers	Percent Complete
Tasks Complete	[13 of 54]	[24%]
Tasks in Progress	[26 of 54]	[48%]
Tasks not Started	[28 of 54]	[52%]
Time spent	[18 of 86 weeks]	[21%]
Time remaining	[68 of 86 weeks]	[79%]
[Project Specific Measure]		

**Summary Project Status**

Based on the color legend below, indicate green, yellow, or red for the reporting periods of each item. Any item classified as red or yellow requires an explanation in the comment boxes that follow this section. Additional priority items can be added to the list for status reporting.

Select one color in each of the Reporting Period columns to indicate your best assessment of:	Last Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY]			This Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY]		
1. Overall Project Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
2. Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
3. Budget (capital, overall project hours)	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
4. Scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
5. Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green

**Color Legend**

	Red	<b>Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement.</b> “Probable that item will <b>NOT</b> meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope”.
	Yellow	<b>Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning.</b> “Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed”.
	Green	<b>Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.</b> “Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality”.

**Product and/or Service Performance**

Performance Standard	Meets	Exceeds	Below	Explanation

<b>Milestones Planned and Accomplished</b>			
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date	Actual Date

<b>Milestones Planned and Not Accomplished</b>			
For each item listed, provide a corresponding explanation of the effect of this missed item on other target dates and provide the plan to recover from this missed item.			
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date	Effect on Other Dates/Plan

<b>Milestones Planned for Next Period</b>		
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date

<b>Decision Points</b>			
For each item listed, provide a corresponding explanation of the effect of this item on other target dates, scope or cost and provide the responsible parties name. The responsible party will ensure the decision is made and carried out.			
Decision Point	Decision Due Date	Deciders Name or Names	Decisions Effect on Project

Project Issues				
Description	Impact on Project - (H,M,L)	Date Resolution is Needed	Issue Resolution Assigned to	Date Resolved

Footnote: High, Medium, Low Impact.

**High**- "project killer" major impact on project time, scope, cost. Issue must be resolved! - **Medium**- impact will moderately effect project time, scope, cost. - **Low**- Issue will not impact project delivery

Comparison of Budgeted to Actual Expenditures				
Use a chart like the following to show actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate.				
Fiscal Year [YYYY]				
Budget Item	Actual Costs to Date	Estimate to Complete	Total Estimated Costs	Total Planned Budget
Salaries				
Contract Services				
Hardware				
Software				
Training				
Other Expenditures*				
Total Costs				
Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc.				

<b>Risks Management</b>			
Major Risk Events	High Medium Low	Risk Mitigation	Mitigation Responsible Party

<b>Additional Comments / Concerns</b>

## Enterprise Project Statutes

### **86-506 Enterprise project, defined.**

Enterprise project means an endeavor undertaken over a fixed period of time using information technology, which would have a significant effect on a core business function or affects multiple government programs, agencies, or institutions. Enterprise project includes all aspects of planning, design, implementation, project management, and training relating to the endeavor.

**Source** Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 276; Laws 2008, LB823, § 2. July 18, 2008

.....

### **86-525 Enterprise project; legislative findings.**

In addition to the findings in section 86-513, the Legislature also finds that:

- (1) The effective, efficient, and cost-effective operation of state government requires that information be considered and managed as a strategic resource;
- (2) Information technologies present numerous opportunities to more effectively manage the information necessary for state government operations;
- (3) Information technologies are changing and advancing at a very rapid rate, increasing the computing power available to individual users;
- (4) The commission should have the responsibility to establish goals, guidelines, and priorities for information technology infrastructure; and
- (5) Periodic investments in the information technology infrastructure are required to develop and maintain the foundation for the effective use of information technologies throughout state government.

**Source** Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 3; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 5; R.S.Supp., 2000, § 81-1192; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 295.

### **86-526 Enterprise project; designation.**

The commission shall determine which proposed information technology projects are enterprise projects. The commission shall create policies and procedures for the designation of such projects. The commission shall evaluate designated enterprise project plans as authorized in section 86-528.

**Source** Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 5; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 6; R.S.Supp., 2000, § 81-1194; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 296; Laws 2008, LB823, § 7. July 18, 2008

### **86-527 Information Technology Infrastructure Fund; created; use; investment.**

The Information Technology Infrastructure Fund is hereby created. The fund shall contain revenue from the special privilege tax as provided in section 77-2602, gifts, grants, and such other money as is appropriated or transferred by the Legislature. The fund shall be used to attain the goals and priorities identified in the statewide technology plan. The fund shall be administered by the office of Chief Information Officer. Expenditures shall be made from the fund to finance the operations of the Information Technology Infrastructure Act in accordance with the appropriations made by the Legislature. Transfers from the fund to the General Fund may be made at the direction of the Legislature. Any money in the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund available for investment shall be invested by the state investment officer pursuant to the Nebraska Capital Expansion Act and the Nebraska State Funds Investment Act.

**Source** Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 6; Laws 1998, LB 924, § 42; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 7; R.S.Supp., 2000, § 81-1195; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 297; Laws 2002, Second Spec. Sess., LB 1, § 10; Laws 2003, LB 408, § 7; Laws 2006, LB 921, § 19; Laws 2008, LB823, § 8. July 18, 2008

**86-528 Enterprise project; funding.**

(1) The Legislature may allocate money from the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund for enterprise projects. The Legislature may recognize multiple-year commitments for large projects, subject to available appropriations, including remaining obligations for the century date change project managed by the department.

(2) No contract or expenditure for the implementation of an enterprise project may be initiated unless the commission has approved a project plan. The project plan shall include, but not be limited to, the objectives, scope, and justification of the project; detailed specifications and analyses that guide the project from beginning to conclusion; technical requirements; and project management. The commission may request clarification, require changes, or provide conditional approval of a project plan. In its review, the commission shall determine whether the objectives, scope, timeframe, and budget of the project are consistent with the proposal authorized by the Legislature in its allocation from the fund.

(3) The commission may also evaluate whether the project plan is consistent with the statewide technology plan and the commission's technical standards and guidelines.

**Source** Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 8; R.S.Supp.,2000, § 81-1196.01; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 298; Laws 2008, LB823, § 9.July 18, 2008

**86-529 Enterprise project; commission; duties.**

To implement enterprise projects pursuant to sections 86-525 to 86-530, the commission shall:

(1) Develop procedures and issue guidelines regarding the review, approval, and monitoring of enterprise projects; and

(2) Coordinate with the Chief Information Officer to monitor the status of enterprise projects, including a complete accounting of all project costs by fund source.

**Source** Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 10; Laws 1998, LB 924, § 43; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 9; R.S.Supp.,2000, § 81-1199; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 299; Laws 2008, LB823, § 10.July 18, 2008

**86-530 Enterprise project; report.**

The Chief Information Officer shall report annually to the Governor and the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature on the status of enterprise projects.

**Source** Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 13; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 10; R.S.Supp.,2000, § 81-11,102; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 300; Laws 2008, LB823, § 11.July 18, 2008

## DRAFT

### **124-x-x DISASTER RECOVERY BACK-UPS FOR THE ENTERPRISE EMAIL SYSTEM**

Data (records) from the enterprise email system is copied to back-up tapes or other storage media by the Office of the Chief Information Officer (“OCIO”) for the purpose of disaster recovery preparations. The data is only to be used for system restoration in the event of a disaster or system failure. Disaster recovery back-ups are never to be used or considered for records access or management purposes. “Enterprise Email System” means the email system maintained by the OCIO utilizing Microsoft Exchange and related products.

<b>End-of-Week Back-ups:</b>	<b>Erase on the first business day after a 14 day retention period</b>
<b>Incremental Daily Back-ups:</b>	<b>Erase contemporaneously with the related End-of-Week Back-up</b>
<b>Off-Site End-of-Week Back-ups:</b>	<b>Erase on the first business day after a 14 day retention period</b>