

Project #	Agency	Project Title
85-01	Public Employees Retirement System	Transfer NPERS Infrastructure to OCIO

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/2012_deficit/index.html]

The transfer of the Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems (NPERS) infrastructure to the Office of the OCIO is driven by economies and efficiencies gained in moving to a virtual environment, increased capability for disaster recovery and relocating NPERS offices from Great Western to the Assurity Building (formerly Woodmen building) in the fall 2012 or spring 2013.

FUNDING SUMMARY**NPERS IT Deficit Spending Request Summary**

This deficit spending request covers the approximate IT expenses for four items:

- 1.) **Migration of the NPERS servers** from NPERS to the OCIO Virtual Machine (VM) environment. This migration will provide economies in the elimination of hardware maintenance and replacement, backup tapes and management, and disaster recovery capability.

1.) **Migration of servers from NPERS to OCIO (1-Time Costs)**

Physical-to-Virtual Migration

Virtual Machines	\$9,000.00	Includes virtualization of 20 NPERS servers. 3 of the existing NPERS servers will be retired because hosting services are provided by OCIO going forward.
Storage	\$750.00	Includes the storage of all major NPERS SQL databases plus imaging data. Current size is approximately 1100GB.
Sub-total	\$9,750.00	

Backup Migration (Tapes)

Backups	\$7,000.00	Includes backup all NPERS data. Current size is approximately 2250GB.
Sub-total	\$7,000.00	

File Store Migration

Storage	\$500.00	Includes the storage of file server data and software distribution data. Current size is approximately 550GB.
Sub-total	\$500.00	

Total Migration Cost **\$17,250.00**

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	15	10	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	25	15	22	25
Technical Impact	20	20	10	17	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	10	6	8	10
Risk Assessment	10	8	5	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	20	20	18	19	20
			TOTAL	87	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goal makes absolute sense for all the reasons stated in the proposal - Promotes efficiencies, results in cost savings, takes advantage of agencies' strengths and potentials. - Project intent is consistent with industry best practice and modest cost reduction is achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a multi-modal migration project including server, primary storage, backup storage and backup system. The intent is clear and in keeping with industry best practice, however, there is not enough detail to determine whether desirable outcomes will be achieved. For example, how will the scalability of the database environment be achieved in a virtualized environment.
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move to the OCIO appears to be the appropriate move. Cost savings should be realized - The responses suggest that this project will consolidate servers from both a facilities and quantitative perspective. The limited detail in the proposal outlines a course of action consistent with industry best practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is clear that a change in facilities has provided an opportunity to consolidate IT infrastructure. There is no mention that other options were explored and the overall reduction in cost relative to the total cost is less than anticipated.
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All indications in the proposal appear to be both technically appropriate and doable. - On the face of it, the move to a virtualized environment is desirable from a manageability, scalability, and ecological perspective. Based on the limited information, the course of action is a reasonable response to the opportunity provided by a change in facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is, simply, insufficient detail to assess the technical impact. What is good, "in theory" requires a great deal of preparation to be successful "in practice." One hopes the level of detail being considered is much greater than the scant outline provided.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phased in three stage plan. Sound project team identified. - It appears there is a reasonable amount of time to properly plan, test, and validate project deliverables. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There could be a need for some limited training in the area of communication between NPERS and OCIO in the area of help desk or outage conditions. - Responses lack sufficient detail and it is unclear how a move of this magnitude will be achieved without the need for any professional development. It may well be that the OCIO will be responsible for the migration to and maintenance of the virtualized environment, SAN environment and backup environment. Such detail is not provided and it is implausible that the expertise in each of the critical infrastructure areas already exists.
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate risks have been addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physical relocation brings many factors - some that are not in direct control of project managers - into play. - A great deal of resources in the form of time, money and work were expended to implement the update to the NPERS environment. Given the documented complexity of that implementation, a move of this magnitude requires far more in the way of a risk assessment and mitigation plan than

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost avoidance of \$ 200,000 is a good financial reason to move to OCIO. All the costs on the data sheet appear reasonable - Cost savings in 2014/15 clearly demonstrate the strategic and financial benefits of the project. - Costs are broken out and an explanation of some of those costs is provided. 	is documented.... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cost of backups remains constant despite an estimated annual growth of 25%. There is not sufficient documentation to explain how cost will remain constant despite growth of 150% over the documented project timeline.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS