MEETING AGENDA

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Tuesday, October 14, 2008
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents: Click the links in the agenda.
or
All Documents (xx pages)
All Documents, except the full text of projects (xx pages)

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

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes* - September 9, 2008

4. Standards and Guidelines

   - Recommendations to the NITC *
     - NITC 1-203: Project Status Reporting
       - Comments Received (None)
     - NITC 1-205: Enterprise Projects
       - Comments Received (1)
     - NITC 5-202: Blocking Email Attachments (Revised)
       - Comments Received (None)
     - NITC 8-301: Password Standard (Revised)
       - Comments Received (None)

5. Project Reviews

   - Ongoing Reviews (as needed)
     - Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown and Robin Goracke
     - Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS - James Ohmberger
     - Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System
   - Project Proposals - FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget - Recommendation to the NITC*
     - Project summary sheets (29 pages)
     - Full text of the projects (94 pages)

6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)

   - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Horn
   - Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Langer
   - Security Architecture Work Group - Hartman
   - Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group - Winkle

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting Date - December 9, 2008

9. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Item

(The Technical Panel 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 Technical Panel websites: http://nitc.ne.gov/
Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on October 1, 2008. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 10, 2008.

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday, September 9, 2008, 9:00-10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Mike Winkle, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. There were five members present at the time of roll call. A quorum was present. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on August 22, 2008. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on September 5, 2008. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall of the meeting room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 12, 2008 MINUTES

Ms. Decker moved to approve the August 12, 2008 meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Winkle-Yes. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS - ONGOING REVIEWS (as needed)

Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown and Robin Goracke

(Handouts)

Phase II final signoff has been completed on all functional area requirements. Phase II Development continues at Saber's offshore site in India, with 14 of the 15 functional areas completed. The one remaining functional area is Optional Service Credit (OSC). Saber has projected that we will receive the modules for IT testing around mid-October, 2008.

Phase III (Batch) Requirements Validation sign-off has been completed on all functional areas. Phase III (Batch) Development is in progress with 11 of the 16 functional areas completed, 4 are in progress and 1 (OSC) has not been started.

IT staff testing of Phase II and III began on August 27th with two (2) functional areas and continued on September 2nd with four (4) additional functional areas. Again, there are 19 functional areas that are being monitored for the testing activity. The user staff is scheduled to start testing the week of September 22nd.

The testing members will create a defect document for each defect they discover. These will be tracked at a weekly defect meeting and reported to the Steering Committee in the form of statistics. The production servers have been installed. Saber and the NPERS infrastructure support staff are in the process of configuring and testing the production environment this week.

The project end date has not changed and it is within budget.

Drop Plan. Implementation into production occurred on August 29, 2008. There are still a couple of issues with the interface to Ameritas, but these will be corrected before the interface runs at the end of September.

The Quality Assurance team has completed QA Phase III activities. This review identified four (4) high risk findings that, if addressed quickly, could be rectified before there is a significant impact on the project. These identified the need to more thoroughly follow the Project Management Plan, keeping the Requirements Traceability Matrix more current, and keeping the Project Plan more current.

The Office of the CIO Security Team completed the first Security Validation process on August 8, 2008. The risk results indicated the following security issues:
- 100% Application-related Security Issues (60 out of a total of 60 issues).
- Application-related Security Issues can usually be fixed by application developers, as they result from defects in the application code.
- 0% Infrastructure and Platform Security Issues (0 out of a total 60 issues).

Saber is in the process of addressing the issues.

The project has decided to utilize SQL rather than Cognos and has saved the project approximately $62,000 in Cognos licensing fees. For next month's meeting, Mr. Brown will bring plans for long-range support for the NPRIS project.

Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS - James Ohmberger. No report.

Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System, Ed Hoffman

The project has been in vendor negotiations for past two months. The project negotiator commented that the State of Nebraska achieved in a matter of months what others have taken years to accomplish. Oracle and CedarCrestone have been selected. Both vendors agreed to the fixed priced negotiations with payments associated with milestone completions. The project will have a shared hardware platform located in Lincoln.

Both projects are now moving towards a centralized approach. There will be a two side-by-side implementations due to the academic policy difference between the two entities. There may be a point where differences in policy may need a decision and these will be addressed as they occur. The implementation team will be located at 56th and O Streets. The first joint meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 12.

PROJECT REVIEWS - COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY FUND GRANT APPLICATIONS

NeHII Proposal
Deb Bass and Chris Henkenius, Bass and Associates; Dr. Harris Frankel, President, NeHII (via phone); and Anne Byers, Office of the CIO

Goal: to create a statewide health information exchange (HIE) for the betterment of patient care in the state. Once implemented, the system would enable physicians statewide to view consolidated patient medical history at the point of care, improving safety and care delivery while reducing duplicate or redundant procedures.

At the last meeting, the Technical Panel found the project technical feasible but had concerns about the financial obligation. NeHII has been meeting with the stakeholders as well as with the NITC eHealth Council. The project has also met with the Governor and he is very interested in seeing the pilot demonstration. The University of Nebraska-Omaha and the Peter Kewitt Institute will be working with the project to provide Level 1 support. The project is in negotiations with the selected vendor, Axolotl.

The project is requesting $100,000 for the year long pilot project. If successful, Axolotl's estimate for the pilot's framework is approximately $355,000 a year plus $107,000 initial set-up fee. Axolotl is requesting a 5-year commitment. The pilot contract can be terminated within the first year if it is not meeting the project's needs. Within three months, five hospitals and over 700 physicians will be using the system. Ms. Byers stated that the eHealth Council and Lieutenant Governor Sheehy realize the financial concern.

Bass Association is currently meeting with medical foundations. Alegent Health and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nebraska have been funding the operation to this point. NeHII has also asked the Governor for $1 million dollars for the next five years out of the Medicaid budget. Lt. Governor Sheehy recommended that NeHII submit a request similar to the Public Service Commission's licensing fee expenses. The project is also exploring federal grants that would match state dollars. It is anticipated that the project would be self-sufficient by end of third year by means of subscription and usage fees as well as contribution. If state funds are approved, the Technical Panel would be again be involved in a technical review of the project.

Mr. Winkle moved to forward the NeHII proposal to the NITC for consideration noting that the project is technically feasible and the proposed technology is appropriate for the project but that the NITC needs to understand the financial risk associated with the project's completion due to ongoing funding efforts. The NITC should also be aware that additional public requests could come back to both the Technical Panel and the NITC for future approval. Ms. Decker seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Motion carried.

Nebraska Public Policy Center Proposal
Anne Byers, Community I.T. Manager

Goal: The overall goal of the proposed project is to obtain perspectives of Nebraskans about electronic sharing of health information, and in particular, perspectives about legal and policy issues currently under consideration by the NITC, HISPC, e-Health council, and other state policymakers and advisory groups.

Ms. Decker moved that there were no technical aspects of the proposal for the panel to review and to forward the proposal to the NITC for their action. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS - BIENNIAL BUDGET - PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS
Rick Becker, Government I.T. Manager

Mr. Becker reviewed the Timeline and Reviewer Scoring Sheet that will be used for this biennium. There were no recommended changes and/or additions.

Panel members did not have any recommendations, changes and/or additions to the "Three Questions" addressed in the technical review for I.T. budget requests and proposals.

Ms. Horn left the meeting.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - SET FOR 30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Becker reviewed the NITC 1-203: Project Status Reporting and the NITC 1-205: Enterprise Projects Standards. These were required duties of the NITC that were discussed in the Performance Review.

Mr. Winkle moved to post the NITC 1-203: Project Status Reporting and NITC 1-205: Enterprise Projects for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, Langer-Yes, Sydik-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Motion carried.

Discussion - Update on Password Standard Recommendations

Mr. Hartman distributed copies of the revised. The work group recommendation is that items covered under section 1.2 would be handled at the OCIO or SAWG to address. Items in section 1.1 would come before the Technical Panel for waiver approval.

Mr. Winkle moved to post the revised [Password Standard Recommendations](#) for the 30-day public comment period. Mr. Sydik seconded. Roll call vote: Sydik-Yes, Decker-Yes, Winkle-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Langer-Yes. Motion carried.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group – Horn. Mr. Sydik reported that the office has been receiving questions about the Target lawsuit.

Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Langer. An adhoc group has been assembled to look at content management and is looking at reasonable response to the NROC issue.

Security Architecture Work Group – Hartman. Mr. Hartman presented information in the standards and guidelines portion of the meeting.

Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group – Winkle. Informational meetings have occurred with the Nebraska Department of Education, Rick Golden of the University of Nebraska, and Gordon Roethemeyer, Distance Education Council. Mr. Roethemeyer had provided a list of possible members to serve on the work group. The work group will be meeting soon. Mr. Winkle would like to have a draft of the standard for the October 14 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held at 9:00 a.m. on October 14 , 2008.

Mr. Langer moved to adjourned. Ms. Decker seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

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

NITC 1-203 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

**Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period**

Title: Project Status Reporting

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on October 10, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at http://nitc.ne.gov/.

**State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines**

NITC 1-203 (Draft)

Title	Project Status Reporting
Category	General Provisions
Applicability	Applies only to projects designated by the NITC

1. Purpose

By statute, the NITC may require progress reports for information technology projects utilizing state appropriated funding. Not all projects will be required to submit progress reports, only those projects specifically designated by the NITC will be subject to these these reporting requirements. The purpose of this policy is to establish the procedures for designating such projects, to establish the format to be used for progress reports, and to assign responsibilities to the Technical Panel.

2. Statutes

2.1 Section 86-516 Commission; duties.

" The Commission shall:

...

(5) Adopt guidelines regarding project planning and management and administrative and

technical review procedures involving state-owned or state-supported technology and infrastructure. Governmental entities, state agencies, and political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions. The commission may monitor the progress of any such project and may require progress reports;" [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516]

2.2 Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-529]

3. Projects Required to Submit Status Reports

The NITC will designate which projects are required to submit project status reports. The agency/entity primarily responsible for the project will be notified of such designation.

4. Project Status Report Format

Unless an alternative format is approved by the Technical Panel, Attachment A is the format to be used for project status reports.

5. Technical Panel Responsibilities

The Technical Panel is responsible for all logistical matters relating to project status reports, including determining the frequency and deadlines for submission. The Technical Panel will coordinate with the reporting agency/entity to ensure compliance with this policy.

The Technical Panel will provide updates to the NITC on the status of projects.

Attachment A: Project Status Form

VERSION DATE: DRAFT - September 5, 2008
HISTORY:
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

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?	☐ Yes ☐ No	
2. Will upcoming target dates be missed?	☐ Yes ☐ No	
3. Does the project team have resource constraints?	☐ Yes ☐ No	
4. Are there problems or concerns that require stakeholder or top management attention?	☐ Yes ☐ 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	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green
2. Schedule	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green
3. Budget (capital, overall project hours)	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green
4. Scope	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green
5. Quality	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green
	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green	☐ Red	☐ Yellow	☐ Green

Color Legend

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

Product and/or Service Performance

Performance Standard	Meets	Exceeds	Below	Explanation

Milestones Planned and Accomplished

Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date	Actual Date

Milestones Planned and Not Accomplished

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

Milestones Planned for Next Period

Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date

Decision Points

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.				

Risks Management				
Major Risk Events	High Medium Low	Risk Mitigation		Mitigation Responsible Party

Additional Comments / Concerns

NITC 1-205 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

**Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period**

Title: Enterprise Projects

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on October 10, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at http://nitc.ne.gov/.

**State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines**

NITC 1-205 (Draft)

Title	Enterprise Projects
Category	General Provisions
Applicability	Applies only to projects designated by the NITC

1. Purpose

By statute, the NITC "shall determine which proposed information technology projects are enterprise projects." Enterprise projects must comply with certain statutory requirements including the submission of a project plan and compliance with monitoring requirements. The purpose of this policy is to document the procedures regarding the designation, review, approval, and monitoring of enterprise projects.

2. Statutes

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-506]

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-525]

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-526]

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-527]

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-528]

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-529]

Section 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." [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-530]

3. Enterprise Projects Designation

The NITC will designate which information technology projects are enterprise projects. The designation will be based on the following criteria: 1) the project must meet the definition contained in Neb. Rev. Stat § 86-506; 2) whether or not the project has received an allocation of funding from the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-528; 3) any recommendations from the Technical Panel or other advisory council of the NITC; and 4) such other factors as the NITC deems appropriate, including but not limited to the size, scope, and complexity of the project. An enterprise project designation shall only be made by the NITC at a public meeting and after the agency/entity primarily responsible for the project has had an opportunity to comment on the issue.

4. Requirements for Enterprise Projects

A project which has been designated as an enterprise project must comply with certain statutory responsibilities, including submission of a project plan and submission of periodic status reports. The Technical Panel will coordinate with the agency/entity primarily responsible for an enterprise project to ensure compliance with this policy.

4.1 Project Plan

Each enterprise project shall submit 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.

4.1.1 Format

Unless an alternative format is approved by the Technical Panel, Attachment B to NITC 1-202 is the format to be used for the project plan.

4.1.2 Review and Approval

The Technical Panel shall review all project plans and provide recommendations to the NITC. The NITC may approve the project plan, request clarification, require changes, or provide conditional approval of a project plan.

4.2 Project Monitoring

Enterprise projects shall provide project status reports as set forth in NITC 1-203.

5. Annual Report

The NITC will assist the Chief Information Officer as requested to prepare an annual report to the Governor and the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature on the status of enterprise projects.

```
----------
VERSION DATE: DRAFT - September 5, 2008
HISTORY:
PDF FORMAT: (to be added)
----------
```

From:	randy.cecrle@wcc.ne.gov
Sent:	Wednesday, October 01, 2008 9:03 AM
To:	Becker, Rick
Subject:	Comments on Enterprise Projects Draft

http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/20080910/1-205_DRAFT_comment.html

My response is simply, "Its about time!".

Systems that should have been implemented at an enterprise level have not because of a
funding model that required government entities with like needs to come together and fund
the project.

That philosophy is nice in principle, but a disaster in practicality. That model only
works if the timing is right and all the "government entity stars" align themselves to
come together and fund the startup of such efforts. If one government entity had the
vision to see a need, but others at that level did not, then that entity had to foot the
startup costs completely. For that reason government entities have picked solutions that
they could afford but were not scalable to an enterprise level. Then when the next entity
had a need another solution was created.

Over my 13+ years in state government I have only participated in one collaborative
project where more than one entity came together to fund the startup. That project was the
current state government enterprise e-fax system.

NWCC in its re-engineering analysis of its systems recognized the need to have electronic
fax for both outbound and inbound if it was ever going to meet the goal of being paperless
efficiently (i.e. that is not scanning paper). At the same time bio-terrorism was the big
issue and funds were available to then HHSS. The two government entities came together
along with the OCIO and funded the startup costs for the system and turned it over to the
OCIO for management and marketing.

I have also participated in failed efforts, such as back a number of years where there was
an attempt to get into enterprise content management (document management, capture, etc.).
Now there are a number different document/content management systems in different
entities.

I hope that the NITC has the information, wisdom, and vision to now identify the
enterprise projects and the will to move them forward.

Randall Cecrle, FLMI
IT Manager / Oracle DBA
Nebraska Workers' Compensation Court
TierOne Center - 1221 'N' Street, Suite 402 PO 98908 Lincoln, NE 68509-8908
Phn: 1-402-471-2976
Fax: 1-402-471-2700
<IT.Manager@wcc.ne.gov>
<Randy.Cecrle@wcc.ne.gov>
http://www.wcc.ne.gov/
"Good faith, honesty, and integrity"

NITC 5-202 DRAFT

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

**Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period**

Title: Blocking Email Attachments

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is posted at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on September 12, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October 14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at http://nitc.ne.gov/.

**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

Extension - Description	Internal [1]	Inbound
ade – Access Project extension (Microsoft)	X	
adp – Access Project (Microsoft0	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	
lnk – 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.

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Standards and Guidelines

**Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period**

Title: Password Standard (Revised)

Notes to Readers:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel
    of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC). This document is
    posted at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/comment/.
2. If you have comments on this document, you can submit them by email to
    rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on
    submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on October 10, 2008.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at
    a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for October
    14, 2008. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at
    http://nitc.ne.gov/.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Password Standard

Category	**Security Architecture**
Title	**Password Standard**
Number	

Applicability	☑ State Government Agencies
	    ☐ **All** .... Not Applicable
	    ☑ **Excluding** <u>**higher education**</u>
	    <u>**institutions**</u>..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 of _____.
	Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	☐ **Adopted** ☐ **Draft** ☐ **Other:**_____
Dates	**Date:** **Date Adopted by NITC:** **Other:**

1.0 Standard

Passwords are a primary means to control access to systems; therefore all users must select, use, and manage passwords to protect against unauthorized discovery or usage.

1.1 Password Construction

The following are the minimum password requirements for State of Nebraska passwords:

- Must contain at least eight (8) characters
  - Must not repeat any character sequentially more than two (2) times
- Must contain at least three (3) of the following four (4):
  - At least one (1) uppercase character
  - At least one (1) lowercase character
  - At least one (1) numeric character
  - At least one (1) symbol
- Must change at least every 90 days
- Can not repeat any of the passwords used during the previous 365 days.

1.2 Non-Expiring Passwords

- Automated System Accounts
  Agencies may use non-expiring passwords for automated system accounts. Examples of automated system accounts include those that perform backups or run batch jobs.

- Multi-user Computers
  Agencies may use non-expiring passwords on multi-user computers. Examples of multi-user computers include those computers in kiosks or training labs, where users have limited or restricted access to state resources.

- System Equipment/Devices (referred to as devices)
  It is common for many devices (e.g. IP Cameras, HVAC Controls) in today's IT environment to utilize login capabilities to protect the device from unauthorized access. While many of these devices make use of a user ID and password in a manner similar to those found while authenticating a user, the distinction to be made is that the User ID is used to authenticate the device itself to the system and not a person.

An agency may request a waiver by submitting the form found in Appendix A. All non-expiring passwords should exceed the character requirements listed in Section 1.1.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

Passwords are used to authenticate a unique User ID to a variety of State of Nebraska resources. Some of the more common uses include: user accounts, web accounts, email accounts.

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.

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

3.2.1 Exemption Process

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Tabs: Not at 1.5"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: (e.g.

Deleted: and

Deleted:)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: after submitting the form found in Appendix A. All non-expiring passwords should exceed the character requirements listed in Section 1.1.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Tabs: Not at 1.5"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

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; system limitation, or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the NITC via e-mail or letter (Office of the NITC, 501 S 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68509). 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 ensuring that any application or system requiring the use of a password adheres to this standard.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 NITC Information Security Policy (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html)
5.2 Non-expiring Password Agreement (Appendix A)

Non-Expiring Password Agreement

This agreement describes the agreed upon policy exception and/or level of security provided by the Office of the CIO for the application known as:

[ ]

To the limits dictated by the State of Nebraska and Federal laws, agency data and system owners are responsible for determining how critical and sensitive information is for their applications to insure integrity, availability, and confidentiality.

Security Classification Levels

The NITC Data Security Standard recognizes four basic levels of security classifications that are associated with varying degrees of known risks. (See NITC Security Officer Handbook for more details). They can be summarized as follows:

HIGHLY RESTRICTED is for the most sensitive information intended strictly for use within your organization and controlled by special rules to specific personnel. It is highly critical and demands the highest possible security.

CONFIDENTIAL is for less sensitive information intended for use within your organization, yet still requires a high level of security. It may be regulated for privacy considerations. (e.g. HIPAA)

INTERNAL USE ONLY is for non-sensitive information intended for use within your organization. The security is controlled, but not highly protected.

UNCLASSIFIED/ PUBLIC is for information that requires minimal security and can be handled in the public domain.

Agency Justification

The undersigned agency representative has been authorized to request a **non-expiring password** for the application and data named above with a **security classification level** of _____ and includes the following criteria as supporting justification:

_____
_____

* * * * *

Office of the CIO Justification

The Office of the CIO recommends **no policy exceptions** with the following justification:

_____
_____

_____   _____   _____   _____

Agency Representative   Date   Office of the CIO Representative   Date

Agency Information Technology Projects
FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget

Technical Panel Meeting
October 14, 2008

NEBRASKA
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
COMMISSION

FY2009-2011 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Project #)

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY10	FY11	Total
09-01	Secretary of State	Election Night Reporting System	$ 540,000	$ 90,000	$ 630,000
09-02	Secretary of State	NECVRS Hardware Replacement	$ 320,000		$ 320,000
09-03	Secretary of State	Enterprise Content Management System	$ 2,500,000	$ 350,000	$ 2,850,000
19-01	Department of Banking	FACTS Migration	$ 140,000	$ 40,000	$ 180,000
23-01	Department of Labor	Integration of Workforce Development Applications	$ 1,024,278	$ 716,178	$ 3,888,990
27-01	Department of Roads	Human Resources Document Management System			$ 35,000
27-02	Department of Roads	Bridge Management System			$ 35,000
27-03	Department of Roads	Accident Records System Rewrite			$ 400,000
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	Courtroom Technology	$ 225,276	$ 15,272	$ 240,548
47-01	NET	Public Media Project - Phase 2	$ 114,000		$ 114,000
65-01	Administrative Services	Human Resources Talent	$ 377,000	$ 413,000	$ 1,741,000

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-01	Secretary of State	Election Night Reporting System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

The Secretary of State is the Chief Election Official for the State of Nebraska. As the Chief Election Official there are many functions that occur during an election cycle. One of most important functions is the reporting of election results on election night to the public, media and candidates. The Election Night Reporting (ENR) System is an integral program that allows the Secretary of State to perform these duties. The current ENR System has been in place since 1996. With new technologies and program languages available, we believe that this project could allow us to better report election results to public, media and candidates. We are currently looking at vendors to host this service for our office.

The Election Night Reporting System allows the public and the media the ability to check election results frequently (default = 5 mins).   The ENR System was created by volunteers for the State of Nebraska in 1996. The State of Nebraska was one of five states that performed this reporting service to the public at that time. Since 1996, the Secretary of State's Office has made the investment in software upgrades every election cycle to add the functionality needed (e.g. creating comma separated values (.CSV) files for the media to import election night data into their equipment). The investment per election cycle has been between $15,000 to $25,000.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$180,000			90,000	90,000	
Total	$180,000	$0	$0	$90,000	$90,000	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$0					
Software	$350,000			350,000		
Network	$0					
Other	$100,000			100,000		
Total	$450,000	$0	$0	$450,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$630,000	$0	$0	$540,000	$90,000	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	4	15	11	10.0	15
Project Justification / Business Case	5	23	16	14.7	25
Technical Impact	7	17	15	13.0	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	2	8	10	6.7	10
Risk Assessment	5	9	9	7.7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	6	17	15	12.7	20
			TOTAL	65	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- I believe the goal of this project is very worthwhile.	-The agency did not provide or address measurements or assessment methods to verify the project outcome, nor provided any data supporting relationship to their technology plan. - No explanation of $280,000 in other categories - relation to project goals
Project Justification / Business Case	- Project justification seems to make sense in something the state should do.	- Did not provide any return on investment justification. Did not address other potential solutions. Did not address state or federal mandates. - More detail needed on cost/benefit vs current system
Technical Impact	- Relevance is limited to analysis of new vs existing systems.	- Technical elements are not present. Strengths and weaknesses are not evaluated. Does not address compatibility or security issues. - My sense is that the agency thinks the entry of data will be a lot easier with this system than it is with the current system. I just don't have enough information at this point to determine whether or not that's true as interfacing with over 90 counties in Nebraska each having some version of an election reporting manager may be daunting. - Do all counties have ERM systems which can automatically feed this proposed system?
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- Minimal information provided. Proper analysis could not be made. - Not enough information at this point to give a very good assessment of the implementation plan
Risk Assessment	- Assuming an outside vendor may in fact host the system I think the risks have been identified	- Barriers and risks are inadequately identified. - Cost / quality of vendor encryption techniques?
Financial Analysis and Budget		- Nearly a third of the budget is undefined in the Other category - Further explanation of $280,000 "other" costs?

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
09-02	Secretary of State	NECVRS Hardware Replacement

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

The Help America Vote Act of 2002, Public Law 107-252, 42 U.S.C. 15301-15545 ("HAVA") following passage by the U.S. Congress was signed into law by the President of the United States George Bush on October 29, 2002. This legislation marked a significant step toward major change in our election systems nationwide. The State of Nebraska successfully implemented the Nebraska Central Voter Registration System (NECVRS) in 2005. This IT Project is for the replacement of server hardware for the NECVRS.

Section 303 of HAVA describes the requirements for a statewide interactive voter registration database. Among the requirements are that the system utilize driver's license numbers and the last four digits of the social security number or in the alternative assign a unique identifier. Other requirements include coordination with other state agency databases and list maintenance procedures as outlined in the National Voter Registration Act. The State of Nebraska received $18.8 million dollars from the Federal Government to implement all of the changes within HAVA (Voter Outreach and Education, Vote Tabulation Equipment for all 93 counties and a centralized Voter Registration System). $4.1 million dollars was awarded to Election Systems and Software after a lengthy RFP process in July of 2004 for the Voter Registration System. The server hardware for the NECVRS was purchased in October of 2004 in preparation for all 93 counties' migration. The Nebraska Central Voter Registration System (NECVRS) was completed on November 22, 2005. Server warranties will run out on all 31 servers of the NECVRS on October of 2009.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$320,000			320,000		
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$320,000	$0	$0	$320,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$320,000	$0	$0	$320,000	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	5	12	9.7	15
Project Justification / Business Case	22	15	20	19.0	25
Technical Impact	20	5	15	13.3	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	3	10	7.7	10
Risk Assessment	10	0	10	6.7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	5	16	13.0	20
			TOTAL	69	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goal is rather straightforward and obvious, that being the replacement of 31 servers that were purchased in 2004. Not sure, based on the documentation, if these 31 servers are located in one location or placed around the state.	- Possible use of virtualization in an effort to reduce the number of servers required? - Objective unclear - Have alternatives to replacing all 31 servers been researched? Is server consolidation or virtualization feasible?
Project Justification / Business Case	- Justification appears sound.	- This is a long-term project that should be budgeted into the biennial budget. It should not be considered a one-time project. - Mandate is clear but approach details are not clear
Technical Impact	- In that this is basically a hardware upgrade does not appear to be any technical concerns. - Submitter recognizes need for technology refresh.	- Consideration should be given to using State facilities and using State resources to manage the equipment. - Other approaches to simply replacing existing hardware should be explored
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Implementation should be straightforward	- There is no plan to evaluate deliverables and implementation timelines are not definitive. No on-going support requirements listed.
Risk Assessment	- Do not see any significant risks for this project	- Has not taken election risk assessment into consideration by establishing a schedule to avoid these dates. Have not documented repercussions of implementation or lack of implementation and no alternative fallback plan identified.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Not knowing the size and scope of the server configurations it's hard to state unequivocally that the price quoted is appropriate.	- Changes in software licensing may in fact cause an increase in software licensing costs due to dual or quad core capabilities - After six years, this should be a part of the Agency's budget and not considered a one-time request. Were alternative methods of funding considered? Options to reduce costs should be evaluated including the use of the State's facilities and resources. - Are any federal funds available between now and 2010 to help fund this project?

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
09-03	Secretary of State	Enterprise Content Management System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

Quality decision making in state government is dependent on access to its documents and records. The accessibility of electronic records is the cornerstone to open and accountable government. The IT Project Proposal is to establish an Enterprise Content Management (ECM) System for the State of Nebraska. All State Agencies are required to manage their records regardless of form or format according to the State Records Management Act. The adoption of this IT Project Proposal will give all agencies the ability to manage their unstructured electronic records. The creation of an ECM System becomes imperative with the Federal Government and State of Nebraska's adoption of the new Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) worked toward the development of a Unified Collaboration System through the purchase and implementation of Exchange 2007 and Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007. However, the Unified Collaboration System currently lacks a robust ECM System to manage the State's unstructured data (records). ECM Systems aid in organizing records by providing seamless access while managing the records' life-cycle until disposal or transfer to the State Archives for permanent retention. State Agencies will continue to forfeit the benefits of efficient business processes and remain at risk for legal discovery issues and compliance with State of Nebraska records retention laws if this IT Project Proposal is not approved and implemented. ECM Systems provide the business logic required to capture, control, maintain and dispose of electronic records. They provide the end user with the ability to control electronic files as records and associate them to a file code and corresponding disposition authority. DoD 5015.2-STD-certified ERM applications (http://jitc.fhu.disa.mil/recmgt/register.htm) accomplish such in a manner that guarantees conformance with record-keeping statutes and regulations. Using ECM applications, Agencies can implement file plans that manage and control dispositions of their records in accordance with State and Federal laws.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$300,000			150,000	150,000	
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$300,000	$0	$0	$150,000	$150,000	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$825,000			825,000		
Software	$1,325,000			1,325,000		
Network	$0					
Other	$400,000			200,000	200,000	
Total	$2,550,000	$0	$0	$2,350,000	$200,000	$0
Total Request	$2,850,000	$0	$0	$2,500,000	$350,000	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	10	12.7	15
Project Justification / Business Case	24	16	15	18.3	25
Technical Impact	15	15	10	13.3	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	5	7.0	10
Risk Assessment	8	7	7	7.3	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	15	13	15.3	20
			TOTAL	74	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goal indicates a good working relationship with the office of the chief information officer and ensuring a successful implementation - Goals, beneficiaries, outcomes well stated. Measurements well defined. Tech plan relationship is well articulated. - No question an ECM capability is needed and statutory and legal implications are clear.	- Since this is enterprise wide, costs unknown and vendors not ready, should this project be "portioned" with this request targeting an overall agency assessment of requirements in anticipation of forthcoming solutions? Subsequent phases about implementing?
Project Justification / Business Case	- The whole issue of records retention this critical and it is good to see that the Secretary of State's office is identifying a solution to deal with unstructured records - Agree that some solution needed.	- Feedback on comparisons was unclear. - Agree that some solution needed. How do Agencies then utilize capabilities? Would OCIO manage offering?, privacy/security concerns, etc..
Technical Impact	- The proposal indicates that the technical elements of this project are still to be determined as a result I reduce the score from 20 to 15.	- Even though several packages were evaluated, no statement of strengths or weaknesses is provided. - As noted, technical elements largely unknown at this time.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- There appear to be a number of unknowns about this project which could obviously impact implementation. While I do not anticipate there will be problems, I think it is still too early to make a judgment call in this area - Without knowing technical implications the implementation are largely unknown and effort also unquantifiable.
Risk Assessment	- Risks have been identified but they do not appear to be barriers at this point.	- Significant financial risk may occur if agencies are not mandated to adopt the system. Significant resources for training and adoption at other agencies may be required. - Risks seem very high with an enterprise solution and legal/statutory implications. Have a concern that a reader could be left with conclusion that a solution is "out front" of the overall requirements?
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Financial analysis does include personnel, hardware, software and I'm assuming the other category is the anticipated implementation cost - Since this is an enterprise solution, should agencies also help fund this effort?	- Growth rate regarding storage is unclear. Comparisons with other states who have adopted similar technologies would be helpful. - Assume project costs represent "framework" infrastructure but not agency document population and use. Hard to quantify but could be very large? Can include comments to clarify what's included in costs?

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
19-01	Department of Banking	FACTS Migration

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

The Department's Financial Agency Centralized Tracking System (FACTS) is the application, licensing and data storage system. FACTS is written in Microsoft Visual Basic 6 (VB6). As of March 2008, Microsoft no longer supports VB6. Utilizing the CIO's office expertise when determining the timing of an upgrade, the Department was told the current application will work provided the Department does not modify existing code, does not change the operating system and does not add new code. This project is to migrate the unsupported existing system from Microsoft Visual Basic 6.

Currently tracking 47,431 financially related entities, institutions, licensees or offerings and exemptions; FACTS serves as the reporting, billing, enforcement tracking and resource allocation source of information. Since the original in-house design and implementation in 2002, enhancements of the program have improved searches, enlarged the databases to provide more relevant information, enabled electronic retrieval of examinations and audits and coordinated exportation of key data fields to better inform the public of financial activities. Web enabling the FACTS system would bring significant efficiencies to the department as national vendors work with licensees and then make their data available to the department.

The responsibilities of the Department have significantly increased since FACTS was written in 2002. For instance, during the past 5 years, the Department supervised bank assets have increased 50% to the current level of $20 billion; the securities division licensed more than 79,000 regulated entities, individuals and activities.

Currently the integration of the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System (NMLS) datahas not been integrated completely due to the potential consequence of placing new code in the mission critical application.

The current financial regulatory environment requires enhanced information collection and reporting; however, the current system can no longer be reliably modified. With the assistance of the CIO office; a consultant was hired to determine the upgrade path and a Request for Information was issued to evaluate the cost of migrating the current VB6 system to Visual Basic.net (VB.net). The Department is also considering contracting with a third-party vendor who would create and maintain the system.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$173,400			135,000	38,400	
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$173,400	$0	$0	$135,000	$38,400	$0
Training						
Technical Staff	$6,600			5,000	1,600	
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$6,600	$0	$0	$5,000	$1,600	$0
Total Request	$180,000	$0	$0	$140,000	$40,000	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	11	12	12.3	15
Project Justification / Business Case	23	16	20	19.7	25
Technical Impact	19	15	15	16.3	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	7	6.7	10
Risk Assessment	9	7	8	8.0	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	13	16	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**79**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Seems a very prudent thing to do to migrate from an operating system environment that is no longer supported to one that is. - Ability to make future upgrades and enhancements when required; Increased Security; Centralization of information; Web Access. All positive objectives. - In light of the current financial turbulence, it seems very appropriate that a project of this type be carried out.	- I would have thought I would have seen either other state agency personnel, business partners or customers included on the steering committee. It appears only Banking and Finance employees are on the committee?
Project Justification / Business Case	- Project seems to make a lot of sense and I agree that doing nothing would result in the eventual decay and the quality of information available. - Temporary Staff will no longer need to be employed to reenter data (was not directly stated but assumed); Expense of VPN tokens no longer required; reliable system built utilizing best practices.	- Not sure why the strengths/weaknesses of the Pearson Vue solution were not included in this section. It was briefly addressed in the Financial Analysis Section but did not include details.
Technical Impact	- The argument for being able to use current technology allowing the department to move forward with a reliable environment makes all the sense in the world. - Intend to conform with NITC standards and guidelines; proposing to replace prior to current system failing;	- It is stated that the current IT staff will need to be trained in VB.net but it is not clear if the cost of the VB.net licenses are included in this proposal; I was unable to determine where the physical infrastructure would reside that supports this system. i.e. 501 Building? - Little detail shown on reliability, security area.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project team appears to represent Agency IT area well.	- Not enough information to score above eight. It does appear however that the agency has a plan to address the implementation. - The indication is there will be two proposals. Unclear about the number "two". I would think involvement from IT individuals other than internal to Banking and Finance would be beneficial. I saw no mention of experience. No deliverables. - I would suggest based on possible barriers in RISK ASSESSMENT portion to add division head representation to project team to minimize possibilities of division heads not taking ownership of this project. Major milestones and deliverables not shown.
Risk Assessment	- Good grasp of the risks from what I've read. - Acknowledgement that loss of financial information is a risk.	- A project manager should be assigned that has no ties to the Department of Banking and Finance so the risk of division heads not taking ownership is negated. An IT Security individual will need to be involved.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Financial Analysis and Budget	- The programming estimate is based on several quotes received on a recent RFI. - Wide variety of vendors with various references. Budget estimates would appear to match up with several of the vendors from the RFI.	- Not sure what's included in the quotes they provided. I cannot tell what's included is it just programmer time? Are there software license costs? Hardware costs? As a result it is hard to make a real firm judgment in this area at this time. - Ongoing maintenance costs unknown and no estimate projected. No hardware costs projected. No ongoing staff costs projected. - Appear to be significant differences on vendor estimates shown and what the feature differences might be as they relate to price differentials.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
23-01	Department of Labor	Integration of Workforce Development Applications

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

NWD-DOL currently has business applications operating on three different technical platforms that have reached their end of life. We are considering a technical solution that will integrate seven business applications, facilitate the enrollment and tracking of participant education and employment activities and reporting on federally mandated performance measures. It will enhance job posting / searching capabilities through the use of a web search engine with 'spidering' capabilities that intelligently traverses multiple sites to find job matches. Initial project estimated costs are $3.1- $3.8M. This project will go through the competitive procurement process of an RFP. Federal funds will be utilized for this project.

The Integrated Workforce Systems Project is in very preliminary stages, and this Executive Summary is being provided at the very highest level.   A detailed proposal for NITC review and scoring purposes is still in the developmental process. Costs for the current infrastructure, applications, and maintenance of the applications are estimated. Preliminary cost comparisons for a vendor hosted solution and an internal hosted solution are estimated. Initial project costs are estimated at $3.1- $3.8M. This project will go through the competitive procurement process of an RFP. Federal funds will be utilized for this project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$149,500			149,500		
Other	$48,500			48,500		
Total	$198,000	$0	$0	$198,000	$0	$0
Training						
Technical Staff	$9,000			9,000		
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$9,000	$0	$0	$9,000	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$0					
Software	$3,580,890			716,178	716,178	2,148,534
Network	$98,500			98,500		
Other	$2,600			2,600		
Total	$3,681,990	$0	$0	$817,278	$716,178	$2,148,534
Total Request	$3,888,990	$0	$0	$1,024,278	$716,178	$2,148,534

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	14	8	10.7	15
Project Justification / Business Case	0	20	14	11.3	25
Technical Impact	13	15	14	14.0	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	8	4	6.3	10
Risk Assessment	7	5	5	5.7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	10	13	12.7	20
			TOTAL	**61**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The concept of integrating major workforce applications into an efficient system is laudable. - I believe the project is laudable and makes a lot of sense. - In the summary, it appears that the idea/concept is to look into consolidating disparate systems which certainly has validity. Options listed for solution delivery indicate open approach.	- Project is in the "definition" phase and doesn't have clear goals and objectives set. - A question? - Should this project be for funding feasibility phase with the outcome a "directional" recommendation for consolidation of systems? Also it was not clear to me if mandates are part of overall rationale for project?
Project Justification / Business Case		- The justification consists of one sentence and states that this is in the development stage. No benefits were stated. - Not enough information at this point to make a judgment call although I did rate it fairly high - As noted, no cost/business case noted yet. Would help to clarify what the implications of mandates and how they are/are not linked to project proposal. This will have a bearing on how the project is prioritized by NITC.
Technical Impact	- The agency recognizes the need to replace end of life equipment and systems with newer and more efficient methods. However, the project is in an initial planning stage and the description of what they are needing to do is adequate. - Early stage as acknowledged by Author. Considerations for leveraging existing infrastructure if possible and plans to develop costing scenarios among current and proposed solutions.	- Again a lot of unknowns at this stage of the proposal. I'm also concerned that there is no funding identified for hardware, which I find rather puzzling at this point, unless of course this is to be outsourced which may be a possibility
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project is in initial planning stage and the description of steps to take are adequate. - Too early in formulation.	- Again not a lot of information to make a judgment call. - Early in planning. While the "bullets" reference assumed guidelines for an RFP and would have budget/project management oversight, nothing included on any high-level thoughts/approach on how the system would be implemented.
Risk Assessment	- Project is in an initial planning stage and the description is adequate.	- One high risk is the staffing issue identified - and the agency priority for funding of the project. - Not enough information to make a valid assessment. - Though early in planning, would expect some assessment of overall project risk as it relates to goal of consolidation of disparate applications/processes.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Planning stage budget is estimated reasonably. - Too early in planning.	- Not enough information to make a valid assessment. - As planning evolves would expect to see more.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
27-01	Department of Roads	Human Resources Document Management System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

NDOR Human Resources maintains 1,000s personnel files and records on all employees, currently or previously, employed with the agency. These records are currently maintained through paper and file cabinets/lektriever. While alternatives are being considered on how to move NDOR Human Resources to a paperless division, more immediate solutions can be addressed toward the elimination of paper personnel files.

Through the use of current NDOR resources, such as Falcon, all current paper files can be scanned and transferred to electronic files, making the files more secure, confidential, and accurate with less loss of paper. Efficiency of Human Resources employees will increase due to the reduction in handling of paper, searching for forms, paperwork and files. All personnel files will be easily accessible by Human Resources employees, and in some cases department supervisors and managers. This system will also automate the archival and retention capabilities of the documents.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed. This project will be completed in FY09.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$5,000		5,000			
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$25,000		25,000			
Total	$30,000	$0	$30,000	$0	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$5,000		5,000			
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$5,000	$0	$5,000	$0	$0	$0
Total Request	$35,000	$0	$35,000	$0	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes		11	14	12.5	15
Project Justification / Business Case		16	19	17.5	25
Technical Impact		15	15	15.0	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		6	10	8.0	10
Risk Assessment		6	9	7.5	10
Financial Analysis and Budget		15	18	16.5	20
TOTAL				77	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clear, measurable goals.	- Consider what you can do to promote adoption of the new capability once it has been established.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Possible savings are identified	- Justification is very general, without identifying much specific or detailed benefit. - The business case lacks specifics. Consider identifying how much HR time will be saved and how the time saved will be reallocated. Can the savings in paper, cabinets, filing time and travel be estimated?
Technical Impact	- Uses existing technology, with no apparent major expansion. - Employs an existing, proven technical platform (Falcon).	- Little detail is provided about the current technology environment. - More analysis should be devoted to the network bandwidth requirements. I am not familiar with the agency's network but I know that employees are stationed in all areas of the State. Scanned images can require a good deal of bandwidth -- will the response time be acceptable in all locations?
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The preliminary plan and the underlying project management processes are sound.	- Only a very high level of information is provided.
Risk Assessment	- A relatively small direct expenditure is required. Learning from this project may benefit the enterprise TMS if that project advances.	- Unclear why this project could not wait until a decision is reached about the Talent Management System from Administrative Services. - Consider if all costs are identified. For example, to what extent (if any) will the savings in HR filing be offset by the scanning and metadata tagging process? How much risk is there that remote staff will not use the system? To what extent may network bandwidth be an issue in some locations?
Financial Analysis and Budget	- A relatively small direct expenditure is required since the project builds on existing facilities.	- $25,000 of the $35,000 total is marked "Other", without much explanation of the expenditure. - The proposal does not appear to address the cost of scanning and indexing the existing paper records.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
27-02	Department of Roads	Bridge Management System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

The purpose of this project is to develop a one-stop shop for Bridge related information, similar to the Pavement Optimization Program (POP). With the completion of this project, customers will be able to access bridge related information through a point and click environment. Information such as Posting Summary sheets, bridge photos, bridge plans; Inspection Reports, etc. will have a direct link from an opening screen. The opening screen will sit on the user's desktop as an icon and when opened the user will have the option to go directly to the bridge information of their choosing. The opening screen will have an arrangement of radio buttons which the user can click-on to retrieve the information they want to view. It is anticipated that the primary users of this new application will be the District Engineers, Division Heads, and Division personnel from Bridge, Roadway Design, Construction, and Planning and Project Development. It is estimated that the initial version could be completed within six months of the start of the project. As users become aware of and begin to use this new application subsequent versions will be enhanced to meet the needs of the users. This new application will greatly enhance the bridge decision-making process and improve the flow of bridge information throughout the Department.

The budget for this project was included inthe appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$10,000		10,000			
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$25,000		25,000			
Total	$35,000	$0	$35,000	$0	$0	$0
Total Request	$35,000	$0	$35,000	$0	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	12	14	13.0	15
Project Justification / Business Case	18	16	18	17.3	25
Technical Impact	12	15	18	15.0	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	8	10	8.0	10
Risk Assessment	3	7	6	5.3	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	10	16	12.0	20
			TOTAL	71	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The agency has described an efficiency project for the Department that is based on a current success for POP. - POP application already exists and can be used as a pattern for new application.	- There is no mention of the agency technology plan and how this fits into it. Additionally, they clearly state that there is not requirement for this project. - Plan assumes that new application requirements will be the same as POP.
Project Justification / Business Case	- The project benefits related to the efficiency of the worker and the saving of physical space. - The concept is good and will bring all the information together and make available through a single interface.	- No actual documentation on ROI or other benefits. - With no mandate to create this system, becoming and staying a priority could delay the project.
Technical Impact	- POP system already exists and the technology can be supported with existing hardware and software.	- Not sure if they are planning to do this work themselves or with an outside contractor. There is no indication that there are costs associated with their side of any of this work. - Technical solution depends on the POP system the similarity of the data and requirements.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- General listing of roles and timelines. - The department already is familiar with FALCON software and the POP application	- Roles and timelines are not detailed by people who have any experience or specific steps that will be accomplished and by whom. - The requirements and scope are not defined and the scope could exceed the POP application.
Risk Assessment	- Development will be completed in-house and the model for this application already exists.	- The risks were not clearly identified. What is the risk of not doing this? - No deadlines to complete have been created, are all stakeholders in agreement on priorities? - What are the risks associated with doing the project?
Financial Analysis and Budget		- The budget of $35,000 is for programming and other without any clear indication of exactly how it will be spent and how the numbers were determined. - Hard to determine if funding is adequate.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
27-03	Department of Roads	Accident Records System Rewrite

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

The Highway Safety document imaging/workflow "CUSTOM CODE" (Accident Records System (ARS)) will be totally rewritten to simplify the routes and make the process more efficient. The core off-the-shelf systems including WorkDesk ^{tm} and the Imaging and Archive Server software will remain as-is. The project will result in a time savings for employees using the system, resulting in quicker entry of crash data and the availability of data for analysis purposes, and a major reduction in the cost of printers, paper, and toner. We will also be applying for some federal grants that would allow us to recover some of the cost to the State.

This project is one of the goals in our Director's Long Range Transportation Plan. The goal to improve safety includes the need to fully develop an automated crash (accident) reporting system so that law enforcement at all levels and other parties can use this technology when they are ready.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation in fiscal year 2009 therefore no additional funds are needed. This project will most likely fall into fiscal year 2010 in which case we will need to move any remaining funds from 2009 to 2010.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual services – Account 4419
        Design - $50,000
            Programming - $300,000
        Other - $50,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	11	14	12.0	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	15	16	17.0	25
Technical Impact	12	13	18	14.3	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	6	9	7.0	10
Risk Assessment	3	5	5	4.3	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	12	12	11.3	20
			TOTAL	66	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The agency is planning to rewrite the web piece of this application and "re-use" the work flow (although it is difficult to tell whether the costs include the new version of WorkDesk Software they mention). They do have a strong set of goals and cost avoidance that they are attempting to achieve.	- I don't see this tied to their technology plan. It is unclear what they are proposing, a bid for service, their own staff rewrite, etc. Costs are for contractual services only - no internal staffing costs. Most of the justification is to replace printers without any documentation about the amount of printing this takes.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- The design for the application already exist, this is an upgrade in software and process.	- The proposal assumes that the current problems can be overcome with newer technology and improved routing.
Project Justification / Business Case	- There is a strong partnership list of additional users. - Software upgrades are needed and the opportunity to introduce web based solution exist.	- The benefits focus on printer replacement without much, if any, emphasis on what will be achieved by analysis, etc. - The justification of reduced printing may not be possible current processes may not be improved to gain desired efficiencies - Other solutions should be researched and evaluated for a project of this size.
Technical Impact	- The Agency is familiar with the software and hardware to be used in this application.	- Not sure if they are planning to do this work with existing staff or outside staff. Budget does not show any break down of costs and narrative doesn't indicate how they plan to accomplish this work. - Source code may not be available creating additional programming. The introduction of web based solutions may break existing processes and require upgrades and changes to the technical environment.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- General listing of roles and timelines. - Project team and sponsors are well defined and familiar with the current solution.	- Roles and timelines are not detailed by people who have any experience or specific steps that will be accomplished and by whom. - Timeframes for steps to be taken may not be realistic; the scope could change thus impacting both time and money.
Risk Assessment		- The risks were not clearly identified and the ones that were identified appear unclear. It also appears that there are some legislative barriers to doing this project that may need changes? - The number and types of risks identified do not seem to address the main threats given the potential scope and complexity of this project. - The risks listed are related to not doing the project. What are the risks of doing the project?
Financial Analysis and Budget		- The budget of $350,000 is for design and programming without any clear indication of exactly how it will be spent and how the numbers were determined. - Based on information in the plan there is no way to know if the budget is adequate. - Seems very expensive. Over two man years at $75/hr

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	Courtroom Technology

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

The court is currently looking for alternative space for the judges and staff now located on the 12th and 13th floors of the State Capitol building, with a projected move-in date of July 1, 2009. The upcoming move will require an additional appropriation to cover costs for basic technology equipment needed at the new facility.

In conjunction with the move the court will be equipping four new Lincoln courtrooms with document presentation, audio, video, and video conferencing technology.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$19,091			19,091		
Total	$19,091	$0	$0	$19,091	$0	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$30,544			15,272	15,272	
Total	$30,544	$0	$0	$15,272	$15,272	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$190,913			190,913		
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$190,913	$0	$0	$190,913	$0	$0
Total Request	$240,548	$0	$0	$225,276	$15,272	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	10	11	11.7	15
Project Justification / Business Case	22	16	19	19.0	25
Technical Impact	17	15	17	16.3	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	6	7	7.3	10
Risk Assessment	9	5	6	6.7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	13	16	15.7	20
			TOTAL	77	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Project objectives are thoroughly explained and aligned with agency responsibilities and goals. - Agency recognizes the need to modernize the courtroom.	- Difficulty understanding the correlation between the Judge's moving out of the Capitol and establishing four new courtrooms. - Clear description, but limited details on stated goals.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Tangible benefits are present. Other solutions evaluated and compared. Justification is present regarding State mandate. - Recognize the need for using technology in the courtroom and potential travel savings. - Good technical description of need for the project.	- The project fits well into modernization of the Capitol and modernization of courtrooms, but partnerships for deploying the technology are not well defined. Agency needs to work with those entities deploying the equipment in the Capitol. - Very little explanation of what business issues are addressed by this project.
Technical Impact	- Project implementation and replacement strategy is good. Hardware and communications are reliable. Statement of strengths and conformity with NITC standards are present. - Expands current projects in progress. - Following advice of respected bodies like National Center for State Courts.	- No weaknesses are apparent. Security statement is somewhat vague. - In the State's best interests, this should not be a stand alone project and should be implemented under the same video project that is currently under way in the Capitol and within other State agencies.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- All elements are adequately addressed.	- Project Team does not show a partnership with any existing video project deployments. Clear timelines and deliverables not defined. - Not particularly detailed. Would be good to know, at a detailed level, what commitments NET will need to meet in this project.
Risk Assessment	- Risks are clearly defined. Strategies to minimize risk are present.	- Security statement is vague. - Lack of identified partnerships could heighten risk factor. Should be required to use existing State resources for planning and deployment so it fits in with the overall State video deployments. - Perhaps too quick to dismiss any chance of significant risk
Financial Analysis and Budget		- Cost seems high for four courtrooms. Partnerships need to be explored to identify need vs. want and that overall inclusion in the State's overall video deployments.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
47-01	Nebraska Education Telecommunication Commission	Public Media Project - Phase 2

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

To serve Nebraskans by keeping pace with today's rapidly evolving technology, NET is requesting $114,000 in capital funds and $60,000 in annual operating funds to implement Phase 2 of the Public Media Project by adding software and storage components that will complement the communications technology redesign at the Capitol and NET, and allow greater public access to Legislative and Judiciary proceedings and communications from the Executive branch. The same investment will allow NET to create a repository for video content produced by educational and non-profit organizations within the state.

In increasing numbers, 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 live media funded by Phase 1 of the Public Media project by extending the content availability through proven new media and internet technologies. This proposal provides those capabilities through cost-efficient applications that will streamline routine production and distribution tasks including capture, logging, editing, transcoding, asset management, archiving and content administration.

The engine driving the archive is a digital rights management system (DRM) coupled with digital media publishing software, hard drive storage, and a web content management system (WCMS) which will optimize the State of Nebraska's investment in content, and more effectively distribute information important to Nebraska's civically and culturally-engaged individuals and organizations.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$11,000			11,000		
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$5,000			5,000		
Total	$16,000	$0	$0	$16,000	$0	$0

Training						
Technical Staff	$3,500			3,500		
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$3,500	$0	$0	$3,500	$0	$0

Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$3,500			3,500		
Travel	$0					
Other	$3,500			3,500		
Total	$7,000	$0	$0	$7,000	$0	$0

Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$55,000			55,000		
Software	$22,000			22,000		
Network	$0					
Other	$10,500			10,500		
Total	$87,500	$0	$0	$87,500	$0	$0
Total Request	$114,000	$0	$0	$114,000	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	12	10	12.3	15
Project Justification / Business Case	24	20	16	20.0	25
Technical Impact	19	16	15	16.7	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	10	9.0	10
Risk Assessment	10	8	10	9.3	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	19	19	18	18.7	20
			TOTAL	86	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals, objectives and outcomes part of this proposal are well stated and well thought out. - Enhancement of service already being provided.	- Relationship to Phase 1 not clearly defined
Project Justification / Business Case	- Justification for this project is also well thought out and it is clear that the agency has a firm understanding of what is necessary to be successful. - Recognize public demand for content and are enhancing the system to provide it. Also allows them to further fulfill their statutory requirements.	- Proposal states Thousands of hours of content have been created, but first year goal of project is 150 hours as the intended target. Also fee based access should be explored further to fund the project costs.
Technical Impact	- Clear that the agency is well aware of the technical requirements necessary to make this a successful project. - Have considered interoperability with not only their own, but with the State's video systems. Are leveraging current equipment and infrastructure to enhance capabilities.	- Relationship to phase 1 of project
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Agency recognizes this is a multiyear project, and the qualifications of the project manager are quite impressive. - Timeline and milestones reasonable.	
Risk Assessment	- Very good grasp of the potential risks giving me the confidence that that they are not going into	

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	this project with their eyes closed. - Describe risks of doing it as well as of not doing it.	
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Financial requirements for project of this type seemed to be well thought out and quite reasonable. - Appears to be a low dollar amount for what will be accomplished. Leveraging existing equipment and resources as much as possible.	- Relationship to phase 1 of ongoing project

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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
65-01	Administrative Services – State Personnel	Human Resources Talent Management System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted here: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2009-11/index.html]

A Talent Management System is a Human Resources Software as a Service (SaaS) product composed of six elements which roughly correspond with the stages of the employee "life cycle." Those stages are recruiting and hiring a new employee, getting the new employee on-board, training, evaluating performance, offering a career path for promotion or lateral skill acquisition, and finally compensating the employee based on performance. The components of the software system are interconnected with each other and interfaces with NIS for better data gathering and reporting.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$0					
Software	$1,741,000		538,000	377,000	413,000	413,000
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$1,741,000	$0	$538,000	$377,000	$413,000	$413,000
Total Request	$1,741,000	$0	$538,000	$377,000	$413,000	$413,000

▼Funding	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr.	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$197,000		120,000	37,000	20,000	20,000
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$1,216,000		170,000	260,000	393,000	393,000
Other Fund	$110,000		30,000	80,000		
Total Funding	$1,523,000	$0	$320,000	$377,000	$413,000	$413,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes		11	14	12.5	15
Project Justification / Business Case		20	18	19.0	25
Technical Impact		15	1	8.0	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		6	7	6.5	10
Risk Assessment		7	1	4.0	10
Financial Analysis and Budget		12	10	11.0	20
			TOTAL	61	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The proposal includes a detailed list of goals, objectives and outcomes. - The description in the project proposal was very good.	
Project Justification / Business Case	- Alternatives to this approach have been reviewed.	- The proposal includes many features but does not spell out the benefits of achieving the goals, objectives and outcomes. Consider describing scenarios that contrast current practice to the proposed future procedures. Include specific tangible and intangible benefits. For example, describe the savings that will result from supporting electronic personnel files.
Technical Impact		- The proposed system is described as a "Software as a Service" solution - no real discussion of the underlying technical details related to the provider. - The proposal fails to account for the technical issues inherent in a SaaS deployment model. These include security, disaster backup, customization, upgrades, scalability, maintenance windows and auditability. These and related business issues like end of contract transition procedures, standards, support levels, training and pricing can be addressed in a good RFP. The statement that "there is no reliance on IT developers and IT technical staff to maintain the TMS" is simply incorrect. The difference is that the staff work for the SaaS provider and not the State; such skills are still required.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Discussions with stakeholders have been ongoing and efforts have been underway to build acceptance.	- Very little detail about how the project would be staffed. Training and support decisions apparently ceded to the vendor. - The implementation plan envisions a phased (by functionality) statewide implementation. Consider an approach that takes advantage of a key benefit of the SaaS subscription model by implementing the entire set of functionality on an agency by agency basis. SaaS implementations can be structured in this way to reduce risk and cost.
Risk Assessment		- Response seems limited to discussion of a few rather technical details. - This large scale SaaS implementation would be a first for State government. There are many business, technical and contractual issues that need to be addressed. Security, for example, is an area of critical importance for HR records. Consider budgeting for a consultant who has experience and expertise in establishing and managing SaaS implementation contracts.
Financial Analysis and Budget		- The request for $1,741,000 appears to apply only to the subscription cost of the SaaS deployment. Consider including estimates of the interface costs, the costs to digitize paper records, digital storage and the personnel costs for ongoing administration of the system. It is unclear if there has yet been an analysis of the lifecycle costs of the SaaS approach compared to other software deployment models. An agency by agency approach to implementation (if adopted) should result in smaller expenditures in the early years. This is one way to address the funding shortfall. The project is in an initial planning phase. Consider including contingency funds

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		since this is the first large scale SaaS deployment in State government and there will probably be a surprise or two.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Project meets?			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?				

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

FY2009-2011 – IT Project Proposals

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-01	Secretary of State	Election Night Reporting System
09-02	Secretary of State	NECVRS Hardware Replacement
09-03	Secretary of State	Enterprise Content Management System
19-01	Department of Banking	FACTS Migration
23-01	Department of Labor	Integration of Workforce Development Applications
27-01	Department of Roads	Human Resources Document Management System
27-02	Department of Roads	Bridge Management System
27-03	Department of Roads	Accident Records System Rewrite
37-01	Workers' Compensation Court	Courtroom Technology
47-01	NET	Public Media Project - Phase 2
65-01	Administrative Services	Human Resources Talent

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 009 - SECRETARY OF STATE
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Election Night Reporting System

General Section

Contact Name :	Josh Daws	**E-mail :**	josh.daws@sos.ne.gov	**Agency Priority :**	
Address :	State Capitol, Suite 2300	**Telephone :**	4718779	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68509460		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	0	0	0	0	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 009 - SECRETARY OF STATE
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	180,000	0	0	90,000	90,000	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	180,000	0	0	90,000	90,000	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	0	0	0	0	0	0
Software	350,000	0	0	350,000	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	100,000	0	0	100,000	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	450,000	0	0	450,000	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	630,000	0	0	540,000	90,000	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	630,000	0	0	540,000	90,000	0
Cash Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**630,000**	**0**	**0**	**540,000**	**90,000**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project: Election Night Reporting System

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Secretary of State is the Chief Election Official for the State of Nebraska. As the Chief Election Official there are many functions that occur during an election cycle. One of most important functions is the reporting of election results on election night to the public, media and candidates. The Election Night Reporting (ENR) System is an integral program that allows the Secretary of State to perform these duties. The current ENR System has been in place since 1996. With new technologies and program languages available, we believe that this project could allow us to better report election results to public, media and candidates. We are currently looking at vendors to host this service for our office.

The Election Night Reporting System allows the public and the media the ability to check election results frequently (default = 5 mins).   The ENR System was created by volunteers for the State of Nebraska in 1996. The State of Nebraska was one of five states that performed this reporting service to the public at that time. Since 1996, the Secretary of State's Office has made the investment in software upgrades every election cycle to add the functionality needed (e.g. creating comma separated values (.CSV) files for the media to import election night data into their equipment). The investment per election cycle has been between $15,000 to $25,000.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

To procure a new Election Night Reporting System that will allow the Secretary of State to display in depth statewide election results via the web for the State, public and media. The system would have the ability to display numerical and graphical results by vote and race types along with maps to illustrate voter turnout by State, County and Precinct. It would also allow for the secure transmission of election data from the counties to the state.   This project is very important to our agency because it allow the public to see an open elections process.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

A new Election Night Reporting System would give the public better access to election night race information (President, Congress, Governor, Amendments...etc). The addition of precinct information gives real time data for better statistical analysis for future elections. The current system is very technical to operate. It requires one IT person to run the system and to support all of the internal functionality. The volunteers that created the system in 1996 are no longer available for support. The current system does not display data in a graphical format, nor does it utilize mapping functionality. Four years ago, our office was one of top states for election night reporting, today we are about even. By the 2010 Election cycle, the State will be behind the curve.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

The new Election Night Reporting (ENR) System project would allow the Secretary of State to present real time election night totals (data) to the public and the media by numerical, graphical and geographical formats. Currently, all county election officials have to manually input their county's election totals into our current ENR System (not including precinct totals). The new ENR System would allow all county election officials to import their election night totals from their own Election Reporting Manager (ERM) system directly into the ENR System utilizing ERM's native format which would include precinct totals. Using the old system, manually keyed results from the counties could be sometimes keyed in error. In the new ENR System, the counties will upload a file to the system, no manually keying is necessary. The State would also have a review function to allow errors to be spotted before being published to the web.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

The Secretary of State's would be issuing an RFP in the summer of 2009, so that the new ENR System would be fully implemented by the Winter of 2009 for the 2010 Elections.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

If the ENR System is hosted by a third party vendor, the State would work with the vendor to encrypt the communication tunnel and by encrypting the data in transit using the latest information security techniques. Network communications from the Counties and State to the internet are crucial because of upload process from the counties to the ENR System. The Vote Tabulation equipment is not connected to any network. Information would be taken from the Vote Tabulation PC by USB key to a PC with internet connectivity for the uploading of election reporting data to the ENR System.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

We are seeking General Fund dollars for this project.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 009 - SECRETARY OF STATE
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : NECVRS Hardware Replacement

General Section

Contact Name :	Josh Daws	**E-mail :**	josh.daws@sos.ne.gov	**Agency Priority :**	
Address :	State Capitol, Suite 2300	**Telephone :**	4718779	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68509460		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	0	0	0	0	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 009 - SECRETARY OF STATE
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	320,000	0	0	320,000	0	0
Software	0	0	0	0	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	320,000	0	0	320,000	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	320,000	0	0	320,000	0	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	320,000	0	0	320,000	0	0
Cash Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**320,000**	**0**	**0**	**320,000**	**0**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project: NECVRS Hardware Replacement

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Help America Vote Act of 2002, Public Law 107-252, 42 U.S.C. 15301-15545 ("HAVA") following passage by the U.S. Congress was signed into law by the President of the United States George Bush on October 29, 2002. This legislation marked a significant step toward major change in our election systems nationwide. The State of Nebraska successfully implemented the Nebraska Central Voter Registration System (NECVRS) in 2005. This IT Project is for the replacement of server hardware for the NECVRS.

Section 303 of HAVA describes the requirements for a statewide interactive voter registration database. Among the requirements are that the system utilize driver's license numbers and the last four digits of the social security number or in the alternative assign a unique identifier. Other requirements include coordination with other state agency databases and list maintenance procedures as outlined in the National Voter Registration Act. The State of Nebraska received $18.8 million dollars from the Federal Government to implement all of the changes within HAVA (Voter Outreach and Education, Vote Tabulation Equipment for all 93 counties and a centralized Voter Registration System). $4.1 million dollars was awarded to Election Systems and Software after a lengthy RFP process in July of 2004 for the Voter Registration System. The server hardware for the NECVRS was purchased in October of 2004 in preparation for all 93 counties' migration. The Nebraska Central Voter Registration System (NECVRS) was completed on November 22, 2005. Server warranties will run out on all 31 servers of the NECVRS on October of 2009.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

Replacement of 31 Servers that are used for the Nebraska Central Voter Registration System. Beneficiaries of the project are the State of Nebraska, all County Election Officials and the general public. Excepted outcomes would be for a seamless transition of old servers to new servers. The project is critical to the State of Nebraska.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

The Nebraska Central Voter Registration System allows all 93 counties and state to manage the voter registration processes that are required by Federal (NVRA of 1993; HAVA of 2002) and State Law (Chapter 32). (Voter Registration, Petitions, Voting (Early and Provisional), Poll Book Generation, Scanning of VR documents...etc.)   If this IT Project is unapproved the hardware warranties will run out in October of 2009.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

Utilizing quad core and dual core processing technologies within the latest servers should allow for a faster system. The current system utilizes Windows and Linux as the Operating Systems. Oracle 10g is the backend database engine. The counties use Internet Explorer and Citrix to connect to the NECVRS over the State's network or county owned DSL. The NECVRS resides at a harden facility in Omaha, Nebraska per the agreement with Election Systems and Software. All server racks are locked in cages on raised floors for environmental control. The raised floor rooms are accessible by security escort. Firewall and router configurations are in place to secure the network and server hardware. Network and Servers are managed by our vendor under SOS supervision.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

The Secretary of State's Office would work with our vendor, Election Systems and Software and all 93 counties to implement the migration of systems for the NECVRS. The servers would be purchased under existing state contracts to save general fund dollars in Summer of 2009. Project team, their roles and responsibilities would be assigned in the early Spring of 2009. The tentative implementation deadline for this project would be December 1, 2009. No training would be required for the hardware replacement.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

County elections in 2009 could possibly be at risk during this transition. The State will coordinate with all 93 on any special elections and/or city elections during the transition period. Server hardware could be brought up side by side along old hardware and finally transitioned server by server to minimize risk.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

This server hardware was purchased by Federal Funds in 2004. That funding will run out in 2010. Our office is seeking the necessary funds to keep the Nebraska Central Voter Registration System running for State and County Governments. No PSL is needed for this project.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 009 - SECRETARY OF STATE
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Enterprise Content Management System

General Section

Contact Name :	Josh Daws	**E-mail :**	josh.daws@sos.ne.gov	**Agency Priority :**	
Address :	State Capitol, Suite 2300	**Telephone :**	4718779	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68509460		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	0	0	0	0	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 009 - SECRETARY OF STATE
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	300,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	300,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	825,000	0	0	825,000	0	0
Software	1,325,000	0	0	1,325,000	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	400,000	0	0	200,000	200,000	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	2,550,000	0	0	2,350,000	200,000	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	2,850,000	0	0	2,500,000	350,000	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	2,850,000	0	0	2,500,000	350,000	0
Cash Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**2,850,000**	**0**	**0**	**2,500,000**	**350,000**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project: Enterprise Content Management System

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Quality decision making in state government is dependent on access to its documents and records. The accessibility of electronic records is the cornerstone to open and accountable government. The IT Project Proposal is to establish an Enterprise Content Management (ECM) System for the State of Nebraska. All State Agencies are required to manage their records regardless of form or format according to the State Records Management Act. The adoption of this IT Project Proposal will give all agencies the ability to manage their unstructured electronic records. The creation of an ECM System becomes imperative with the Federal Government and State of Nebraska's adoption of the new Rules of Civil Procedure.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) worked toward the development of a Unified Collaboration System through the purchase and implementation of Exchange 2007 and Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007. However, the Unified Collaboration System currently lacks a robust ECM System to manage the State's unstructured data (records). ECM Systems aid in organizing records by providing seamless access while managing the records' life-cycle until disposal or transfer to the State Archives for permanent retention. State Agencies will continue to forfeit the benefits of efficient business processes and remain at risk for legal discovery issues and compliance with State of Nebraska records retention laws if this IT Project Proposal is not approved and implemented. ECM Systems provide the business logic required to capture, control, maintain and dispose of electronic records. They provide the end user with the ability to control electronic files as records and associate them to a file code and corresponding disposition authority. DoD 5015.2-STD-certified ERM applications (http://jitc.fhu.disa.mil/recmgt/register.htm) accomplish such in a manner that guarantees conformance with record-keeping statutes and regulations. Using ECM applications, Agencies can implement file plans that manage and control dispositions of their records in accordance with State and Federal laws.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

The goal of this project is the implementation of an independent Enterprise Content Management System that oversees the life-cycle of unstructured records in the OCIO's Unified Collaboration System (Exchange 2007, Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007, Office Communication Server 2007...etc)

When implemented, the ECM System will benefit all State Agencies, but most importantly it will benefit the citizens of the State because their electronic records will be held with the same regard and professionalism as paper or microfilm records. The Records Management Division within the Secretary of State's Office will create measurements and assessment goals during the Request for Proposal process. These measurements will assist the Secretary of State and Office of the Chief Information Officer in creating and implementing a successful Enterprise Content Management System for the State of Nebraska. This project is vital to the State of Nebraska because the implementation of the OCIO's Unified Collaboration Project did not properly address this issue during that procurement process.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

The introduction of Enterprise Content Management will benefit the State of Nebraska by allowing State Agencies to properly manage their records according to their agency specific schedule(s) and the Schedule 124 for General Records. Whether the unstructured records are in an email or documents located in SharePoint, agencies have a statutory responsibility to maintain those records during their life-cycle. The public has the right to inspect records for open and accountable government, while being assured that their vital records are being maintained and protected. An ECM System will allow for that oversight. The Secretary of State's Office and the Office of Chief Information Officer have evaluated several ECM vendors over the last 12 months. If an ECM System is not adopted there are several issues that could occur. Agencies will not be able to maintain their records management schedules and records that are required to be maintained for a legal hold could be deleted (purposely or by accident). The State could be held liable for the destruction

of records during a lawsuit (Federal or State). There is also a high probability that some records will be lost by not utilizing an ECM System and because of that some of Nebraska's history may be lost. This project's goal is to properly maintain records according to their scheduled life-cycle and to keep safe those records which need to be kept in perpetuity.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

Currently, there is not an Enterprise Content Management System in the State of Nebraska that will manage unstructured data (emails, documents, spreadsheets, pdf...etc). The project does not include relational databases; however they will be included at a later date. The technical elements of the project are still to be determined because most vendors will be releasing new ECM packages over the next year. The technical elements will be chosen during the Request for Proposal process started in 2009. Currently, strengths and weaknesses are unknown. Reliability, security and scalability will be addressed during the RFP process. The ECM System will be evaluated using NITC criteria and DoD 5015.2-STD as guidelines. The addition of this new ECM System should be compatible with existing systems and expandable for new solutions that come out at later dates.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

If approved, our plan is to compose an RFP in the Spring of 2009. The RFP will be released in the Summer of 2009. Once a vendor is chosen, the Secretary of State along with its partners in State government would implement the Enterprise Content Management System. Project Sponsors would be the Secretary of State and Office of the Chief Information Officer with stakeholders being all Constitutional Officers, State Agencies, Boards and Commissions. The project sponsors will work closely with the State Historical Society to make sure that perpetual records are properly transferred. The project team with their corresponding roles and responsibilities has not yet been defined. Agencies Records Officers will be trained on the use of the new ECM System and in turn train their agency end users. The ongoing support requirements for an ECM System are great. ECM will be in a constant state of growth because of the proliferation of electronic systems and the records they create. Software support will be critical during and after implementation. New hardware will need to be added as more and more electronic records are being introduced.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

Non-adoption of the ECM System by State Agencies is a possible barrier for this Project. The Records Management Division within the Secretary of State's Office will be working with the Office of the Chief Information Officer and each Agency Records Officer to train and implement ECM within their organization.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

The Secretary of State's Office will be seeking General Fund Dollars for this project. Our office will also seek the authority to utilize Cash Funds from the Uniform Commercial Code Division and Corporations Divisions. Our office would also seek to use Revolving Fund authority from our Records Management Division. We are asking for PSL for 2 FTEs with Information Technology and Records Management backgrounds to assist with the implementation and future management of the Enterprise Content Management System.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 019 - DEPARTMENT OF BANKING
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : FACTS Migration

General Section

Contact Name :	Jeanette Lee	**E-mail :**	jeanette.lee@nebraska.gov	**Agency Priority :**	1
Address :	1230 'O' St., Suite 400	**Telephone :**	1-4936	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68508		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	173,400	0	0	135,000	38,400	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	173,400	0	0	135,000	38,400	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	6,600	0	0	5,000	1,600	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	6,600	0	0	5,000	1,600	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 019 - DEPARTMENT OF BANKING
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	0	0	0	0	0	0
Software	0	0	0	0	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	180,000	0	0	140,000	40,000	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash Fund	180,000	0	0	140,000	40,000	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	180,000	0	0	140,000	40,000	0
VARIANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0

IT Project: FACTS Migration

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Department's Financial Agency Centralized Tracking System (FACTS) is the application, licensing and data storage system. FACTS is written in Microsoft Visual Basic 6 (VB6). As of March 2008, Microsoft no longer supports VB6. Utilizing the CIO's office expertise when determining the timing of an upgrade, the Department was told the current application will work provided the Department does not modify existing code, does not change the operating system and does not add new code. This project is to migrate the unsupported existing system from Microsoft Visual Basic 6.

Currently tracking 47,431 financially related entities, institutions, licensees or offerings and exemptions; FACTS serves as the reporting, billing, enforcement tracking and resource allocation source of information. Since the original in-house design and implementation in 2002, enhancements of the program have improved searches, enlarged the databases to provide more relevant information, enabled electronic retrieval of examinations and audits and coordinated exportation of key data fields to better inform the public of financial activities. Web enabling the FACTS system would bring significant efficiencies to the department as national vendors work with licensees and then make their data available to the department.

The responsibilities of the Department have significantly increased since FACTS was written in 2002. For instance, during the past 5 years, the Department supervised bank assets have increased 50% to the current level of $20 billion; the securities division licensed more than 79,000 regulated entities, individuals and activities.

Currently the integration of the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System (NMLS) datahas not been integrated completely due to the potential consequence of placing new code in the mission critical application.

The current financial regulatory environment requires enhanced information collection and reporting; however, the current system can no longer be reliably modified. With the assistance of the CIO office; a consultant was hired to determine the upgrade path and a Request for Information was issued to evaluate the cost of migrating the current VB6 system to Visual Basic.net (VB.net). The Department is also considering contracting with a third-party vendor who would create and maintain the system.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

Migrate FACTS to a language that will be supported and reliably modifiable; allow continuing upgrades and enhancements; Increase utilization of the web access to sensitive information and accelerate the delivery of public information. Increase security regarding the collection and utilization of personally identifiable information; Increase use of imaging to make information available to examiners and investigators.

Increase capability to gather information from national licensing systems; offering more centralization of information; Increase routine reporting of input and output workflow; Increase identification and service to Department stakeholders.

The migration of FACTS will continue to offer the application, licensing and data management functions of the original FACTS system. Updating the technology and code behind FACTS will translate into increased security, streamlined workflow and cost savings both in terms of decreased out of pocket day to day expenses and decreased risk of the loss of control of licensing information.

Expected Beneficiaries of the Project

Department employees would be the primary beneficiaries, as they are expected to render risk-based opinions, licensing and regulatory decisions with consideration to numerous sources of information.   Secondarily the health of the Nebraska economy would be influenced, as the stakeholders consist of every Nebraska bank, financial institution and security issuer or broker dealer. Realistically the stakeholders maybe expanded to consider every one that places money in a Nebraska bank, financial institution or invests with a security issuer or broker dealer.

Expected Outcomes:

Increased centralization of data will allow for case management, licensing and enforcement efficiencies. Utilization of imaging will decrease costs and reliance on the physical delivery of paper to stakeholders. Increased security will protect the data using current technology. The result will be an updated and unified systemic approach to data gathering, processing and security.

Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

The IT Staff will work directly with the vendor using project management processes and procedures. Weekly status meetings will be held to determine direction and measure progress.

A FACTS Steering committee which includes a representative from all areas of the department will be called upon to give input and make sure each area's needs are covered in the new system.

NDBF will manage and monitor all tasks in the project.

Describe the project's relationship to your agency comprehensive information technology plan.

The FACTS migration is the agency's top IT priority and was submitted in the September 15th Agency Information Technology Plan for FY 2009-2011 Biennial Budget.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

Tangible benefits: Access to a reliable centralized system written in currently supported computer code that will be ongoing and can be enhanced; Streamline data received from national data collection sources. Currently the Department employs a temporary staff position during part of the year to reenter data; Web enhancement would decrease remote access reliance and the related cost, of VPN technology. Currently every examiner carries a RSA VPN token; Increase access, due to imaged files and secure web availability, by field examiners to routine reports, audits and bank related information; Improve security; the Department field examiners routinely work with thousands of Personally Identifiable Information records, security is a key consideration.

Intangible benefits: The public will continue to view the Department as a reliable source of information with regard to licensing and chartering decisions; The Information needed will all be available on one screen rather than relying on multiple screens from multiple systems; Email and activity trigger notices will be employed rather than reliance on the existing manual paper driven system; Continued public reliance on Nebraska Financial System

Doing nothing would result in the eventual decay in the quality of information available to the various NDBF licensing and case management desks.   It is not acceptable to continue with the current system and it is unpredictable when a problem may be caused by continued enhancements and operating system upgrades.* This puts the Department at great risk and the potential to lose access to the entire database

Based upon funding, NDBF wishes to update the current system to a supported language utilizing current best practices and technology.

*We have been told "as long as you don't touch the code, it will work on the operating system you now have. No promises on future operating system release or if you have to add new code in VB 6.0 that it will continue to work."

If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

The reason for the upgrade is to become current with supported programming languages, techniques and standards. State and Federal reporting is generated from this system.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or implements a new technology system. Describe the technical elements of the project, including hardware, software, and communications requirements. Describe the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution.

Being able to use current technology will allow the department to move forward with reliable and supported technology. Web enabling the system will improve communication between the program and the users allowing easy notification of system alerts. The computer language skills of the current IT staff will need to be upgraded from VB6 to VB.net. At this point, we feel our server hardware upgrade schedule will come out of the regular budget and new equipment is not expected to be needed for this project.

A Web enabled system would allow our remote field offices to access data that is a bit difficult to access at this time as they must connect to our Network with their secure RSA Token which slows the process. VB.net licenses would need to be purchased if the system is written in VB.net and supported by the Department IT Staff.

Address the following issues with respect to the proposed technology:

Describe the reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation) of the technology.

Address conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards.

Address the compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

The new FACTS system will comply with the requirements addressed on the NITC website.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance. Describe the project team, including their roles, responsibilities, and experience.

After the IT Staff evaluates the two proposals, an RFP will be created to select a vendor to do the migration of FACTS.

The Project Team will include:

John Munn: Director of the Department - Project Sponsor\

Kelly Lammers: IT Review Examiner - Chairman of the FACTS Migration Steering Committee

Jeanette Lee, IT Manager – Project Sponsor and Project Manager

Deb Caha, Senior Information Systems Infrastructure Analyst– Programming, User's input and support.

Chris Voss, Infrastructure Support Analyst – Roles: End user Support and Training.

The IT Manager and the Senior Information Systems Infrastructure Analyst will be involved with the vendor in the day to day ongoing effort with weekly reports to the FACTS Migration Steering Committee. Periodic progress reports will be given the Project Sponsor as well as direction for strategic questions.

List the major milestones and/or deliverables and provide a timeline for completing each.

Prior to December 31, 2008: Evaluate resources available regarding the re-write of FACTS into a Department housed program or identify service providers capable of delivering FACTS as a service. Request for Proposal to the Street.

Prior to February 15, 2009: Establish migration plan moving legacy system while addressing work flow efficiencies. Begin input review; begin to identify migration needs, migration pilot and target beta rollout for first quarter 2010.

Major milestones and deliverables are to be determined.

Describe the training and staff development requirements

The Banking Department IT Staff will receive training from the vendor and will be responsible to train the Department State staff on the proposed system. The FACTS Steering committee will be called upon to assist the IT Staff in in-depth area training. All staff will receive tool specific training.

Describe the ongoing support requirements.

Knowledge transfer to the IT Staff will be ongoing while the system is being created. The RFP will state what on-going maintenance costs with be.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project and the relative importance of each.

The project offers opportunity to address workflow efficiencies. Risks include division heads not taking ownership; workflow efficiencies may be negated by requirements to create paper trails to follow the system trail. Routine and exacting area meetings reflecting all screens, fields and potential utilization of the information will be addressed prior to implementation. Draft work flows will be proposed to prevent miscommunication regarding the format as well as the availability of information.

Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

Threats relative to any financial information is the loss of control of information, the unauthorized viewing of information or a denial of access to the information. The risks of the cited events are minimized when rights management, cryptography and standard programming methods are utilized.   Project completion will be contractually assigned to a vendor or developer with frequent Department review and acceptance.

Deployment of Each risk provides a situation in which the Department would experience the loss of trust and potentially be responsible for inaccurate data.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

Analysis of the information on our June 2008 RFI, we received the following estimates:

Bass & Associates, Omaha, References: BC/BS – Nebraska, BC/BS - Nebraska
Union Pacific, Dot.com, IA Water Works Language: VB6 to VB.Net Recommendation: 5 phase program $125,000; Experienced

AntinSoft, International References: None listed Recommendation: VB6 to VB.Net or C#; 4 phase program $159,425; Experienced

Client Resources Inc, Omaha, References: None listed. Recommendation: VB6 to VB.Net; $313,000

Ajilon, References: First American, McClatchy, NelNet, ClarkWestern. Recommendation: VB6 to VB.net; 5 phase program $259,400; 2nd year cost - 153,600; Experienced

GuruAlliance, References: Not Listed, Recommendation: Not Stated; 4 phase program $130,000; 2nd year 32,000

Additionally a demonstration by Pearson Vue at the Department of Insurance was attended. This was an example of a third-party vendor that would write and support the system. Other vendors will be available at the Conference of State Bank Supervisor's Technology Conference at the end of September. This allows research in what other State Banking Departments are using.

The budget request is based on contracted costs for programming and training. Ongoing department staff and expenses are not included.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 023 - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Integration of Workforce Development Applications

General Section

Contact Name :	Terri Johnston	**E-mail :**	terri.johnston@nebraska.gov	**Agency Priority :**	3
Address :	550 S. 16th Street	**Telephone :**	471-8358	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln, NE			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68509		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	149,500	0	0	149,500	0	0
Other	48,500	0	0	48,500	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	198,000	0	0	198,000	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	9,000	0	0	9,000	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	9,000	0	0	9,000	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 023 - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	0	0	0	0	0	0
Software	3,580,890	0	0	716,178	716,178	2,148,534
Network	98,500	0	0	98,500	0	0
Other	2,600	0	0	2,600	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	3,681,990	0	0	817,278	716,178	2,148,534
TOTAL PROJECT COST	3,888,990	0	0	1,024,278	716,178	2,148,534

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash Fund	3,888,990	0	0	1,024,278	716,178	2,148,534
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**3,888,990**	**0**	**0**	**1,024,278**	**716,178**	**2,148,534**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project: Integration of Workforce Development Applications

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

NWD-DOL currently has business applications operating on three different technical platforms that have reached their end of life. We are considering a technical solution that will integrate seven business applications, facilitate the enrollment and tracking of participant education and employment activities and reporting on federally mandated performance measures. It will enhance job posting / searching capabilities through the use of a web search engine with 'spidering' capabilities that intelligently traverses multiple sites to find job matches. Initial project estimated costs are $3.1- $3.8M. This project will go through the competitive procurement process of an RFP. Federal funds will be utilized for this project.

The Integrated Workforce Systems Project is in very preliminary stages, and this Executive Summary is being provided at the very highest level.   A detailed proposal for NITC review and scoring purposes is still in the developmental process. Costs for the current infrastructure, applications, and maintenance of the applications are estimated. Preliminary cost comparisons for a vendor hosted solution and an internal hosted solution are estimated. Initial project costs are estimated at $3.1- $3.8M. This project will go through the competitive procurement process of an RFP. Federal funds will be utilized for this project.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

Goal:

To implement an Integrated Workforce System by replacing NWAS, SASi, JobLink, TrainingLink, Career Compass, TRED, NStars & SARAS

Objectives/Deliverables:

- Develop and release an RFP to meet the project goals, budget, timeline and critical success factors
- Select a solution that meets business and technical requirements
- Contract vendor/business partner to deliver solution
- Evaluate merits of fee-based hosted solution and contract with vendor/business partner
- Cooperatively establish transition project plan with vendor/business partner to successfully accomplish transition
- Launch transition project
- Assess impact new solution will have on current services and business processes.
- Establish "new world" project plans to bring business successfully through transition e.g. manage service and business process changes, staff training, etc.
- Establish vendor management role to manage vendor/business partner performance for transition contract and possible Service Level Agreement for post implementation fee-based hosted solution

Success Criteria:

- Job seeking for Nebraskans will have a highly visible promotional mix
- Field Staff will have an integrated application that is user friendly with acceptable response time
- Technical architecture will include a browser type interface and single relational database
- NWAS, SASi, JobLink, TrainingLink, Career Compass, TRED, NSTARS & SARAS will be retired

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

Project cost justification and business cases are in the developmental stage of this project, therefore, funding data is estimated.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

The Integrated Workforce Systems project will replace seven existing applications residing on three different platforms. We are in the very early stages of project development, examining current infrastructure, applications and maintenance costs and assembling cost comparisons for a vendor hosted solution or an internal hosted solution. Existing infrastructure may be utilized if the application is hosted internally, either by NWD-DOL or OCIO. Technical elements, including hardware, software, and communications requirements, conformity with NITC technical standards and guidelines, will be analyzed and developed as the project progresses.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

Methods/Approach:

- Following DAS guidelines, an RFP will be released for competitive bid
- A budget and project plan will be developed
- The project will be formalized using proven project management practices leveraging expertise from an experienced vendor
- Vendor mangement practices will ensure performance objectives are accomplished

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

Risks and Dependencies:

- RFP released and vendor selected in timely manner
- Agency priority and performance in terms of funds and staff needed for project

- Vendor performance
- Application performance

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

Financial analysis is in the developmental stage. The budget reflected in this document is estimated until financial analysis is complete.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 027 - DEPARTMENT OF ROADS
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Human Resources Document Management System

General Section

Contact Name :	Bill Wehling	**E-mail :**	bill.wehling@nebraska.gov	**Agency Priority :**	
Address :	1500 Highway 2	**Telephone :**	402-479-3986	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68502		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	25,000	0	25,000	0	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	30,000	0	30,000	0	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	0	0	0	0	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 027 - DEPARTMENT OF ROADS
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	0
Software	0	0	0	0	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	35,000	0	35,000	0	0	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash Fund	35,000	0	35,000	0	0	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**35,000**	**0**	**35,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 027 - DEPARTMENT OF ROADS
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project: Human Resources Document Management System

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

See supporting information for the complete Executive Summary for the IT project - Human Resources Document Management System.

NDOR Human Resources maintains 1,000s personnel files and records on all employees, currently or previously, employed with the agency. These records are currently maintained through paper and file cabinets/lektriever. While alternatives are being considered on how to move NDOR Human Resources to a paperless division, more immediate solutions can be addressed toward the elimination of paper personnel files.

Through the use of current NDOR resources, such as Falcon, all current paper files can be scanned and transferred to electronic files, making the files more secure, confidential, and accurate with less loss of paper. Efficiency of Human Resources employees will increase due to the reduction in handling of paper, searching for forms, paperwork and files. All personnel files will be easily accessible by Human Resources employees, and in some cases department supervisors and managers. This system will also automate the archival and retention capabilities of the documents.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed. This project will be completed in FY09.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

See supporting information for a complete descritpion of goals, objectives and outcomes.

 Project Goals, Objectives:

The goal of this project is to provide a document management system for personnel files that will allow DOR employees to access their own personnel information and allow Human Resources Division to manage their documents electronically instead of having to maintain paper copies. The security will be as such that DOR employees can see only their own records and only authorized HR staff will be able to add, modify or remove documents. The security will be set using the capabilities of Falcon, our existing Document Management System.

The beneficiaries from this project will be the employees of the DOR being able to view their personnel date electronically instead of having to setup an appointment with HR. HR will also benefit once all documents are in the system by not having to spend time to search for all employee records and also the increase in work space since the lektriever and file cabinets will no longer be required.

This project falls in line with our goal to provide an agency-wide document management system for people to utilize for maintaining documents electronically and moving towards a paperless environment. It also is one of the reasons we purchased more licenses for the software as well as additional functionality that will be used on other applications throughout the DOR. Future applications could be utilizing our Crystal Reports portal for employees to view the records by utilizing the Falcon APIs or Application Programming Interfaces instead of going directly into the system.

Project Outcomes:

We have developed a project management methodology that will assist us in keeping the project within budget and with the necessary resources for completing the project. Our methodology includes the following phases;

1) Project Initiation
2) Project Planning
3) Project Executing
4) Project Controlling
5) Project Closing

We will be more than happy to provide a copy of our methodology if needed.

Once the system is implemented, Falcon has tracking capabilities built in that will allow us to see how many people have accessed the system at any time. We will use this to see the usage of the system.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

Significant cost savings will occur in time spent by Human Resources employees in the maintaining of employee files. Currently it takes significant employee time in locating employee files, removing of documents and then replacing with other documents. While not a common practice, it is not unlikely for documents to become misplaced, resulting in duplication of effort in a copy document.

Cost savings will also be seen in the savings of purchases of paper, files, and file cabinets, as well as maintenance to existing filing systems. At this time, if an employee wishes to view his/her personnel file, he/she must travel to the Human Resources location to do so. For some employees this would be a 6 hour drive each direction which means the employee would miss two days of work. With electronic files, employees are able to view their personnel files from their home office.

No other solutions were evaluated since the DOR already owned the software and this project is another way that we can utilize the software.

This project is not the result of a state or federal mandate.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

The project is moving from a manual process to a technological process. It will be utilizing the capabilities of our existing Document Management System (Falcon). We will most likely purchase a separate server to house the scanned documents since they are sensitive documents and confidentiality is a must. This system will not require and modifications or additions to our existing communications. The strengths of this solution are the ability for employees to view their records from their own office across the State and also to make it easier for HR to find personnel records. A possible weakness is that the metadata for each document must be added manually. Anytime you have manual entry there exists the possibility of errors. Sufficient checking by appropriate personnel must be done to avoid any errors.

The security is based off of windows security and only network administrators and our Falcon administrators have the ability to make changes or add folders or environments. The only need for growth may be additional space required as more employees are added but also we will be removing documents as per our own retention policies so it may even out in the long run.

We have implemented all NITC security policies and data standards throughout the NDOR as well as any industry standards that have been identified by our network and/or data administrators.

This will be a stand-alone application with no ties to other existing applications.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 027 - DEPARTMENT OF ROADS
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

We will be working with the Falcon vendor to assist us in developing the structure for the environment. We may also require the Falcon vendor to do some development for us to automate the process of inputting the documents and populating the metadata in an attempt to eliminate any manual data entry errors. We will then work with HR to determine how the documents will be added to the system. Will we be doing it internally or hire a third party to scan the documents for us. We will start with a "proof of concept" utilizing a sampling of documents to make sure they meet an acceptance criterion that is determined by our HR staff. Once the documents have been added into the system we will begin the training of employees and HR staff as describe in Section 11.

We have already begun working on this project and are in the process of completing the business requirements.   The actual approval

date for the charter and proposal was July 7th, 2008 so work did not begin until the third week in July.

Milestone	Date completed	Deliverable(s) completed
Charter and Proposal Form	6/10/2008	Fill out and Route
Preliminary Estimate Meeting	6/25/2008	Discuss proposed project make any needed changes to charter.
Charter Routed for Approval	6/27/2008	Charter Signed
Begin Requirements gathering and completion of Requirements Documentation.	7/15/2008	Hold requirements gathering meetings and document requirements. Approve requirements form.
Confirm selection of deliverables from requirements, document Milestones	07/31/2008	Deliverables are documented and agreed on.
Project Work Plan and Build Schedule.	08/15/2008	Build Implementation Plan, Build project schedule and Gantt chart. Route to Sponsor(s) for approval.
Project Work	08/15/2008 thru 12/31/2008	Implementation work is conducted. Milestones acceptance forms are completed and signed off. Deliverables are completed.
Project closing/ Formal Project Acceptance. Project Completed	1/15/2009	Project acceptance meetings are held and project acceptance form is routed and signed.
Post Implementation Review (PIR)	2/15/2009	Hold PIR meeting and fill out lessons learned form.

Training will be done by our Falcon team and will consist of a one or two hour session with HR staff that will be adding and removing documents from the system. The everyday user should not need any one-on-one training. A simple user document describing the environment, how to access it and navigate to their folder should suffice.

NDOR staff will be responsible for maintaining the system once it is implemented and HR staff will be responsible for the input and removal of documents from the system.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

Risk Area	Level (H/M/L)	Risk Plan
1. Nebraska Administrative Services pursuing Talent Management System.	M	If this system is to be put into place, many records currently stored in the NDOR Human Resources would then be relocated into the Talent Management System Server. This information includes all performance related documents and disciplines, recruitment, and hiring information
2. Employee Confidentiality	H	Provisions taken during system design to ensure access to information meets the security requirements.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

Budget for Project:

        Contractual services – Account 4419
                Programming - $5,000
                Other - $25,000
        Capital Expenditures – Account 4856
                Hardware - $5,000
        PROJECT TOTAL - $35,000

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed. This project will be completed in FY09.

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 027 - DEPARTMENT OF ROADS
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Bridge Management System

General Section

Contact Name :	BillWehling	E-mail :	bill.wehling@nebraska.gov	Agency Priority :	
Address :	1500 Highway 2	Telephone :	402-479-3986	NITC Priority :	
City :	Lincoln			NITC Score :	
State :	Nebraska	Zip :	68502		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	25,000	0	25,000	0	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	35,000	0	35,000	0	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	0	0	0	0	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 027 - DEPARTMENT OF ROADS
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	0	0	0	0	0	0
Software	0	0	0	0	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	35,000	0	35,000	0	0	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash Fund	35,000	0	35,000	0	0	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**35,000**	**0**	**35,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project: Bridge Management System

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

See supporting information for a complete executive summary for the Bridge management System project.

The purpose of this project is to develop a one-stop shop for Bridge related information, similar to the Pavement Optimization Program (POP). With the completion of this project, customers will be able to access bridge related information through a point and click environment. Information such as Posting Summary sheets, bridge photos, bridge plans; Inspection Reports, etc. will have a direct link from an opening screen. The opening screen will sit on the user's desktop as an icon and when opened the user will have the option to go directly to the bridge information of their choosing. The opening screen will have an arrangement of radio buttons which the user can click-on to retrieve the information they want to view. It is anticipated that the primary users of this new application will be the District Engineers, Division Heads, and Division personnel from Bridge, Roadway Design, Construction, and Planning and Project Development. It is estimated that the initial version could be completed within six months of the start of the project. As users become aware of and begin to use this new application subsequent versions will be enhanced to meet the needs of the users. This new application will greatly enhance the bridge decision-making process and improve the flow of bridge information throughout the Department.

The budget for this project was included inthe appropriation for FY09, therefore no additional monies are needed.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

See the supporting information for a complete descritpion of the goals, objectives and outcomes for this project - Bridge Management System.

The project has three goals;

1)   Create an application similar to the POP where all of the information on a structure including load ratings, structure type, condition ratings, etc. can be viewed along with an indication to the condition of the bridge using a red, yellow or green status.
2)   Scan all pertinent documents and place them in our Document Management System (Falcon) so the documents are stored electronically instead of handling paper copies.
3)   Creating links within the application to access other information about the structure such as the documents in Falcon, video log information or a map showing the location along with an aerial image.

The expected beneficiaries of this product will be District Engineers, Division Heads, and Division personnel from Bridge, Roadway Design, Construction, and Planning and Project Development. It will allow management to make decisions on what structures need to be replaced or refurbished, provide designers the information they need to do their work in creating construction plans and provide information to Construction personnel so they can review current status and determine the approach to the construction of the structure.

The expected outcome is a "One-stop shop" where people can open the application from their desktop, find the structure they need and finally access all pertinent information about that structure by connecting to other systems.

We have developed a project management methodology that will assist us in keeping the project within budget and with the necessary resources for completing the project. Our methodology includes the following phases;

1)   Project Initiation

2)   Project Planning

3)   Project Executing

4)   Project Controlling

5)   Project Closing

We will be more than happy to provide a copy of our methodology if needed.

This project fits in with our goal to move towards a paperless environment as well as providing information to our customers in an easy to use application and eliminating the need to search in various locations or applications to get the information they require to do their jobs.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

The primary return on investment will be decision-makers having readily available bridge data to assist them in making informed decisions in order to maintain a safe and functional network of State and County bridges. Also, bridge data will be more easily retrieved by Division and District personnel which will streamline their processes. They will have one location to access all information about a structure so they can perform their job functions and make determinations on when structures will need to be replaced or refurbished.

Having documents stored electronically will ensure that documents can be found when needed and the chance of documents being misplaced or accidentally thrown away would be eliminated. Security on the system will allow us to minimize the chance of electronic files being eliminated but if it does happen we have adequate backups to ensure that we

can get the files back.

The reduction in paper may allow us to save space where current lektrievers and file cabinets are located, thus making floor space available for others to use as needed.

There were no other solutions available to us that we could find. We looked at creating an in-house application using a GIS interface but decided that the customers were happy with the existing POP application that we would base this application off of it to be successful. Doing nothing means that we will have to find this information manually and access three or four different application separately in order to get the information necessary to perform job tasks and make project determinations.

There is not a mandate for this project but we are required to provide ratings and other information on all structures to the Federal Highway Administration as part of the National Bridge Inspection Standards and National Bridge Inventory.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

While the system needs to be reliable it is not critical that it meets a 99.99% up-time or higher but we will make that as a goal.

The security is based off of windows security and only network administrators and our Falcon administrators have the ability to make changes or add folders or environments to the Falcon portion of the project. Security is set on the mainframe such that only authorized individuals can update information on structures and submit jobs to push new data into systems.

The data is stored on the mainframe and each time we do new inspections the data on the mainframe will be refreshed so there will not be a need to purchase additional hardware or server space.

We have implemented all NITC security policies and data standards throughout the NDOR as well as any industry standards that have been identified by our network and/or data administrators. Since the structure data is stored on the mainframe we know that the OCIO has implemented all standards and policies.

This application will connect to our video log, mapping application and our document management system to provide a "one-stop shop" for DOR personnel so they do not have to search through file cabinets, open numerous applications or find someone to help them get the information they need to perform their job duties.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

Project Organization / Chart

Executive Sponsor:	Deputy Director Engineering
Project sponsor:	Material and Research Engineer
BTSD Project manager:	Responsible for ensuring the project follows the methodology
Business Team Leader:	Responsible for business requirements and deliverables
Technical Team Leader:	Responsible for implementing the approved deliverables
Data Team Leader:	Responsible for data design and standards/policy adherence

Project team members:	Two business individuals who handle the data on a daily basis and our Falcon Administrator

Project Stakeholders:

Name	Division	Interest in Project
Director - State	Executive Office	Having easily accessible bridge data in order to make sound decisions
Deputy Director - Engineering	Executive Office	Having easily accessible bridge data in order to make sound decisions
Deputy Director - Operations	Executive Office	Having easily accessible bridge data in order to make sound decisions
District Engineers	Districts	Having easily accessible bridge data in order to make sound decisions
Division Heads	Divisions	Having easily accessible bridge data in order to make sound decisions

Our approach will be to have two defined components. One being the input of all documents into Falcon and the other being the development of the application that will be accessing Falcon as well as other applications.

Bridge Division currently retains documents related to structures (as-builts, load rating summaries, photos, etc.) on a File Server. These documents will be input into Falcon so we can provide the tools to manage the documents and allow for easy retrieval. TSA Advet staff will provide guidance in developing this system and may be required to assist us in some of the development aspects as well. Our plan is to use existing NDOR staff to input the electronic files and metadata into the system but we may need to hire a third party to do the scanning an metadata for us.

The second component will be the development of the custom up-front application. This application will gather the required data fields from the mainframe and present the information back to the user. The application will be developed by existing in-house staff that developed the POP application that this application will be modeled after. This application will also interface with Falcon to allow the documents associated with the chosen structure to be presented to the user, without the user having to open another system to retrieve those documents. This may require development by TSA Advet staff in utilizing their Application Programming Interfaces that we purchased last year or assisting our developers in using them.

Until we have completed our business requirements document we cannot give an accurate timeline. We do believe that once we start the development of the application, we will have it running within six months. Depending on the number of documents that need to be scanned and input into Falcon along with the associated metadata this could take some time. We believe this activity could take six months as well. With both the application development and Falcon implementation running in tandem our best guess would be a six to nine month timeframe, taking into account possible delays with people being unavailable or waiting on the vendor if needed. Our major milestones are as follows;

1) Begin Requirements gathering and completion of Requirements Documentation
2) Confirm selection of deliverables from requirements, document Milestones
3) Project Work Plan and Build Schedule
4) Application Development
5) Creating Falcon Environment and folder structure
6) Inputting scanned documents and metadata into Falcon
7) Implementation Plan
8) Training Plan
9) Lessons Learned

Once the application is completed we will need to develop a user document. Team members will provide training to individuals that will be utilizing the software and we will also look into developing an on-line training course utilizing our Learning Bay on-line training system. All training will be done by in-house personnel on an as-needed basis.

NDOR staff will be responsible for maintaining the system once it is implemented and Bridge staff will be responsible for the input and removal of documents from the system as well as ensuring that the data shown in the application is correct.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

Risk Area	Level (H/M/L)	Risk Plan
1. Developer or Vendor unavailable for	M	Meet as a team and determine if the schedule needs to be

a certain amount of time due to other commitments		adjusted. Receive approval of sponsors to adjust the schedule or obtain alternate resources.
2. Data Input errors when inputting electronic files into Falcon	M	Ensure that adequate staff is available for reviewing the data and develop a process for making corrections
3. Data requirements are changed by FHWA	L	Review the application design and determine the time for necessary changes. Receive approval of sponsors to adjust the schedule.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

     Contractual services – Account 4419
             Programming - $10,000
             Other - $25,000
      PROJECT TOTAL - $35,000

Project #27-03

IT Project Proposal ❓   »Version Locked

Budget Cycle:	2009-2011 ▼	Agency:	027 - ROADS ▼

Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST ▼

IT Project: Accident Records System Rewrite ▼

• General Section	Financial	Narrative

▼General Section

Contact Name	Bill Wehling		E-mail	bill.wehling@nebrask.gov	Telephone	402-479-3986
Address	1500 Highway 2					
City	Lincoln		State	Nebraska	Zip	68502
Agency Priority			NITC Priority		NITC Score	

Executive Summary

The Highway Safety document imaging/workflow "CUSTOM CODE" (Accident Records System (ARS)) will be totally rewritten to simplify the routes and make the process more efficient. The core off-the-shelf systems including WorkDesk ™ and the Imaging and Archive Server software will remain as-is. The project will result in a time savings for employees using the system, resulting in quicker entry of crash data and the availability of data for analysis purposes, and a major reduction in the cost of printers, paper, and toner. We will also be applying for some federal grants that would allow us to recover some of the cost to the State.

This project is one of the goals in our Director's Long Range Transportation Plan. The goal to improve safety includes the need to fully develop an automated crash (accident) reporting system so that law enforcement at all levels and other parties can use this technology when they are ready.

The budget for this project was included in the appropriation in fiscal year 2009 therefore no additional funds are needed. This project will most likely fall into fiscal year 2010 in which case we will need to move any remaining funds from 2009 to 2010.

Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes (15 pts)

The objectives of this project are;
1) Evaluate and align the technology with the Highway Safety section business rules and workflow.
2) Improve the turnaround time for Accident Records processing by streamlining processing routes and improving efficiencies.
3) Evaluate the feasibility and migration of the custom code to a simpler web browser user interface.
4) Upgrade software and hardware.
5) Document the new system so that NDOR staff can make future changes.

The beneficiaries of the project are as follows;
Highway Safety Section – Principal user of ARS System, major effect on all operations
Traffic Design Sections – User of ARS System, Consumer of HSI data, more timely and accurate information

DMV (Financial, Hwy Safety) – Consumer of HSI data and Accident documents; more timely and accurate information
State Patrol (Carrier Enforcement) – Consumer of HSI data and Accident documents; more timely and accurate information
HHS (CODES Project) – Consumer of HSI data and Accident documents; more timely and accurate information
Commercial Entities (e.g. Carfax) – Consumer of HSI data; more timely and accurate information

The expected outcome is a new system that eliminates a number of inefficiencies and will aid us in improving our business and workflow processes.

We have developed a project management methodology that will assist us in keeping the project within budget and with the necessary resources for completing the project. Our methodology includes the following phases;
1) Project Initiation

2) Project Planning

3) Project Executing

4) Project Controlling

5) Project Closing

We will be more than happy to provide a copy of our methodology if needed.

Once implementation has been completed, the amount of printing of scanned documents should be drastically reduced or eliminated thus allowing us to either surplus printers or not replace them when they break.

I believe that the more important issue is that it one of our Long Range Transportation goals which is safety. Part of that goal is to fully develop an automated crash (accident) reporting system.

The information we receive and process is utilized by Department of Motor Vehicles, State Patrol and others. It is critical that we have this information available in a timely matter.

Project Justification / Business Case (25 pts)

Supporting Information (unlimited)   **Minimum Characters: 10**

The database server behind the Global 360 WorkDesk ^{tm} system will become un-supported soon and a new version of the WorkDesk ^{tm} software will be available in the next few months. The current Custom code modules written in an older version of Visual Basic are maintenance intensive and need to be upgraded to work with a newer database, current desktop operating systems and web technologies to make our users more efficient. The workflow/route processing configuration will be addressed, as there are several business processes that would be more efficient and productive if re-written.

Even though it was a goal for the system when it was implemented in August, 2000 we were never able to get to a paperless environment. We had to purchase a number of printers so our data entry personnel could print the scanned documents and then input the metadata into the system. Along with the cost of the printers was the cost of toner used by the systems as well. Highway Safety used extraordinary measures to catch up on data entry and to stay within the required time frame to meet statutory requirements for reporting information to other agencies.

No other solutions were evaluated since we are happy with the off-the-shelf WorkDesk ^{tm} software and the Imaging and Archive Server software. It is the custom code portion of the process that needs to be rewritten. Looking at other systems would require a huge increase in cost in our opinion and retraining staff would result in some lost productivity while learning new applications and procedures.

Doing nothing will result in wasting of paper by printing scanned documents and then throwing them away once the metadata is entered into the system. The State may also lose money if accidents that damage State Property are entered wrong and we are unable to recover our costs from the responsible party. We will also need to continue to purchase a number of printers because of the printing needs mentioned in the previous sentence. We would continue "business as usual" with ineffective processes and having to hire additional personnel to catch us up when data entry gets behind and we are faced with not meeting required time frames for reporting information.

The mandate is an agency mandate from our Director stating it as part of our Safety goal in our Long Range Transportation plan.

Technical Impact (20 pts)

Supporting Information (unlimited)   **Minimum Characters: 10**

The current custom code is an older version of Visual Basic and need to be upgraded. We want to take advantage of new web technologies that are easier to maintain, modify and allowing agencies outside of NDOR to easily have access to HSI data and Accident documents. Modification of the current custom code will allow us to eliminate the manual steps and workarounds that our users must do in order to perform their job. We do not see the need for any additional hardware. We still want to utilize the COTS WorkDesk ^{tm} software and our imaging software. Going the direction of an entirely new system would increase the cost dramatically in our opinion. The goal is a web based solution ad we do not feel any additional communication requirements will be needed.

While the system needs to be reliable it is not critical that it meets a 99.99% up-time or higher but we will make that as a goal. With NCJIS requesting access to accident reports via their website, meaning that their site is used 24/7.

We do foresee the number of users growing from 50 to possibly over 1000 Statewide once this project has been completed. This will mean either purchasing more licenses from the vendor or possibly a license pool.

We have implemented all NITC security policies and data standards throughout the NDOR as well as any industry standards that have been identified by our network and/or data administrators. Data from this system is then moved from our mainframe Highway Safety Information (HSI) system where it is stored and accessed by other agencies through direct access to our Accident Records System. Mainframe security is determined by OCIO staff and based off of NITC policies and guidelines.

The application will receive data from our Electronic Accident Form and then push data to our HSI system on the mainframe and then pushed to the ARS Database on the LAN. We will be able to create reports on the data using our Crystal Reports Portal if our customers feel it is required.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10 pts)

Supporting Information (unlimited)   **Minimum Characters: 10**

A business assessment will be conducted for the Highway Safety Office. This assessment will result in a report/document that describes the current business process as well as the future direction of the business processes. This business assessment is currently focused on the ARS Rewrite but may extend to processes connected to the ARS application.

This project will involve efforts in two specific areas of the ARS: 1) The configuration to the current Workdesk[tm] software, and 2) a rewrite of the Custom Code. The Workdesk[tm] software will be configured to streamline routes and other processes within the off-the-shelf product. The Custom Code that extends the capabilities of the Workdesk[tm] software will be re-written and enhanced. Both of these will involve significant use of vendor supplied resources. Members of the project team will need to perform enough testing to ensure that the data is complete and metadata is accurate before we can complete our development phase.

Once development has been completed we will begin the training of our staff. This could involve using the vendor as the trainer. User documentation must be developed before the project is completed for reference by future users of the system so we do not have to hire the vendor to train new people.

Project Organization / Chart

Executive Sponsor:	State Director and Deputy Directors
Project Sponsor:	Traffic Engineer
BTSD Project manager:	Responsible for ensuring the project follows the methodology
Business Team Leader:	Responsible for business requirements and deliverables
Technical Team Leader:	Responsible for implementing the approved deliverables
Data Team Leader:	Responsible for data design and standards/policy adherence
Project team members:	WorkDesk User Group to test system and check data

Project Stakeholders:

Name	Division	Interest in Project
Highway Safety Section	Traffic	Users of the system.
Traffic Engineering Division	Traffic	Users of the system.
DMV (Financial, Highway Safety)	External	Users of the system.
State Patrol (Carrier Enforcement)	External	Users of the system.
HHS (CODES Project)	External	Users of the system.

Law Enforcement Community	External	Users of the system.

The deliverables identified by our team are;
   Deliverable 1: Report of findings from review of Highway Safety business rules, workflow
   Deliverable 2: Written plan (requirements document) for rebuild of ARS System
   Deliverable 3: ARS code delivered and tested for all modules/functions
   Deliverable 4: Completion of training for Highway Safety staff
   Deliverable 5: Completion of documentation for revised ARS System

A high-level project timeline the team developed;

Milestone	Date completed	Deliverable(s) completed
Project planning	10/01/2008	· Schedule, Scope, Resources
Business Requirements Completed	11/01/2008	· Requirements Document

Vendor Agreement Completed	02/31/2009	·	Specifications, Agreements, SOW
Implementation	09/01/2009	·	Software Delivered & Tested
Go Live	10/01/2009	·	Go-live
Project Completed	02/01/2010	·	Acceptance criteria met and documentation completed

Once the team completes their business requirements document and it has been approved by the sponsors a more definitive timeline will be developed.

User documentation will be developed and approved by the team before any training will begin. The training may be conducted by the vendor. Only staff within the Traffic Division will need to go through this training since they will be the only stakeholders who deal with the information directly. In the review of business processes various stakeholders may have some changes and we will need to be sure to document those processes as well.

NDOR technical staff will be responsible for maintaining the system once it is implemented and Highway Safety staff will be responsible for how the system is used and the sharing of information with other agencies.

Risk Assessment (10 pts)

Supporting Information (unlimited)   **Minimum Characters: 10**

Risk Area	Level (H/M/L)	Risk Plan
1. Equipment breakdowns.	H	Repair or replace as soon as possible. See if more resources can be assigned to the project to push up the delivery date.
2. Parts of the original Source code cannot be found.	M	Determine the additional time required to reverse engineer the code and adjust the schedule. Notify stakeholders and get the approval.
3. Legislative / Statute Changes	M	Review changes and determine what effect they have on the project. Notify stakeholders and make any necessary changes to deliverables and timelines as per their guidance.

Financial Analysis and Budget (20 pts)

Supporting Information (unlimited)   **Minimum Characters: 10**

Contractual services – Account 4419
Design - $50,000
Programming - $300,000
Other - $50,000

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 037 - WORKERS COMPENSATION COURT
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Courtroom Technology

General Section

Contact Name :	Randall Cecrle	**E-mail :**	randy.cecrle@wcc.ne.gov	**Agency Priority :**	1
Address :	1221 N St, Ste 402, PO Box 98908	**Telephone :**	402-471-2976	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68509-		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	0	0	0	0	0	0
Programming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	19,091	0	0	19,091	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	19,091	0	0	19,091	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	0	0	0	0	0	0

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	30,544	0	0	15,272	15,272	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	30,544	0	0	15,272	15,272	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	190,913	0	0	190,913	0	0
Software	0	0	0	0	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	190,913	0	0	190,913	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	240,548	0	0	225,276	15,272	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash Fund	240,548	0	0	225,276	15,272	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**240,548**	**0**	**0**	**225,276**	**15,272**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project: Courtroom Technology

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The court is currently looking for alternative space for the judges and staff now located on the 12th and 13th floors of the State Capitol building, with a projected move-in date of July 1, 2009. The upcoming move will require an additional appropriation to cover costs for basic technology equipment needed at the new facility.

In conjunction with the move the court will be equipping four new Lincoln courtrooms with document presentation, audio, video, and video conferencing technology.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

Equipment will be installed in new Lincoln courtrooms in the following major categories.

One Large Courtroom used for First Hearings, Motion Hearings, and Review Hearings

- Document Camera and HD Digital Television
- Video Equipment
- Audio Equipment
- Control Equipment
- HD Video Conferencing Option

Three Small Courtrooms used for First Hearings and Motion Hearings

- Document Camera and HD Digital Television
- Video Equipment (Subset of Large Courtroom)
- Audio Equipment (Subset of Large Courtroom)
- Control Equipment (Same as Large Courtroom)

Maintenance and Support for the above.

For complete detail see attachment.

Attachments:

NET-Proposal_NWCC_Courtroom_Technology.pdf

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

The court's existing facilities at the Capitol lack the basic technology required for a modern, electronic court environment, including document presentation, audio, video, and video conferencing equipment. The technology being requested will address this problem.

Existing evidence presentation equipment consists solely of VCR/DVD players and analog televisions, which are incapable of accommodating evidence being introduced in newer media formats.

Sound quality is also extremely poor in existing courtrooms, which interferes with the conduct of hearings. This will be partially addressed through proper acoustics in walls and ceilings and controlled sound levels of the HVAC system. However, audio equipment, including microphones and speakers, is needed to fully address the problem.

Video conferencing is currently being used for review hearings in western Nebraska in order to promptly serve our constituents and avoid unnecessary travel costs. However, other state facilities must now be used as existing courtrooms do not have such capability.

The requested basic technology will also position the court in the future to digitally capture and retain electronic evidence, record court proceedings in both audio and video, and broadcast those proceedings. The Chief Justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court has set a goal of making Nebraska courts transparent through broadcasting of proceedings.

Initial technology lists and costs were obtained from the Nebraska Supreme Court. The court then engaged the National Center for State Courts and Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET) in analysis of court technology needs and each provided technology recommendations and costs. All lists were technologically equivalent and cost estimates were close to each other. The appropriation being requested is based on the NET cost estimate.

See attached NET cost estimate.

Attachments:

NET-Proposal_NWCC_Courtroom_Technology.pdf

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

The project is primarily made up of document presentation, video, audio, and video conferencing equipment, along with installation and training services.

The requested basic technology will also position the court in the future to digitally capture and retain electronic evidence, record court proceedings in both audio and video, and broadcast those proceedings.

Crestron control equipment will be implemented in each courtroom and will become the heart of all add-on equipment to the systems, including future digital court reporter recording equipment, new content players and presentation equipment, digital evidence capture equipment, and future taping and broadcasting equipment.

All PCs and future servers will have virus/spamware and other software installed to protect equipment and the network when media is placed in the devices.

NITC standards and guidelines will be reviewed for applicability at appropriate times during the project. The OCIO will be consulted when necessary.

The technology being requested has been tested by the National Center for State Courts, and has been implemented for other courts nationally and internationally. Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET) has installed the same technology for other Nebraska governmental entities.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

The new facilities are targeted to be opened for business on July 1, 2009. Installation of courtroom technology is planned between July and December 2009.

Underlying infrastructure (wiring, wall reinforcements, etc.) will be designed and installed during the build-out phase of the facility prior to July 1.

An implementation strategy is being considered to fully equip the large courtroom and use it as a laboratory to shake-out the bugs before the completion of the small courtrooms. This "lab" would allow the court to train court staff and judges and write procedures and instructions for use.

The project sponsor is the Presiding Judge of the court.

Stakeholders include judges, court adjudication staff, outside attorneys, and parties appearing before the court.

The project team is made up of the following persons:

- Project Manager - Clerk of the Court
- Presiding Judge with input from other judges regarding equipment placement and testing
- Outside attorneys with experience using technologies in other courts to assist in equipment placement and testing
- Information Technology Staff - Lead Infrastructure Support Analyst to address infrastructure issues
- Various Contractors

Maintenance and support agreements will be put into place. Additional small items, such as microphones will be procured in case of failures.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

As part of the move out of the State Capitol, court judges and staff are excited about the introduction of technology in the courtrooms to better serve the public and provide new means of information presentation and flow within the court. The presiding judge has been actively involved and other Lincoln judges have been consulted as this request has been developed. A number of outside attorneys are already using similar equipment and the Nebraska Bar has recently held a seminar on technology. Therefore, resistance to use of the new technology should be minimal.

The technology being requested has been tested by the National Center for State Courts, and has been implemented for other courts nationally and internationally. Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET) has installed the same technology for other Nebraska governmental entities. As we move into the design and implementation phase, one or both of these entities will be consulted. Therefore, the chance of the technology failing or not meeting the needs of the court is also minimal.

All PCs and future servers will have virus/spamware and other software installed to protect equipment and the network when media is placed in the devices.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

Initial technology lists and costs were obtained from the Nebraska Supreme Court. The court then engaged the National Center for State Courts and Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET) in analysis of court technology needs and each provided technology recommendations and costs. All lists were technologically equivalent and cost estimates were close to each other.

For purposes of supporting this procurement request, the equipment proposal from NET is attached.

Attachments:
NET-Proposal_NWCC_Courtroom_Technology.pdf

September 4, 2008

Proposal of Production Equipment
**Large Courtroom (1) &
Small Courtrooms (3)
For the Workers' Compensation Courts**
Deb Bandiola

**By the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications – Government
Systems**
Mark A. Weakly – Chief Engineer

Large Courtoom Equipment

- One 50" Plasma Monitors (wall swivel-mounted).
- Wideband Routing Switcher for High Definition Video.
- Scalers for each Video Format Output (XGA and S-Video for recording).
- Two Robotic HD Video Cameras (configured with XGA output).
- High Definition Document Camera.
- One Computer Monitor for Multimedia Computer.

Video Equipment Proposed:

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	TH-50PH10UK	Panasonic 50" 9-Series Professional Plasma Display	$3,995.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
2	1	PDR-2051	Chief Swivel Mount for 50 Inch Panasonic Plasma	$799.00	$600.00	$600.00
3	1	60-219-16	Extron, CrossPoint 300 84 HVA, RGBHV & Stereo Audio	$3,590.00	$3,123.30	$3,123.30
4	2	60-736-01	Extron, DVS 304 Digital Video Scaler	$2,590.00	$2,253.30	$4,506.60
5	1	60-246-03	Extron, P/2 DA4xi, 1x4 VGA-QXGA	$390.00	$339.30	$339.30
6	2	BRC-H700	Sony, HD 3-CCD Robotic Camera.	$8,995.00	$7,825.65	$15,651.30
7	2	HFBK-XG1	Sony, XGA Interface Card for BRC-H700 (in cam).	$1,500.00	$1,305.00	$2,610.00
8	1	SDP-6500DX	Samsung, Digital Document Camera	$3,500.00	$3,045.00	$3,045.00
9	1	A1486975	Dell, 22" Computer Monitors Wide (Samsung 2220WM-HAS)	$650.00	$565.50	$565.50
10	1	TBD	Dell, Multimedia Computer	$2,000.00	$1,740.00	$1,740.00
			Grand Total:			$34,681.00

Video Equipment Total Budget Price: **$ 34,681.00**

Audio Equipment Proposed:

- Automatic microphone and line input mixers.
- Cardiod gooseneck microphones with momentary Push-to-Mute buttons (push and hold to mute the microphone) in the base (two back ups listed).
- Phone teleconferencing interaction capabilities within the courtroom.
- Ceiling mounted speakers for best conferencing remote / local isolation.
- Distribution system for feeding multiple devices.

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	7	ES915C	Audio-Technica, Cardioid Condenser Gooseneck Microphone	$350.00	$304.50	$2,131.50
2	7	AT8666RSP	Audio-Technica, Microphone Desk Stand with PTM switch	$200.00	$174.00	$1,218.00
3	1	SCM810	Shure, 8 Channel Auto Microphone Mixer	$1,195.00	$1,039.65	$1,039.65
4	2	SCM410	Shure, 4 Channel Line Level Matrix Mixer	$995.00	$865.65	$1,731.30
5	1	XAP TH2	ClearOne, Telephone Hybrid	$995.00	$865.65	$865.65
6	1	XAP 400	ClearOne, Conferencing Processor	$4,250.00	$3,697.50	$3,697.50
7	2	RMX850	QSC, Stereo 200W Power Amplifier	$465.00	$404.55	$809.10
8	4	C870	Proficient, LCR Ceiling Series Speakers	$300.00	$261.00	$1,044.00
9	2	60-692-20	Extron, DA 6A Six Output Stereo Audio Distribution Amplifier	$420.00	$365.40	$730.80
			Grand Total:			$13,267.50

Audio Equipment Total Budget Price: **$ 13,267.50**

Control Equipment Proposed:

- IP Control Capability through VPanel interface and Internet Explorer browser.
- PTZ control of HD cameras.

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	PRO2	Crestron Professional Dual Bus Control System	$3,600.00	$3,132.00	$3,132.00
2	1	C2ENET-1	Crestron Single Port Ethernet Card	$900.00	$783.00	$783.00
3	1	TPS-6LB-T	Crestron Touchscreen Control Interface, 5.7" Active Matrix	$1,995.00	$1,735.65	$1,735.65
4	1	CNXIO-16	Crestron 16 I/O Versiport Control Card	$700.00	$609.00	$609.00
5	1	Labor	Crestron Control System Programming	$5,000.00	$4,350.00	$4,350.00
			Grand Total:			$10,609.65

Control System Equipment Total Budget Price: **$ 10,609.65**

Video Conferencing Option

- Includes Four Point MCU (Multi-conference Unit) for connecting up to four sites (which includes your site as one of the four).
- PTZ HD Camera included.

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	1000-0000-0203	LifeSize, TEAM Video Conferencing System, One Camera, No Micpod	$7,999.00	$6,959.13	$6,959.13
			Grand Total:			$6,959.13

HD Video Conferencing Option Total Budget Price: **$6,959.13**

Miscellaneous Components and Parts

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	Extend-It VGA SR	Gefen Extend-It VGA SR Extender	$199.00	$173.13	$173.13
2	1	BRK20	Middle Atlantic, 18" Deep Rack Laminated Black 20RU	$152.95	$133.07	$133.07
3	1	PD-815SC	Middle Atlantic, 15A Power Strip w/Surge Suppressor	$85.00	$73.95	$73.95
4	1	Lot	Cables and Connectors	$4,000.00	$3,480.00	$3,480.00
			Grand Total:			$3,860.15

Miscellaneous Components and Parts Total Budget Price: **$ 3,860.15**

Combined Total Costs with HD Video Conferencing Option:

Video Equipment	$34,681.00
Audio Equipment	$13,267.50
Control Equipment	$10,609.65
Optional LifeSize Video Conferencing	$6,959.13
Cables, Connectors, and Extenders	$3,860.15
Equipment Total:	$69,377.43

Installation per room (10% of system cost)	$6,937.74
Large Courtroom Grand Total:	$76,315.17

Total Budget Price Large Courtroom (w/VC Option): $ 76,315.17

Small Courtoom Equipment

- One 50" Plasma Monitors (wall swivel-mounted).
- Wideband Routing Switcher for High Definition Video.
- Scaler for XGA Video Format Output.
- High Definition Document Camera.
- One Computer Monitor for Multimedia Computer.

Video Equipment Proposed:

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	TH-50PH10UK	Panasonic 50" 9-Series Professional Plasma Display	$3,995.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
2	1	PDR-2051	Chief Swivel Mount for 50 Inch Panasonic Plasma	$799.00	$600.00	$600.00
3	1	60-219-16	Extron, CrossPoint 300 84 HVA, RGBHV & Stereo Audio	$3,590.00	$3,123.30	$3,123.30
4	1	60-736-01	Extron, DVS 304 Digital Video Scaler	$2,590.00	$2,253.30	$2,253.30
5	1	60-246-03	Extron, P/2 DA4xi, 1x4 VGA-QXGA	$390.00	$339.30	$339.30
6	1	SDP-6500DX	Samsung, Digital Document Camera	$3,500.00	$3,045.00	$3,045.00
7	1	A1486975	Dell, 22" Computer Monitors Wide (Samsung 2220WM-HAS)	$650.00	$565.50	$565.50
8	1	TBD	Dell, Multimedia Computer	$2,000.00	$1,740.00	$1,740.00
			Grand Total:			$14,166.40

Video Equipment Total Budget Price: **$ 14,166.40**

Audio Equipment Proposed:

- Automatic microphone and line input mixers.
- Cardiod gooseneck microphones with momentary Push-to-Mute buttons (push and hold to mute the microphone) in the base (two back ups listed).
- Phone teleconferencing interaction capabilities within the courtroom.
- Ceiling mounted speakers for best conferencing remote / local isolation.
- Distribution system for feeding multiple devices.

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	5	ES915C	Audio-Technica, Cardioid Condenser Gooseneck Microphone	$350.00	$304.50	$1,522.50
2	5	AT8666RSP	Audio-Technica, Microphone Desk Stand with PTM switch	$200.00	$174.00	$870.00
3	1	SCM810	Shure, 8 Channel Auto Microphone Mixer	$1,195.00	$1,039.65	$1,039.65
4	2	SCM410	Shure, 4 Channel Line Level Matrix Mixer	$995.00	$865.65	$1,731.30
5	1	XAP TH2	ClearOne, Telephone Hybrid	$995.00	$865.65	$865.65
6	1	XAP 400	ClearOne, Conferencing Processor	$4,250.00	$3,697.50	$3,697.50
7	2	RMX850	QSC, Stereo 200W Power Amplifier	$465.00	$404.55	$809.10
8	4	C870	Proficient, LCR Ceiling Series Speakers	$300.00	$261.00	$1,044.00
9	2	60-692-20	Extron, DA 6A Six Output Stereo Audio Distribution Amplifier	$420.00	$365.40	$730.80
			Grand Total:			$12,310.50

Audio Equipment Total Budget Price: **$ 12,310.50**

Control Equipment Proposed:

- IP Control Capability through VPanel interface and Internet Explorer browser.
- PTZ control of HD cameras.

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	PRO2	Crestron Professional Dual Bus Control System	$3,600.00	$3,132.00	$3,132.00
2	1	C2ENET-1	Crestron Single Port Ethernet Card	$900.00	$783.00	$783.00
3	1	TPS-6LB-T	Crestron Touchscreen Control Interface, 5.7" Active Matrix	$1,995.00	$1,735.65	$1,735.65
4	1	CNXIO-16	Crestron 16 I/O Versiport Control Card	$700.00	$609.00	$609.00
5	1	Labor	Crestron Control System Programming	$5,000.00	$4,350.00	$4,350.00
			Grand Total:			$10,609.65

Control System Equipment Total Budget Price: **$ 10,609.65**

Miscellaneous Components and Parts

Item	Qty	Part Number	Description	List Ea.	Budget Ea.	Bud. Total
1	1	Extend-It VGA SR	Gefen Extend-It VGA SR Extender	$199.00	$173.13	$173.13
2	1	BRK20	Middle Atlantic, 18" Deep Rack Laminated Black 20RU	$152.95	$133.07	$133.07
3	1	PD-815SC	Middle Atlantic, 15A Power Strip w/Surge Suppressor	$85.00	$73.95	$73.95
4	1	Lot	Cables and Connectors	$3,500.00	$3,045.00	$3,045.00
			Grand Total:			$3,425.15

Miscellaneous Components and Parts Total Budget Price: $ 3,425.15

Combined Small Courtroom Total Costs:

Video Equipment	$14,166.40
Audio Equipment	$12,310.50
Control Equipment	$10,609.65
Cables, Connectors, and Extenders	$3,425.15
Equipment Total:	$40,511.70

Installation per room (10% of system cost)	$4,051.17
Small Courtroom Grand Total:	$44,562.87
(X3) Three Small Courtrooms Grand Total:	$133,688.60

Total Budget Price Large Courtroom (w/VC Option): $ 76,315.17
Total Budget Price Three Small Courtrooms: $ 133,688.60

Grand Total Budget of One Large and Three Small Courtrooms:
$ 210,003.77

Equipment Consideration Notes:
Budget prices are typically 87% of MSRP.

Ongoing Equipment Maintenance and Support Costs:
Percentages provided by Mark Weakly – NET and calculations performed by Randy Cecrle – NWCC IT Manager

2 yr contract - Equipment Value x 8% per year
Large Conference Room Equipment Value $69,937.74 x 8% x 2 = $11,100
Three Small Conference Rooms Equipment Value $121,535.10 x 8% x 2 = $19,445

Total Equipment Maintenance and Support Costs for Two Years $30,545

Equipment Informational Links:

Sony BRC-H700 HD Camera Link:
http://pro.sony.com/bbsc/ssr/product-BRCH700/

Panasonic Plasma Monitor Website Link:
http://catalog2.panasonic.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ModelDetail?displayTab=O&storeId=11201&catalogId=13051&itemId=271232&catGroupId=14624&surfModel=TH-50PH11UK

Chief Wall Mounts Website Link:
http://www.chiefmfg.com/
Chief PDR Wall Mounts Link:
http://www.chiefmfg.com/store/detail/?product_id=80867

Shure SCM410 Audio Mixer Link:
http://www.shure.com/ProAudio/Products/MixersAndDSP/us_pro_SCM410_content
Shure SCM810 Audio Mixer Link:
http://www.shure.com/ProAudio/Products/MixersAndDSP/us_pro_SCM810_content

LifeSize Video Conferencing System:
http://www.lifesize.com/products/lifesize_team_mp/

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 047 - NE EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMM.
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project : Public Media Project - Phase 2

General Section

Contact Name :	Michael Winkle	**E-mail :**	mwinkle1@unl.edu	**Agency Priority :**	1
Address :	1800 North 33rd Street	**Telephone :**	402-472-3611	**NITC Priority :**	
City :	Lincoln			**NITC Score :**	
State :	Nebraska	**Zip :**	68503		

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Contractual Services						
Design	11,000	0	0	11,000	0	0
Programming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0
Subtotal Contractual Services	16,000	0	0	16,000	0	0
Telecommunications						
Data	0	0	0	0	0	0
Video	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wireless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training						
Technical Staff	3,500	0	0	3,500	0	0
End-user Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Training	3,500	0	0	3,500	0	0

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 047 - NE EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMM.
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

Expenditures

IT Project Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies & Materials	3,500	0	0	3,500	0	0
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	3,500	0	0	3,500	0	0
Subtotal Other Operating Costs	7,000	0	0	7,000	0	0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	55,000	0	0	55,000	0	0
Software	22,000	0	0	22,000	0	0
Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	10,500	0	0	10,500	0	0
Subtotal Capital Expenditures	87,500	0	0	87,500	0	0
TOTAL PROJECT COST	114,000	0	0	114,000	0	0

Funding

Fund Type	Total	Prior Exp	FY08 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add
General Fund	114,000	0	0	114,000	0	0
Cash Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revolving Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**114,000**	**0**	**0**	**114,000**	**0**	**0**
VARIANCE	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

IT Project Proposal Report - Detail
Agency: 047 - NE EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMM.
Budget Cycle: 2009-2011 Biennium   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project: Public Media Project - Phase 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To serve Nebraskans by keeping pace with today's rapidly evolving technology, NET is requesting $114,000 in capital funds and $60,000 in annual operating funds to implement Phase 2 of the Public Media Project by adding software and storage components that will complement the communications technology redesign at the Capitol and NET, and allow greater public access to Legislative and Judiciary proceedings and communications from the Executive branch. The same investment will allow NET to create a repository for video content produced by educational and non-profit organizations within the state.

In increasing numbers, 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 live media funded by Phase 1 of the Public Media project by extending the content availability through proven new media and internet technologies. This proposal provides those capabilities through cost-efficient applications that will streamline routine production and distribution tasks including capture, logging, editing, transcoding, asset management, archiving and content administration.

The engine driving the archive is a digital rights management system (DRM) coupled with digital media publishing software, hard drive storage, and a web content management system (WCMS) which will optimize the State of Nebraska's investment in content, and more effectively distribute information important to Nebraska's civically and culturally-engaged individuals and organizations.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OUTCOMES (15 PTS):

The Public Media archive project will become the repository for video content produced by public entities within the state of Nebraska. In addition it will be open to contribution by non-profit organizations that wish to have their content available to the public. The goals of the project are:
Increase available video and audio content to the public. Create a user-friendly contribution system whereby public entities can donate content to the archive. Support cross-platform compatibility to accommodate the widest possible segment of the public. Engineer a system that allows contributors to make content available while maintaining it on their own storage. Increase public knowledge and value by making public records easily accessible and searchable.

The Public Media archive's intended beneficiaries are Nebraska citizens needing access to content produced by public entities. In addition government entities would be able to access content created by other government entities which would promote increased cooperation and better understanding between departments.

After a successful implementation the expected outcomes of this project are:

·   Increased availability of content in both quantity and audience
·   Ability to search content across departments to locate content that might be relevant to a need but created by an unexpected source.

·   Unprecedented access to content by the general public

The success of the project will be determined by a variety of metrics, including hours of content available, number contributors, number of visitors, feedback from usability focus groups, and direct feedback from users.

In the first year NET will have a minimum contribution of 80 hours of video content, with 150 hours being the intended target. Additionally we would promote the service to other entities and encourage them to contribute media to the archive. Expected growth rate in subsequent years would be heavily dependent upon the number of contributors and the number of hours NET is able to contribute and is impossible to accurately predict.

User traffic to the archive will also be a key metric in measuring the success of the project. A standard of 5000 unique visitors per month would indicate a successful adoption of the service. This information would be determined by analyzing the logs of the servers maintaining the archive.

In addition to the statistics NET would solicit feedback on improving the service and determining its value by identifying key individuals for feedback, as well as soliciting feedback on the archive web page directly.

A significant item in NET's strategic plan is to increase impact and reach through programs and services, and the Public Media archive is a key initiative designed to fulfill that strategy. This project is listed in NET's agency technology plan for FY 07-09 under planned future projects for 07-08. (Content Management System)

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION / BUSINESS CASE (25 PTS):

The proposed digital media publishing solution and web content management system will allow "mission-similar" partners to adapt the best of their content for widespread distribution across multicast and broadband services. This distribution has the potential to raise the profiles of the 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.

The digital rights management system coupled with a digital media publishing solution will allow partners throughout the state to provide content to the people in a wide range of "channels" without knowledge of sophisticated code. The specific goals and objectives are to:

     Increase the amount of content which can be delivered to the people of Nebraska.
Thousands of hours of content have been created by public agencies and organizations across the state. Most of this content has limited channels of distribution, such as live broadcast or internet streaming, face to face settings or underutilized tape libraries. Following implementation of the DRM and storage system, this content would be collected, ingested, and stored on servers for internet playback.

     Metadata would be uploaded by the partners through a simple web interface to allow users to search for, filter, and play the files they want. Common metadata elements would be producing organization, title, key words, publication date, rights information, and expiration date.

     The digital media publishing solution would automatically transcode, convert files from one format to another, providing video which can be distributed to viewers using different platforms and connection speeds. This allows for the widest possible audience for the content.

     Once the files are ingested, metadata stored, and transcoded. The videos would be available through an easily navigated web portal created by a web content management system.

The rights management system also allows for content to be distributed to specific groups rather than the general public at large. It also allows for fee-based access to content, should a partner require.

In addition to being hosted on a video portal, the content could be linked to the content provider's website for further exposure. The digital media publishing solution can also make the content available to additional audiences through portable devices such as iPods and cell phones.

The overarching goal of this project is to enable the citizens of Nebraska to become even more aware of important information and, as a result, make them more culturally and civically engaged.

The following solutions were evaluated and considered to address publishing content on the web:

The web publishing tool

1) Custom designing a publishing tool, the player technology and addressing integration with a CDN service.

   Strengths:
   - a) The tool would be geared specifically to NET's needs and existing technology
   - b) NET developers would own and develop their own code.

   Weaknesses:
   - a) NET does not have internal talent on staff to develop the code
   - b) NET would need to devote at least two FTEs to develop the code for this tool.
   - c) Training staff in-house as programmers to code the project would significantly delay the project.
   - d) NET would have to develop custom players as streaming formats change –
     Extensive development would be required to address this aspect. The player formats and browser compatibility technology is already in place with vendor solutions.
   - e) Staffing costs would be higher than purchasing a vendor provided solution

2) Using a vendor provided solution that provides the publishing tool, the player technology, content hosting and content hosting.

   Strengths:
   - a) Turnkey solution - platform and tools are already developed so staff could immediately begin using the technology to publish and channelize video and content to the web.
   - b) Proven technology widely adopted by very large media organizations

   Weaknesses:
   - a) The solution is designed to be an end to end package which makes the architecture much more restrictive and less flexible.
   - b) The solution is more than needed for emerging creators of content with mixed media needs, solutions would silo creators into one content type.
   - c) Limit the capability to leverage storage at different locations.
   - d) Cost is for vendor solution is very high

The following options were considering providing a web content management system solution:

The WCMS:

1)   Purchasing a customized solution developed by a similar entity in the public broadcasting
community.

Strengths:

a)   Purchasing a solution from an entity with similar needs would decrease the need to do additional development.
b)   The web CMS/DRM would be available immediately for use.

Weaknesses:

a)   The entity providing the solution would have control over the code and
functionality of the platform.
b)   The entity may stop development of the code and terminate support.
c)   Limits the agency's ability to automate certain features.
d)   Cost to purchase the code and supported solution is very high.
e)   Cost for operating system and hardware would be very high

Implications of doing nothing:

If NET continues to manually provision the management of digital content rights, including the publishing of this content to the web, archiving and cataloging this content, these processes will inhibit NET's ability to provide the necessary management needed to allow the Public, Educational Community and State Government to make use of the Content.

State statute 79-1315 Laws 1963 defines duties of NET, including "To maintain a library of films and videotapes which depict persons who appear to be significant or prominent in Nebraska history." NET created the Heritage Library, which now includes over 500 hours of unique Nebraska content, to comply with statutory requirement. NET has begun digitizing the contents of the library for preservation purposes. This proposal will provide the distribution capabilities that will allow public access to the library.

TECHNICAL IMPACT (20 PTS):

The Public Media Archive enhances NET's current distribution channels via television, Radio, and the Internet by providing additional content from and NET and other contributors to the State and its citizens. This will be accomplished by implementing new technologies such as a Web Content Management System and a Digital Media Publishing System. NET will also leverage our existing network, storage infrastructure, and Content Delivery Network (CDN) providers, which are highly scalable.

Web Content Management System

A **Web content management system** (WCMS or Web CMS) is a content management system (CMS) software, usually implemented as a Web application, for creating and managing HTML content. It is used to manage and control a large, dynamic collection of Web material (HTML documents and their associated images). A WCMS facilitates content creation, content control, editing, and many essential Web maintenance functions. Usually the software provides authoring (and other) tools designed to allow users with little or no knowledge of programming languages or web coding to create and manage content with relative ease of use. Most systems use a database to store content, metadata, and/or

artifacts that might be needed by the system.

The Web Content Management System(Web CMS) will meet the following requirements:
- · An easy and intuitive contribution platform without any web programming or coding skills
- · Provide a user friendly web portal to content
- · Provide search engines such as Google and Yahoo the ability to index content for searching
- · Use of templates for contribution and portal design
- · Compatibility with our Digital Media Publishing System and Content Delivery Network provider

Digital Media Publishing System
A Digital media Publishing System is also known as a content delivery platform. It is a subscription based content service that utilizes embedded software to deliver web content.
The Digital Media Publishing System(DMPS) will meet the following requirements:
- · Ability to support a wide range of audio and video formats
- · Ability to distribute content utilizing industry leading Content Delivery Network providers such as Akamai and Limelight
- · Compatibility with our Web CMS
- · Provide a packaged DRM solution

DMPS Software requirements:
- · The DMPS will be supported using software from a hosted subscription vendor such as THEPLATFORM
- · Backup agent for disaster recovery
- · Vmware ESX license, which will provide a high level of redundancy and scalability

DPMS Hardware requirements:
- · Server capable of running Vmware ESX (Dell PowerEdge 2950)
- · NET will expand our current Xiotech storage infrastructure to meet the needs of this project.

Content Delivery Network
A **content delivery network** or **content distribution network** (*CDN*) is a system of computers networked together across the Internet that cooperate transparently to deliver content most often for the purpose of improving performance, scalability, and cost efficiency, to end users.
NET will also be us using our existing Content Delivery Network provider Akamai, but in the future we will look into leveraging PBS's business relationship with Limelight another CDN. These are both subscription based services.

Reliability:
- · All hardware and software provider's offer 24/7 support. Storage is high performance distributed storage with built in redundancy.

- · Content Delivery Network and Digital Media Publishing vendors offer a SLA with 99.9% availability

- · NET will backup content weekly and retain for a year, which will allow us to recover most content if needed.

Security:
NET will secure content and systems hosted by NET using industry standard practices(Firewalls, Antivirus, Intrusion Detection System,etc) NET has met both State and PCI security requirements.

Scalability:
The Web CMS, DPMS, CDN and storage are all subscription services so as the needs of the Public Media Archive increase we can purchase additional services on demand. Storage is an ever increasing need when distributing content especially video. Our current storage infrastructure will scale to 168TB. Also, as new larger drives are developed we can integrate these into our infrastructure thus exceeding our current limitations.

Conformity:
All systems meet with the NITC technical standards and guidelines.   Proposed solutions were designed and supported used accepted industry standards.

Compatibility:
All systems will be using robust IP based technologies, which will function on both NET and the State's networks.

PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION (10 PTS):

In FY '09-'10, the archive capacity of system will be increased to accommodate storage of the digital assets.

In FY '09-10, the web content management system will be purchased and installed.

Also in this year, content will be solicited from partners. Content existing on tape will be digitized in preparation for ingest into the digital media publishing solution. Metadata will also be collected for ingest into the digital rights management system.

In FY '09-10, the DRM and the digital media publishing system will be acquired. Implementation will begin with a proposed installation deadline of March 1, 2010. Content and metadata will be ingested into the DRM, trans-coded in the digital media publishing solution, and integrated with the WCMS.

Public rollout of the public media archive is targeted for September 1, 2010.

Input to this plan has originated from all departments of NET involved with storage, networking and web content management as represented by the following individuals.

Overall project manager for the pubic media archive and delivery system is Terry Dugas, Manager of NET's Learning Services. Mr. Dugas has 29 years experience in both commercial and public broadcasting, including holding the position of Station Manager in both areas. He was overall project manager for a 7.5 million dollar grant from the Department of Defense.

Kate Tempelmeyer, Information Services Manager, will be project manager for the hardware and storage installation and network integration. Ms Tempelmeyer has strong technical and business qualifications with an impressive track record of more than 8 years of hands-on experience in strategic technology planning, budgetary development, project management, and system engineering strategies.

Scott Leigh, Senior Producer, Interactive Media Group, will be the project manager for the web content management system. Mr. Leigh the webmaster for NET. He has produced a wide variety of Web-based educational and training courses for external clients, has provided major revisions of Web-based materials for several divisions of UNL and manages the day-to-day operation of NET's Web sites.

FY '09-10

Archive expansion

June 2009 – Identify specific equipment and storage needs to expand digital media archive capacity
August 2009 – Purchase equipment through State Purchasing Bid process
September- 2009 – Integrate additional storage capacity into enterprise content management system

Web content management system implementation

Summer 2009 – Identify specific web content management system software.
Fall 2009 - Purchase software through State Purchasing Bid process
January 2010 – Install software and equipment and implement training
April 2010 – Transition existing web sites to web content management system

Digital rights management and digital media publishing solution implementation

December 2009 – Identify specific DRM and digital media publishing solution software.
Spring 2010 - Purchase software through State Purchasing Bid process
July 2010 – Begin acquisition of content from partners and begin digitization
July 2010 – Development of DRM policies
August 2010 – Installation of software and integration with existing storage and network
September 2010 – Begin ingest of content and input of metadata

FY 10-11

July 2010 – Begin development of web portal for public media archive
September 2010 – Begin integration of digital publishing solution with web portal
October 2010 – Premiere portal to public.

As new software and hardware elements are deployed, formal training from the respective vendors and integrators will be provided to key staff in a "train the trainer" approach. These staff will provide wider training to other staff expected to use the content management systems.
Training for end users (consumers) will not be required due to the intuitiveness of the system. However, appropriate help websites will be constructed if they are deemed necessary and we will also have the NET Customer Service Help Desk available to receive calls for help.

Within NET's budget there are designated line items for maintenance of the hardware and technical infrastructures. These will continue to exist . By expanding the existing system with new equipment and software NET can take advantage of maintenance agreements already in place. Following the expiration of the initial maintenance agreements for additional hardware and software, extended agreements would need to be negotiated and budgeted within NET's budget.

NET commits to supporting the Public Media Archive with the equivalent of two FTE positions. These duties will be distributed among several current NET positions. One position will act as a server administrator, hardware maintainer, and network troubleshooter providing technical support for the system components. The other position will be responsible for

acquiring content from partners, supervising the ingest of content and metadata, transcoding, and providing programming support for the web portal.

RISK ASSESSMENT (10 PTS):

Risk: The accepted technology standards for distribution change between the project inception date and the project go-live date.

Impact: NET would have to redesign the Public Media Archive or spend more money to buy new equipment to support the newer standards.

Compensating Controls: Project leaders shall research technology standard trends continually up until project inception date, and also ensure that "Flexibility" is a criterion upon which possible solutions are judged.

Risk: NET consumers are not aware of or use the Public Media Archive.

Impact: NET will not have expanded its true distribution reach to its consumers, however it still will have expanded access to the content.

Compensating Controls: NET will make its audience aware of the new service through several different mediums over a period of time.

Risk: NET suffers a loss of Knowledge Capital by way of project member turnover.

Impact: The planning, implementation, or maintenance phase of the Public Media Archive project suffers.

Compensating Controls: Project leaders will hold regular meetings with all project members to discuss aspects of the project, and also establish an electronic repository for information.

Risk: NET fails to deliver a functional Public Media Archive due to technical reasons.

Impact: NET will have wasted and abused Nebraska Taxpayer monies.

Compensating Controls: Appropriate hardware and software installation contracts shall be included in the proposal, which come with guarantees from the vendors and integrators.

See "Compensating Controls" under item 13 to minimize and mitigate risk.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND BUDGET (20 PTS):

See the Financial section for costs associated with this request.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget

IMPORTANT NOTE: Starting with FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget requests, project proposals should only be submitted by entering the information into the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS). The information requested in this Microsoft Word version of the form should be entered in the NBRRS in the "IT Project Proposal" section. The tabs in the "IT Project Proposal" section coincide with sections contained in this Microsoft Word version of the form. Information may be cut-and-pasted from this form or directly entered into the NBRRS. ALSO NOTE that for each IT Project Proposal created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.

Project Title	Human Resources Talent Management System
Agency/Entity	Administrative Services – State Personnel

Notes about this form:

1. **USE.** The Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC") is required by statute to "make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel..." Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(8) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823). "Governmental entities, state agencies, and political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions." Neb. Rev. Stat. §86-516(5) (as amended by Laws 2008, LB 823).In order to perform this review, the NITC and DAS Budget Division require agencies/entities to complete this form when requesting funding for technology projects.

2. **WHICH TECHNOLOGY BUDGET REQUESTS REQUIRE A PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM?** See the document entitled NITC 1-202 "Project Review Process for Information Technology Budget Requests and Grant Applications" available at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/. Attachment A to that document establishes the minimum requirements for project submission.

3. **COMPLETING THE FORM IN THE NEBRASKA BUDGET REQUEST AND REPORTING SYSTEM (NBRRS).** Starting with FY2009-2011 Biennial Budget requests, project proposals should only be submitted by entering the information into the NBRRS. The information requested in this Microsoft Word version of the form should be entered in the NBRRS in the "IT Project Proposal" section. The tabs in the "IT Project Proposal" section coincide with sections contained in this Microsoft Word version of the form. Information may be cut-and-pasted from this form or directly entered into the NBRRS. ALSO NOTE that for each "IT Project Proposal" created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.

4. **QUESTIONS.** Contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at (402) 471-7984 or rick.becker@nitc.ne.gov

Section 1: General Information

Project Title	Human Resources Talent Management System
Agency (or entity)	Administrative Services – State Personnel

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	Mike McCrory
Address	301 Centennial Mall South 1st Floor, State Personnel
City, State, Zip	Lincoln, NE 68508
Telephone	402/471-2833
E-mail Address	Mike.McCrory@nebraska.gov

Section 2: Executive Summary

Talent Management is about getting the right people in the right jobs doing the right things to improve business results. A Talent Management System (TMS) provides a web-based integrated technology-based platform to streamline and automate many of the current pen, paper, and spreadsheet processes of human resources. Additionally, this system provides the state of Nebraska an opportunity to maximize the use of current personnel by identifying and defining the most effective workflows for each HR process; thereby, eliminating redundant transactional processes, like creating a job order, new hire paperwork and employee master data entry, and multiple HR shadow systems.

There are several different components within a TMS. Those components include Sourcing, Recruiting, and Selection, On-boarding, Performance Management, Succession Planning, Learning Management, and

Compensation Management.

The Sourcing, Recruiting, and Selection component automates and streamlines the entire recruiting and candidate management process. This component allows an applicant to match their jobs skills to posted vacancies. It provides one-click job posting to job boards on a daily basis and automatically screens and ranks the applicants based on minimum qualifications, questionnaires, and online assessments.

Another piece within the Sourcing, Recruiting and Selection component is the integrated use of both skills and behavioral assessments. Assessments provide a broad range of performance-predicting questions designed to elicit responses that reveal the knowledge, skills, and abilities, attitudes, and beliefs, as well as the personality traits, biographical history and problem solving abilities of future state employees. This validated data is then translated into a candidate profile of strengths and development needs that can be integrated into an employee profile for future use in the areas of performance management, succession planning, learning and development, as well as initial steps to an employee's career path.

The On-boarding component assists with the orientation and successful integration of new hires into the organization. On-boarding also brings a new dimension to the State – socialization to State Government culture. This can be done via an on-line version of New Employee Orientation for all new state employees. The same message is conveyed, the same business goals are delivered and State Personnel Division has an opportunity to help the new employee view employment with the State as a career opportunity rather than a stepping-stone to the next job. Additionally, this component automates most new hire paper forms and stores them, creating the

initial pieces of a paperless employee file. Through the on-boarding component two additional pieces of the hiring process can be automated: E-verify and background checks.

The paperless Performance Management application automates the performance appraisal process and simultaneously aligns employee values, development, and activities with organizational goals through a feature called "cascading goals." The performance management process becomes interactive, with both the employee and supervisor having input into the rankings, projects for the next performance period, and developmental activities necessary. Succession Planning is the process of identifying suitable employees to replace key personnel in key positions and to identify employee talent early for additional development. The TMS software provides employee ranking for key positions based on knowledge, skills, abilities, and previous positions. The Learning Management System (LMS) component stores data to develop comprehensive employee curriculum based on skill gaps identified through either the performance management or succession planning process. The LMS houses training records for each employee, manages training course catalogs and registrations, and provides a web-based training platform for employee development.

The Compensation Management piece makes a direct connection between compensation and performance. It offers electronic market wage survey and analysis tools, as well as scenario planning for budget projections and cost containment.

In contrast to other technology purchases of this nature within the state, the TMS purchase is Software-as-a-Service (SaaS). SaaS is a model of software deployment where an application is hosted as a service provided to customers across the Internet. This allows the Human Resources personnel to focus more time and energy on the people and unified business process model, rather than working on hardware and maintenance issues.

Initially, the NIS teams reviewed, evaluated, and determined the feasibility of using JD Edwards software applications as the primary Human Capital Management product. The Oracle JD Edwards products were simply not robust enough for HR business practices in the areas of: Applicant Tracking, Succession Planning, Learning Management, Performance Management, and Compensation Management.

Two additional product demonstrations of the PeopleSoft (Oracle) E-recruit application were scheduled, attended, and evaluated. A demonstration of Oracle JD Edwards E-learning product was also scheduled, attended, and evaluated. Two states with the E-recruit product were contacted. One state was terminating the E-recruit contact. The Oracle JD Edwards products were simply not robust enough for the state of Nebraska business practices in the areas of: Applicant Tracking, Succession Planning, Learning Management, Performance Management, and Compensation Management.

With NITC approval, we will be evaluating several procurement options that include: an RFP process, purchasing off another State's contract, purchasing from the GSA contract, or obtaining this product from a single source vendor.

Section 3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes (15 Points)

1. Describe the project, including:

   The goal of this project is to provide HR functionality that was thought to be contained as part of the NIS system. As a result of not providing these services, a settlement was reached with JD Edwards. We are requesting to use NIS settlement funds toward the purchase of a Talent Management Suite for Human Resource functionality that supplements the historical employee position, payroll, and benefit information housed within NIS. We are also requesting to use existing funding sources within Administrative Services. No money from the NITC is being requested at this time.

   Currently, several agencies within the classified system are working to develop custom technology solutions to HR challenges, or are actively trying to purchase, or already have purchased, separate pieces contained within a TMS. These individual efforts simply create additional information silos.

   This project meets the NITC goals of:
   1. Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable, and efficient;
   2. Support the use of information technology to enhance community and economic development;
   3. Promote the use of information technology to improve the efficiency and delivery of governmental and educational services, including homeland security;
   4. Ensure the security of the State's data and network resources and the continuity of business operations;
   5. Promote effective planning, management and accountability

- Specific goals and objectives;
   1. Eliminate Human Resource technological shadow system efforts and automate redundant and transactional HR processes.
   2. Position the state for future workforce planning issues, including e-verify and succession planning.
   3. Align HR function with the business goals of the state
   4. Positive introduction to State Government
      a. Increase communication with applicants
      b. Reduced time to screen and interview
      c. Provide consistent orientation to State Government for new employees
   5. Implement accurate and reliable performance metrics and reporting capabilities for HR process accountability and decision making.
      a. Reduce time to hire and cost per hire
      b. Return on Investment of training and training dollars
      c. Return on Investment of advertising dollars
      d. Internal turnover and external turnover
   6. Increase HR process consistency across the state; for example:
      a. Background checks
      b. Performance management
      c. Training tracking
   7. Automation of transactional processes allows more time to spend focused on other areas of Human Resources that have the potential to increase retention, like Succession Planning.
   8. Implement and /or improve training and education delivery systems with Learning Management System
      a. Computer-based training opportunities
      b. Reduced cost of training based on higher number of users
      c. Course content development opportunities
      d. Tracking of training dollars across classified agencies

- Expected beneficiaries of the project;
    1. Applicants
    2. Current Employees
    3. State Agencies
    4. Taxpayers
    5. HR Practitioners
    6. People and entities requesting HR data, including:
        a. Governor
        b. Legislature
        c. Other States

- Expected outcomes.
  Nebraska classified agencies will all use the same "best practice" workflows using the same HR enterprise solution, collecting the same information one time.

  Positive and measurable outcomes will be evident through the availability of data collected and housed in the TMS. Some of the areas to impacted include: improved quality of hire though the use of assessments; higher levels of performance through performance management and cascading goals; statewide skills gap analysis; reduction of duplicated training efforts (i.e. defensive driving); reduction of duplicated efforts in background checking; and increased communication and information sharing between agencies because employee information, like I-9, W-4, training records, performance appraisal scores, etc. is centrally stored.

TALENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM EFFICIENCIES			
	AUTOMATE MANUAL HR PROCESSES	**CONSOLIDATE MULTIPLE HR SYSTEMS**	**USER-FRIENDLY HR TECHNOLOGY**
Sourcing and Recruiting	Yes	Yes	Yes
On-boarding	Yes	Yes	Yes
Performance Management	Yes	Yes	Yes
Succession Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes
Compensation Management	Yes	Yes	Yes
Learning and Development	Yes	Yes	Yes

2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

- **Outcome #1** – One enterprise Talent Management Suite will be implemented, replacing multiple legacy systems
- **Outcome #2** – The Succession Planning component will be implemented statewide for optimal human resource capital management. Reports will be utilized for current and future workforce planning efforts and decisions. Bench strength for positions and competencies will be identified and addressed through individual development plans.
- **Outcome# 3** – Business priorities identified at the highest levels of the state can be communicated through the system and cascaded through the state.
- **Outcome #4** – User-friendly web-enabled application brands the state as an employer of choice with career options. Using technology engages younger applicants, indicating that the state is a progressive employer. Number of applications completed online will increase.
- **Outcome #5** – Delivered reports and user-friendly reporting capabilities are part of the Talent Management Suite. Increased use of HR metrics for decision making and process accountability will occur.
- **Outcome #6** – Part of the TMS implementation is process mapping. For the transactional HR processes, one best practice will be identified and adopted by the classified agencies.
- **Outcome #7** – More time will be spent managing the people, rather than the paper.
- **Outcome #8** – Implement and utilize a Learning Management System consistently.

3. Describe the project's relationship to your agency comprehensive information technology plan.

The Comprehensive Technology Plan for Administrative Services is currently under development.

Section 4: Project Justification / Business Case (25 Points)

4. Provide the project justification in terms of tangible benefits (i.e. economic return on investment) and/or intangible benefits (e.g. additional services for customers).

Currently there is not a comprehensive, integrated Human Resource technology solution at an enterprise level that can manage our human capital needs through the lifecycle of an employee, from hire through retire. This would be one investment statewide to procure the best product to meet the needs of the state now and in the future. The TMS will create consistent workflows for transactional HR processes for the classified agencies, and begin the transition from paper-based, manual systems to automated, data-based Human Capital Management.

5. Describe other solutions that were evaluated, including their strengths and weaknesses, and why they were rejected. Explain the implications of doing nothing and why this option is not acceptable.

Other solutions that were evaluated:

Initially, the NIS teams reviewed, evaluated, and determined the feasibility of using JD Edwards software applications as the primary Human Capital Management product. The Oracle JD Edwards products were simply not robust enough for HR business practices in the areas of: Applicant Tracking, Succession Planning, Learning Management, Performance Management, and Compensation Management.

Two additional product demonstrations of the PeopleSoft (Oracle) E-recruit application were scheduled, attended, and evaluated. A demonstration of Oracle JD Edwards E-learning product was also scheduled, attended, and evaluated. Two states with the E-recruit product were contacted. One state was terminating the E-recruit contact. The Oracle JD Edwards products were simply not robust enough for the state of Nebraska business practices in the areas of: Applicant Tracking, Succession Planning, Learning Management, Performance Management, and Compensation Management.

Since that time, HR technology has evolved to become more user-friendly, integrated, and does not necessarily require an investment in hardware, called SaaS.

The implications of doing nothing:

- Multiple HR legacy silo systems not connected to NIS or each other, limiting system functionality and costing the state more money in multiple investments.
- Less effective or non-existent workforce planning initiatives, leaving the state less competitive to attract, hire, and retain talent, now and in the future.
- Less effective or non-existent Human Resource performance metrics, like time to hire, amount of dollars spent on training each year, which positions within state government have the highest turnover and why, which positions within state government have the highest number of people eligible to retire and what actions are being taken to promote or recruit people to fill those positions.

6. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

E-Verify is an Internet-based system operated by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in partnership with the Social Security Administration (SSA). E-Verify is currently free to employers and is available in all 50 states. E-Verify provides an automated link to federal databases to help employers determine employment eligibility of new hires and the validity of their Social Security numbers.

Homeland Security Requires E-Verify for Federal Contractors

Companies doing business with the government would have to use the electronic system operated by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service and the Social Security Administration to prove each person they hire for a contract and each employee who works on it is legal. It's unclear when the directive goes into effect.

Both Mississippi and South Carolina have also passed legislation making it mandatory for all employers to use E-Verify. Utah, Colorado, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Missouri, Georgia, and North Carolina have required the use of E-Verify by public employers and contractors.

Section 5: Technical Impact (20 Points)

7. Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or implements a new technology system. Describe the technical elements of the project, including hardware, software, and communications requirements. Describe the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution.

Changes or Enhances Present Technology Systems:
- All classified agencies using the same HR workflows/process
- One, consolidated performance evaluation system
- Electronic personnel files (provides a detailed account of the life cycle of the employee captured in one place and accessible from hire to retire and beyond)
- Web enabled HR applications
- Update on-line application process
- Branding
- Consistent introduction to State Government
- HR metrics can assist in "people" decisions and the measuring HR processes
- Career and succession planning initiatives / opportunities
- Capture skills inventory of every employee
- One, comprehensive statewide training program with financial analysis
- Ability to create assessments that assist in getting the right people in the right places based on their knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors and beliefs
- Interfaces with NIS to supplement HR functionality

Replaces:
- Single agency investments in HR functionality/legacy systems
- Eliminates duplicate data entry for many HR processes

Technical Elements (Hardware, Software, Communications):
1. The Software as a Service solution does not require any hardware purchases by the State.
2. Document management will be important to house the electronic on-boarding forms and initiate the beginnings of a complete electronic personnel file.

Strengths / Weaknesses
Strengths
1. With SaaS, there is no reliance on IT developers and IT technical staff to maintain the TMS or invest in any additional hardware.
2. Human Resources will own and manage their data and processes.
3. Web-based technology.
4. Comprehensive enterprise solution for Human Resources.
5. Enables HR to become a business partner with decision makers through reliable data and consistent metrics.
6. Positions the state for more progressive Human Resource practices and initiatives.
7. Integrates with NIS and Department of Homeland Security

Weaknesses
1. Web-access will be necessary for all system users, including all state employees. Currently, not all state employees have access to the internet.

8. Address the following issues with respect to the proposed technology:
    - Describe the reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation) of the technology.
    - Address conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards.
    - Address the compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

Technology infrastructure in place will be given a high-level of consideration for this project, including compatibility with existing systems currently in use. Additionally, the goal of this project is to create a seamless bi-directional interface between NIS and the TMS.

The NITC standards will be addressed through the procurement process.

Section 6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10 Points)

9. Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance. Describe the project team, including their roles, responsibilities, and experience.

Project Sponsor: Carlos Castillo, Jr.
Director of Administrative Services

Examine Stakeholder Acceptance:
- Vendor research has involved multiple vendors and key Administrative Services personnel to ensure buy-in and support of the project and its direction from the beginning.
- Talent Management System information has been presented at two Interactive Informational Forums (IIF). The IIF is a quarterly meeting of HR professionals who represent all agencies. Reaction was positive.
- HR administrators from the largest eight classified agencies were invited to a meeting to discuss a Talent Management Suite concept. Reaction was favorable.
- A vendor demonstration was set-up for the Directors and HR staff of the eight largest classified agencies. Reaction was favorable.
- Two presentations to the Governor have been met with favorable results.
- Presentations to the Policy Research Office and Office of the CIO were met with favorable results.
- Administrative Services Director presented a TMS Overview at Governor's Cabinet meeting for all code agencies and was met with endorsements from one of the code agencies.
- The identified project team has been meeting individually with the eight largest agency directors, and HR staffs to present an overview, discuss funding, and answer any specific questions. The response has been overwhelmingly positive.
- Vendor demonstration has been scheduled for all code agency directors, and HR staff to see the technology capabilities first hand and ask the hard questions to a TMS vendor. These demos are scheduled for September 15 and 16.
- The project team will also consist of subject matter experts that identify, review, assess, and modify the workflow processes for HR. Focus groups increase the likelihood of workflow and software acceptance.
- Ongoing communication will occur at various venues.

Identified Project Team:
Dovi Mueller, Cindy DeCoster – State Personnel
Other Project Team Members will come from the Agencies determined

9. List the major milestones and/or deliverables and provide a timeline for completing each. Ideally, the project timelines would be to implement one component of the Talent Management System every six months. As this is the project team's first large scale project with a SaaS implementation, the timeline may be increased, or decreased depending on the vendor's and focus group's progress. Listed below is the tentative order of implementation and the proposed timeline for the first TMS component. Actual timelines will be developed through the procurement process.

Phase I - On-boarding / Assessments
Prepare Activities – July 2009
- Strategy and Planning
- Determine Project Team
- Launch Project
- Discovery Meeting

- Determine Process Scope
- Develop Project Plan
- Project Kick-Off

Requirements Analysis – August 2009
- Train Project Team
- Analyze Current Environment
    o Gather Existing Reports, Diagrams, Literature, Workflow, Statutes
    o Conduct Business Analysis Discovery Workshops and Interviews
    o Identify Interfaces, Data Conversion, Third Party Transmissions
    o Prepare "As Is" Flowcharts
    o Identify / Design Custom Reports, If Needed
- Perform Preliminary Gap Analysis
- Develop Future "To Be" Processes and Workflows

Application FastStart Workshop – September 2009
- Review and Approve Final Workflow
- Approval of Changes to Fit Gap Analysis

Internal Testing Before Roll Out – October 2009
- Develop "How To" Scripts for Live Demonstration for Development Team
- Develop Conversion Strategy
- Develop End-User Training Strategy

"Go Live" – November 2009
- Readiness Assessment
- Post Production Support

Deliverables – December 2009
- Develop High Level Implementation Plan
- Business Requirements Documentation
- Identify Performance Metrics
- Fit Gap Analysis Documentation over "To Be" Business Processes
- Complete Test Strategy
- Readiness Assessment
- Implemented On-boarding and Assessment Components

Phase II – Learning Management System
Prepare Activities -
- Strategy and Planning
- Determine Project Team
- Launch Project
- Discovery Meeting
- Determine Process Scope
- Develop Project Plan
- Project Kick-Off

Requirements Analysis

- Train Project Team
- Analyze Current Environment
    - Gather Existing Reports, Diagrams, Literature, Workflow, Statutes
    - Conduct Business Analysis Discovery Workshops and Interviews
    - Identify Interfaces, Data Conversion, Third Party Transmissions
    - Prepare "As Is" Flowcharts
    - Identify / Design Custom Reports, If Needed
- Perform Preliminary Gap Analysis
- Develop Future "To Be" Processes and Workflows

Application FastStart Workshop
- Review and Approve Final Workflow
- Approval of Changes to Fit Gap Analysis

Internal Testing Before Roll Out
- Develop "How To" Scripts for Live Demonstration for Development Team
- Develop Conversion Strategy
- Develop End-User Training Strategy

"Go Live"
- Readiness Assessment
- Post Production Support

Deliverables
- Develop High Level Implementation Plan
- Business Requirements Documentation
- Identify Performance Metrics
- Fit Gap Analysis Documentation over "To Be" Business Processes
- Complete Test Strategy
- Readiness Assessment
- Implemented Learning Management System

Phase III – Performance Management
Prepare Activities
- Strategy and Planning
- Determine Project Team
- Launch Project
- Discovery Meeting
- Determine Process Scope
- Develop Project Plan
- Project Kick-Off

Requirements Analysis
- Train Project Team
- Analyze Current Environment
    - Gather Existing Reports, Diagrams, Literature, Workflow, Statutes
    - Conduct Business Analysis Discovery Workshops and Interviews
    - Identify Interfaces, Data Conversion, Third Party Transmissions

- o Prepare "As Is" Flowcharts
- o Identify / Design Custom Reports, If Needed
- Perform Preliminary Gap Analysis
- Develop Future "To Be" Processes and Workflows

Application FastStart Workshop
- Review and Approve Final Workflow
- Approval of Changes to Fit Gap Analysis

Internal Testing Before Roll Out
- Develop "How To" Scripts for Live Demonstration for Development Team
- Develop Conversion Strategy
- Develop End-User Training Strategy

"Go Live"
- Readiness Assessment
- Post Production Support

Deliverables
- Develop High Level Implementation Plan
- Business Requirements Documentation
- Identify Performance Metrics
- Fit Gap Analysis Documentation over "To Be" Business Processes
- Complete Test Strategy
- Readiness Assessment
- Implemented Performance Management System Component

Phase IV – Succession Planning and Compensation Management
Prepare Activities
- Strategy and Planning
- Determine Project Team
- Launch Project
- Discovery Meeting
- Determine Process Scope
- Develop Project Plan
- Project Kick-Off

Requirements Analysis
- Train Project Team
- Analyze Current Environment
    - o Gather Existing Reports, Diagrams, Literature, Workflow, Statutes
    - o Conduct Business Analysis Discovery Workshops and Interviews
    - o Identify Interfaces, Data Conversion, Third Party Transmissions
    - o Prepare "As Is" Flowcharts
    - o Identify / Design Custom Reports, If Needed
- Perform Preliminary Gap Analysis
- Develop Future "To Be" Processes and Workflows

Application FastStart Workshop
- Review and Approve Final Workflow
- Approval of Changes to Fit Gap Analysis

Internal Testing Before Roll Out
- Develop "How To" Scripts for Live Demonstration for Development Team
- Develop Conversion Strategy
- Develop End-User Training Strategy

"Go Live"
- Readiness Assessment
- Post Production Support

Deliverables
- Develop High Level Implementation Plan
- Business Requirements Documentation
- Identify Performance Metrics
- Fit Gap Analysis Documentation over "To Be" Business Processes
- Complete Test Strategy
- Readiness Assessment
- Implemented Succession Planning and Compensation Management System

11. Describe the training and staff development requirements.
To be determined by the selected vendor.

With NITC approval, we will be evaluating several procurement options that include: an RFP process, purchasing off another State's contract, purchasing from the GSA contract, or obtaining this product from a single source vendor.

12. Describe the ongoing support requirements.
To be determined by the selected vendor. From discussions we have had with vendors, support requirements will include two TMS Administrators with associated technical support.

With NITC approval, we will be evaluating several procurement options that include: an RFP process, purchasing off another State's contract, purchasing from the GSA contract, or obtaining this product from a single source vendor.

Section 7: Risk Assessment (10 Points)

13. Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project and the relative importance of each.
    1. Age of current computer systems within some Agencies (M)
    2. Lack of statewide employee intranet (H)
    3. Lack of single sign-on (H)
    4. Electronic personnel file storage (H)

14. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.
    - **Risk/Barrier #1** - Determine OS and IE requirements through the procurement process and communicate these requirements as soon as possible. This risk is mitigated because NIS has current system requirements that are currently in place.
    - **Risk/Barrier #2 and #3 and #4** – Partner with the Office of the CIO to determine state needs.

Section 8: Financial Analysis and Budget (20 Points)

15. Financial Information

Below is a screen shot of the "Financial" information tab in the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System used to enter the finance information for this project (NOTE: For each IT Project Proposal created in the NBRRS, the submitting agency must prepare an "IT Issue" in the NBRRS to request funding for the project.):

Our goal is to move forward with the procurement process of a TMS. Once a TMS vendor is selected, specific, additional costs like training, materials and supplies, travel, data conversion, and other expenses will be specifically identified with associated costs. We would like to request authorization to spend funds for these expenses once those specific dollar amounts are known.

IT Project Request Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Telecommunications						
Data	$0					
Video	$0					
Voice	$0					
Wireless	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Training						
Technical Staff	$0					
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$0					
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Request	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr.	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					

| Done | | das-nebs-cat.ne.gov |

Official Nebraska Government Website

Welcome RBecker
User Options | Logout

Administrative Services State Budget Division
NEBRASKA BUDGET REQUEST AND REPORTING SYSTEM

| Home | Reports | Budget Division | Budget Instructions | Training Resources | FAQ |

Home   Information Technology   IT Project Proposal

Hide Menu

Operating Budget Request
Issues
Issue Details

Information Technology
Agency IT Set-Up
IT Project Proposal
IT Agency Summary

Administration
User Options

Reports
Preparation Reports

IT Project Proposal ❓   »Version Locked

Budget Cycle: 2009-2011   Agency: 065 - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES   Division: 08 - SPO   Version: AF - AGENCY FINAL REQUEST

IT Project: Human Resources Talent Managment System

| General Section | • Financial | Narrative |

▼ Financial
IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Telecommunications						
Data	$0					
Video	$0					
Voice	$0					
Wireless	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Training						
Technical Staff	$0					
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$0					
Software	$1,741,000		538,000	377,000	413,000	413,000
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$1,741,000	$0	$538,000	$377,000	$413,000	$413,000
Total Request	$1,741,000	$0	$538,000	$377,000	$413,000	$413,000

▼ Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr.	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$197,000		120,000	37,000	20,000	20,000
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$1,216,000		170,000	260,000	393,000	393,000
Other Fund	$110,000		30,000	80,000		
Total Funding	$1,523,000	$0	$320,000	$377,000	$413,000	$413,000

Variance	Total	Prior Exp	FY09 Appr/Reappr	FY10 Request	FY11 Request	Add Request
Total Request	$1,741,000	0	538,000	377,000	413,000	413,000
Total Funding	$1,523,000	0	320,000	377,000	413,000	413,000
Variance	$218,000	0	218,000	0	0	0