MEETING AGENDA

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

Tuesday, October 9, 2012
9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents (82 pages)
Meeting Documents - Including Full Text of Projects (463 pages)

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

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes* - August 14, 2012

4. Enterprise Projects

   - Project Status Dashboard - Andy Weekly

5. Standards and Guidelines

   - Requests for Waiver
     - Nebraska State Patrol - Request for Waiver from the requirements of NITC 5-101*

6. Project Proposals - 2013-2015 Biennial Budget - Recommendations to the NITC*

   - Reviewer Assigments
   - New Reviewers* - Anne Byers and Tom Rolfes
   - Project summary sheets (64 pages)
   - Full text of the projects (381 pages)

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

   - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Christy Horn
   - Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Kirk Langer
   - Security Architecture Work Group
   - Intergovernmental Data Communications Work Group - Tim Cao

8. Other Business

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 September 5, 2012. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 5, 2012.

TECHNICAL PANEL
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday, August 14, 2012, 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska
Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Michael Winkle, NET

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. There were four members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on July 3, 2012. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on August 10, 2012. The Open Meetings Act was posted on the South wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF JUNE 12, 2012 MINUTES

Mr. Langer moved to approve the June 12, 2012 **minutes as presented. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.**

ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

Final Report - Recommendation to Close Project; DHHS - ACCESSNebraska*
Karen Heng and Eric Henrichsen

Ms. Heng distributed a written project summary to panel members. The project is up and running with all components in place and operating well. There have been no issues with telecommunications. The biggest hindrance is keeping up with staffing the centers. Staff must go through a 3-month training session. One goals of the project is to have a wait time of 3 minutes. Currently the project is receiving over 100,000 calls a month.

Ms. Horn arrived to the meeting.

Ms. Heng reviewed the enhancements as well as the what the project would have done differently. Enhancements will be funded out of operational costs.

Mr. Henrichsen acknowledge Ms. Heng for her work, collaboration effort, and approach in addressing project issues.

Mr. Winkle moved to recommend to the NITC that the ACCESSNebraska project be designated as a closed and completed project. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Project Update - Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)
Bob Wilhelm and Sue Krogman, Nebraska Emergency Management Agency

The project's goal is to build microwave system across Nebraska that all first responders will be able to communicate with each other. It will be built in 5 rings that will have downlinks to communication centers and law enforcement offices. A pilot ring project was done with funding that ended on June 30th. The pilot ring has been tested and accepted by local jurisdictions in the panhandle area. The project will move east now. Appropriate sites will need to be identified. The southwest region is having difficulty acquiring sites due finding tower sites that are powerful enough to handle the microwave. Local jurisdictions are receiving 80% of the funding thru 2013 via homeland security funds but the funding is declining year by year. This is a project being funded through Homeland Security grants via NEMA (20%). No state agency is heading the project. It is all run by local jurisdiction. There is no formal governance heading the project.

The group is struggling with the issues of governance and maintenance of the network. Governance would need to be at the local jurisdiction and not a state agency. NPPD is also a partner in the project and the group is reviewing the use of their fiber.

It is anticipated that the project will have more to report since the first ring has been tested and operational. Locals will be able to get onboard and the project will have a better feel as to the system usage. The Office of the CIO has been working with NEMA and NPPD regarding possibilities of management and monitoring. This information has been given to the local jurisdictions in regards to what services the OCIO could provide.

Mr. Weir left the meeting. Ms. Decker presided over the reminder of the meeting.

Project Status Dashboard
Andy Weekly

Mr. Horn expressed continued concern about accessibility for the Online Assessment Project.

Mr. Weekly was asked to review the project completion dates and update to reflect current information.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Requests for Waiver
Department of Revenue - Request for Waiver from the requirements of NITC 8-301*

Problem or Issue: Currently the Nebraska Department of Revenue (Department) relies on the use of a State Identification Number and PIN to authenticate users for its public facing web applications. The Department and Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) are working on a new authentication system which will use individual usernames and passwords. This system will allow an individual user to be associated with a given organization and be assigned the necessary roles. The Department is also working with the Department of Labor to allow users to have the same username and password for both agencies' web applications. The development of this new authentication process is unlikely to be completed prior to the need for additional web applications. Specifically, Cigarette Tracking and the Prepaid Wireless Surcharge web applications need to be opened early in 2013 to be in compliance with legislative requirements.

Description of the agency's preferred solution: Allow the Department to continue using State Identification Numbers and PINs to authenticate users until the new authentication process has been developed. We are requesting this waver for an 18 month period.

Prior to leaving his position, Mr. Weakly sent a memo to the Technical Panel recommending approval of the request.

Mr. Winkle moved to approve the Department of Revenue's request for waiver of NITC 8-301 for a period of 18-months. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Golden-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried

New Resource Document - NITC 7-RD-01: Telecommunications Facilities and Services*

Mr. Langer moved approval of the NITC 7-RD-01 Telecommunications Facilities and Services Resource Document. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Golden-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried

The State Government Council will review this document before it is posted to the website.

FY2013-2015 BIENNIAL BUDGET - IT PROJECT REVIEW TIMELINE

Mr. Becker reviewed the following FY2013-15 Biennial Budget Review Timeline with the panel members.

9/15/2012:	IT Project Proposals due
9/17/2012:	Projects posted on website
9/18/2012:	Initial assignment of reviewers by staff and notice sent to Technical Panel members
9/20/2012:	Reviewers receive projects and scoring sheets by email
10/1/2012:	Completed scoring sheets due from reviewers
10/2/2012:	Distribute summary sheets, with reviewer scores and comments, to submitting agencies for comment/response
10/5/2012:	Agency response due (optional)
10/9/2012:	**Technical Panel** meeting
10/11/2012:	**State Government Council** Meeting
10/17/2012:	**Education Council** Meeting
10/29-11/14:	**NITC** Meeting
11/15/2012:	Report Submitted to the Governor and Legislature

The project scoring will remain the same. Individual scores will score with a 100 point possibility. NITC Councils will also review requests. When the recommendation is submitted to the NITC, it will be based on Tier 1-4.

Members discussed the difficulty in reviewing projects with very limited information available to reviews. Often it is not the agency's fault because few details are available for projects that will start far in the future, but timing of biennial budget requests necessitates submission of a proposal.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Christy Horn. No report.

Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Kirk Langer. No report.

Security Architecture Work Group. Brad Weakly has resigned to take a position with the University of Nebraska.

Intergovernmental Data Communications Work Group - Tim Cao. No report.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Decker informed the panel that Mark Robertson has left the Office of the CIO to take a position with the UNL Police Department.

ADJOURN

Mr. Langer moved to adjourn. Mr. Winkle seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

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

Project:	**LINK – Human Capital Management** (formerly Talent Management System)			Contact:		**Dovi Mueller**	
Start Date	6/1/2009	Orig. Completion Date	7/1/2012		Completion Date	5/09/2012	
	October	August	June	May	April	March	
Overall Status	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟡	
Schedule	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	
Budget	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	
Scope	⚪	⚪	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	

Comments

October update:
Implemented the Human Capital Management portion of LINK on May 9, 2012. Request to close out the project.

Project:	**LINK – Procurement**			Contact:		**Steve Sulek**	
Start Date	6/1/2009	Orig. Completion Date	7/1/2012	Revised Completion Date		TBD	
	October	August	June	May	April	March	
Overall Status	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	
Schedule	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	
Budget	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	
Scope	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	

Comments

October update:
Steve Sulek will be reporting as the project manager on the Procurement portion of LINK.

The focus has been on the Employee Work Center up to this point. The expectation is that for the November reporting period the Procurement implementation will have started again.

Project:	**Network Nebraska Education**			Contact:		**Tom Rolfes**	
Start Date	05/01/2006	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date		7/01/2013	
	October	August	June	May	April	March	
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟡	
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🔴	
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	

Comments

October Update:
Since 8/1/2012, all 150 K-12 WAN circuits came up on time, and were tested and accepted EXCEPT for one provider in northeast Nebraska. This provider has a combination of late equipment ordering, central office facility upgrades, and inability to provide service above 40Mbps for approximately 8 sites. Additionally, one Northeast Community College 100Mbps circuit from West Point to Norfolk with the same provider was temporarily being limited at 40Mbps until the provider upgrades its central office Ethernet ports.

August Update:
Two tribal colleges, one nonpublic school, and two public school districts will be new Network Nebraska members by 7/1/2012, and one public school district will be deleted due to a school district merger. UNCSN staff is working with the telecommunications providers and ESU staff to help manage and coordinate the circuit upgrades and backbone replacement.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

Project:	**Nebraska Statewide Radio System** (formerly Public Safety Wireless)		Contact:		**Mike Jeffres**	
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢
Budget	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	⚪	🟢
Comments						

October update:
System acceptance testing is in planning with coverage testing started on September 17. System life cycle planning is in process.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
Discussions with Motorola on system acceptance, life cycle planning, and project closeout.

Project:	**Fusion Center**			Contact:		**Kevin Knorr**
Start Date	04/13/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/11/2011	Revised Completion Date		06/22/2012
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

October Update:
Nebraska State Patrol requests to close the project for NITC reporting. The system is now in production.
They have not signed-off on the contract with the vendor due to one outstanding requirement that has yet to be met.

August update:
The dual layer authentication is fixed and in final testing before we deploy our training. In the process of full deployment.

Project:	**Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) – Year 2012-13** (formerly Statewide Online Assessment)		Contact:		**John Moon**	
Start Date	07/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2011	Revised Completion Date		06/30/2012 06/30/2013
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	🟢
Comments						

October update:

The State of the Schools Report (SOSR) with results from NeSA assessments will be released in November 2012.

The NeSA enrollment window for reading, math, science, and writing will be open October 8th through 19th. Districts will order paper/pencil copies of the assessments using the enrollment system.

The Check 4 Learning system update will be released on October 30 -31. The updates have addressed issues reported from districts in 2011-12.

A preliminary PreID file will be sent to our vendor DRC on November 1, 2012. Training for updates to the NeSA online system will be made on November 6-8, 2012. After the updated system opens on November 12, NDE has encouraged districts to have students complete the practice tests online to ascertain the local tech system will work with the updated NeSA online system.

August update:

The 2012 aggregated student results will be shared with districts and the public on August 13th and 21st respectively. NeSA testing for reading, math, and science finished with 154,416 students tested. About 85 % of the reading assessments were completed online with about 78% of the students assessed online for math. Over 55,000 students took the science assessment online about 87% of students in grades 5, 8, and 11. Final corrections of assessment errors will completed by September 15th and reported on the 2012 State of Schools Report (SOSR) in November. The 2012 SORS will include disaggregated data for reading, math, science, and writing.

As of August 8, 176 schools including sixteen new districts have signed up to participate in the 2012-2013 Check for Learning (C4L) formative assessment system. Updates were made to system during the summer including revisions to development of reading assessments, item searches, student data upload, and reports. On August 27th, the school districts will be able to upload student information, and administer tests. The reading test development change, a priority for teachers, will be effective by October 29th.

The 2012-2013 writing assessment window will be January 21 through February 8, 2013, while the window for reading, math, and science will be March 26 through May 3, 2013. The eDirect Enrollment system will collect student numbers for assessment purposes such as Braille, Large Print, etc. from October 8 through October 19.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

The revised completion date on the project is June 30, 2013 (from June 30, 2012)

Project:	**Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)**			Contact:		**Bob Wilhelm**
Start Date	10/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/01/2013	Revised Completion Date		09/30/2013
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Schedule	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

October Update:
The contractor is moving forward with installations and the ordering of equipment. The contractor is also providing the information necessary for the Environmental and Historic Preservation (EHP) reviews and assessing the viability of some of the proposed sites and prioritizing the EHP direction to those areas where construction may occur in a more timely manner based on infrastructure. All PSIC funds were paid out for this project by September 30, 2012 (end of grant) and we have moved on to using State Homeland Security Grant funds as the primary source of funding for this project.

August update:
Testing of the Panhandle Pilot Ring occurred on June 5th and 9th. The Regional and state representatives were satisfied that the testing met the final testing criteria and the contractor, CSI, was advised that they were authorized to implement the remainder of the project. Since that time much equipment for the Southwest Ring has been ordered with PSIC funds as that grant ends on June 30, 2012. Additional purchasing of equipment for the Southwest ring has and will continue under the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) funds that were identified for this project. Adequate infrastructure (towers, etc.) continue to be problematic for this project.

Project:	**MMIS**			Contact:		
Start Date	N/A	Orig. Completion Date	N/A	Revised Completion Date		N/A
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Schedule	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Budget	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Scope	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪	⚪
Comments						

Project On Hold until renewed

Project:	**Adjudication Re-engineering**		Contact:		**Randy Cecrle**	
Start Date	09/01/2011	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date		12/31/2012 03/31/2013
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	🟢
Schedule	🟢	🟢	🟡	⚪	⚪	🟡
Budget	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	🟢
Scope	🟢	🟢	🟢	⚪	⚪	🟢
Comments						

October update:
The draft of the e-filing rules was completed in June, 2012. Internal review meetings with the Judges were held on June 27 and 28, 2012. A Rule Hearing is scheduled for August 29, 2012.

Phase 1a has the following functional areas of the system defined:
1. Account Setup
2. E-filing Drafting
3. E-filing System Help
4. Permissions
5. Drafting
6. Signature
7. Submittal
8. Clerk Review and Notification
9. ACH
10. Management Functions

Analysis (process, screen/views, and data attributes) has been completed on the above functions. The Analysis was completed ahead of schedule from what was previously planned in early July. Analysis documentation is in the process of being updated. Design through mock-ups and proto-types are in progress. Database schema (tables and relationships) design and creation has been started.

In addition, the following data quality projects are in progress:
1. Parties / Entity Types Definition and Update – The court's "Parties" table needs to be enhanced to add entity types such as Employee, Employer, etc. so that the types can be used in the Drafting and Signature functions.
2. Attorneys Bar Number Cleanup – The Attorney's Bar Numbers are being reviewed and updated where necessary. Also in the second half of the year the WCC will begin working with the Supreme Court on a data feed from the Nebraska Bar Association to keep our "Attorneys" table updated programmatically.
3. Current Internal System Enhancements. A number of minor enhancements need to be put in place, such as adding an additional address line to the Parties table.

---------Project Description

Adjudication Re-engineering is a multi-phase project that will span a number of years to incorporate e-filing, electronic docket files, public web access to docket status, e-documents creation and judges e-signing of decisions and orders, and other performance improvement changes.

Project 1a - Release of Liability E-Filing is focusing on the development of one pleading type to complete the full end-to-end set of e-filing functions and limited changes to Clerks Review to process the submitted e-documents in the same manner as performed today with paper.

Project 1b - Semi-automated Docket / RFJA Setup, Electronic Docket File, and possibly Centralized Scanning will follow up immediately after 1a is completed. A rough time frame for completion is first half of calendar year 2013.

Because of the tight integration of judicial data and functions with non-judicial data and functions, (such as Vocational Rehabilitation), WCC systems, including e-filing, are separate from the rest of the courts in the state.

Because of the court's limited jurisdiction, our e-filing system is being designed to provide web-based drafting of pleading documents by outside attorneys, which utilize internal WCC electronic docket information. PDFs are generated for printing and "wet signatures" and the submittal with the "/s/" signature format as is the current rule and practice by the other courts in the state.

Tentatively, Project 2 will focus on adding the remainder of the pleading types to e-filing with a rough target completion date end-of-calendar year 2013.

Other adjudication functions to be addressed following Project 2 include:
- Scheduling and Calendar management,
- Public access to case status and case documents,
- Judge's Decisions and Orders management,
- Automated notification to other sections of the court of court case changes,
- Electronic transmission of documents to the Court of Appeals,
- Electronic Exhibit management.

There has not been any identification of additional out-of-pocket costs following Project 2, other than the knowledge that electronic storage costs will grow as more e-documents are added to the Electronic Docket Files.

September update:
The revised completion date on the project is March 31, 2013 (from December 31, 2012).

Please note: The project listed below is reporting voluntarily and is not considered as an Enterprise Project by the NITC.

Project:	**Law Enforcement Message Switch Replacement (V)**		Contact:		**Suzy Fredrickson**	
Start Date	08/01/2011	Orig. Completion Date	05/15/2012	Revised Completion Date		11/30/2012
	October	August	June	May	April	March
Overall Status	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Schedule	🟢	⚪	🟡	🟡	🟢	🟡
Budget	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Scope	🟢	⚪	🟢	🟢	🟢	🟢
Comments						

October update:
Production Cut Over – Troubleshooting connectivity to metro hosts. Datamaxx will be onsite the week of October 22-26. Go live will be scheduled following that time.

Project milestones:
1. Establishing a Project Schedule - Complete
2. Development of Design Specifications - Complete
3. Receipt of Software Licensing - Complete
4. Server Installs - Complete
5. Implementation of Interfaces – Datamaxx developing interfaces for DMV, VTR, PO - Complete
6. Regression Testing - Complete
7. User Testing - User testing is complete. Issues were reported and are being addressed by the vendor. – Complete
8. Training - Complete
9. Documentation - Complete
10. **Production Cut Over – In Progress**

On-Going Issues:			
Application	Issue	Report Date	Comment
Student Information System	ADA Compliance	June, 2012	None.

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.
⚪	Gray	**No report for the reporting period or the project has not yet been activated.**

Agency Name:
Nebraska State Patrol

Name, title, and contact information for the agency contact person regarding the request:
Pam Zilly
Crime Laboratory Director
402-471-8967
Pam.Zilly@nebraska.gov

Title of the NITC Standards and Guidelines document at issue:
NITC 5-101
Enterprise Content Management System for State Agencies

Description of the problem or issue:
The Nebraska State Patrol Crime Lab must be utilizing a document management system by the end of 2012 in order to show a year's worth of compliance prior to our 2014 inspection. The document management solution available through the State does not offer the specialized features necessary to ensure compliance and thus successful accreditation.

Description of the agency's preferred solution, including a listing of the specific requirement(s) for which a waiver is requested:
The Nebraska State Patrol respectfully requests permission to purchase QualTrax Compliance Software.
http://www.qualtrax.com/
- Contains 1300 + Crime Lab Accreditation Criteria
- Software updates released regularly as changes are made to the criteria.
- Hyperlink to policies applicable to criteria.
- Ability to run compliance reports so gap analyses can be performed.
- Built in Crime Lab workflows such as:
  o Corrective Action Requests/ Preventative Action Requests
  o Audit report functionality
  o Testing features
- Workflows developed by Labs using QualTrax can be shared with other QualTrax Labs.

Any additional information and justification showing good cause for the requested waiver:
As the Nebraska State Patrol Cime Lab works towards ISO International Accreditation Standards, it has become apparent that we will need a system to ensure proper document control and ensure compliance with the numerous criteria we are responsible for meeting. Because QualTrax has turned their attention to Forensic Laboratories, it contains the Accreditation criteria the Lab is required to be compliant with (over 1300 criteria) including:
ASCLD/LAB Legacy (152)
ASCLD/LAB-International (445)
FBI Quality Assurance Standards for DNA Databasing Laboratories (352)
FBI Quality Assurance Standards for Forensic DNA Testing Laboratories (371)

QualTrax updates their software regularly when changes are made to any of the criteria. It allows you to hyperlink your policies to applicable criteria and run compliance reports so gap analyses can be performed. QualTrax has many workflows built into it that are currently used by the Lab, such as

Corrective Action Requests/ Preventative Action Requests, Audit report functionality and Testing features to ensure personnel have read procedure revisions. In addition, any workflows developed by Labs using QualTrax can be shared with other QualTrax Labs, thus decreasing duplication of efforts and increasing efficiency.

Additional information requested:
Is Disaster Recovery addressed in your proposed solution?
- Yes, the Nebraska State Patrol uses the Avamar solution for agency backups.
- The virtual environment will provide redundancy at an offsite location >50 miles away.

Confirmation that this solution will only be used for the Crime Labs.
- Since QualTrax is compliance software for forensic laboratory accreditation and audits, this solution is only intended for use by the NSP Crime Lab.

Is there an option for the OCIO to host the solution (server infrastructure)?
- Consideration will be given for this solution to be hosted by OCIO.

Does the cost include software, implementation, annual maintenance, hardware and all on-going support?
- The cost includes software installation, implementation, onsite training, maintenance and support.
- Since the solution will be implemented in the virtual environment, there is no price included for hardware.
- Ongoing annual maintenance and support is estimated at $4,000.

At what point will NSP be reevaluating this application so that consideration on moving to the enterprise ECM solution will be evaluated?
- Consideration will be revisited upon end of life. NSP estimates the life cycle to be approximately five years.

Please let us know if any further information is needed. Thanks!

Suzy Fredrickson
Nebraska State Patrol
Information Technology Team
1600 Nebraska Highway 2
Lincoln, Nebraska 68502
suzy.fredrickson@nebraska.gov

<div style="background:#990000;color:white;text-align:center;">

NITC 5-101

</div>

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

NITC 5-101

Title	Enterprise Content Management System for State Agencies
Category	Groupware Architecture
Applicability	Standard for all State government agencies, excluding higher education

1. Standard

1.1 State agencies managing content and creating workflow as described in Section 2 shall use the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM) that is provided through the Office of Chief Information Officer (OCIO).

1.2 Agencies must consider, through consultation with the OCIO, using the ECM's E-Forms software for any new electronic forms applications.

2. Managing content and creating workflow includes the following:

- Capturing paper documents through the use of scanners and storing them in electronic form;
- Capturing all type of content (audio, video, e-faxes, emails, MS Office documents, etc) and storing them in electronic form;
- Electronic searching and retrieval of captured content;
- Automating records retention and archiving;
- Automating business processes through workflow;
- Reducing and/or eliminating paper document storage.

3. Purpose

The purpose of this standard is to provide, to the extent possible, a single technical solution for State agencies:

- Capturing all types of content and storing content electronically;
- Converting and minimizing the number of paper documents the State maintains;
- Facilitate searching and retrieval of electronic documents;
- Retain and dispose of electronic documents based on established document retention policies;
- Improve efficiency and accuracy of exchanging information; and
- Unify document management in a single system to take advantage of economies of scale.

4. Exception

This standard does not apply to systems already in use by an agency, unless:

- The agency intends to buy significant upgrades;
- The agency intends to buy a significant amount of new modules; or
- The agency intends to do a significant amount of custom development

For guidance on these points, contact the OCIO.

5. Definitions

5.1 Documents – The State currently utilizes a great deal of paper-based documents. These documents are generated internally from both manual and automated processes. Paper documents also come from external businesses and citizens. Additionally, each paper document is read by a person to determine its purpose, what information it contains, what it is associated with and what should be done with it.

Indexing is a process of extracting the key content of the document and storing that information with the electronic version of the document. The purpose of the index information is to facilitate searching and retrieval of the document and facilitate automating processes using workflow in an agency. The index information can also be used for securing the document as well as to associate multiple documents together.

The ECM will consume paper documents by either using scanners and/or electronic document uploads. The documents can be indexed by automated means using Optical Character Recognition (OCR), Intelligent Character Recognition (ICR) and/or bar codes. The ECM facilitates both automated and manual indexing.

5.2 Processes (Workflow) –For those paper documents that are processed manually, (i.e. from one desk to another, one agency to another, and are dependent on individual organizational skill sets to insure documents are not lost, processed timely, processed accurately and filed correctly) can be greatly improved with automated workflow. Even automated processes that were previous built with little or no integration to other processes can be improved and enhanced as well.

The ECM supplies a framework to allow agencies to easily create flexible automated workflows that can utilize documents or work as independent processes. These automated workflows readily integrate with existing processes.

HISTORY: Adopted on April 11, 2012.
PDF FORMAT: http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/5-101.pdf

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Reviewer Information Sheet

Purpose: By statute, the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission is responsible for performing technical reviews of certain budget requests and grant applications. As part of the review process established in NITC policies (NITC 1-202), the Technical Panel may request qualified individuals to review, score, and comment on project proposals as part of the technical review process. This document requests background information from potential reviewers allowing the Technical Panel to document a reviewer's qualifications. Please send the completed form to: ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov

Name	Anne Byers
Agency/Employer	Nebraska Information Technology Commission/Office of the CIO
Title	Community IT and eHealth Manager
Email Address	Anne.byers@nebraska.gov
Phone	402 471-3805

1. Employment History (IT Related Only)

NITC—(May 1999 to present) Currently administer the State HIE Cooperative Agreement from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of the National Coordinator for Health IT

University of Nebraska, Program Coordinator (June 1996-May 1999) Developed and coordinated a community Internet training program

2. Education

Bachelor of Journalism, University of Nebraska
Master of Education, Boston University

3. Professional Training and Certifications

4. Information Technology Areas of Expertise (Optional. List areas of expertise.)

eHealth
Broadband planning

Technical Panel Review

Date	
Action	

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Reviewer Information Sheet

Purpose: By statute, the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission is responsible for performing technical reviews of certain budget requests and grant applications. As part of the review process established in NITC policies (NITC 1-202), the Technical Panel may request qualified individuals to review, score, and comment on project proposals as part of the technical review process. This document requests background information from potential reviewers allowing the Technical Panel to document a reviewer's qualifications. Please send the completed form to: ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov

Name	Thomas Rolfes
Agency/Employer	Office of the CIO-NITC/State of Nebraska
Title	Education I.T. Manager
Email Address	Tom.rolfes@nebraska.gov
Phone	402-471-7969

1. Employment History (IT Related Only)
   1998-present   Education I.T. Manager, Office of the CIO-NITC
   1986-1998   Teacher/Technology Coordinator, Lincoln Public Schools

2. Education
   B.S. in Ed-Natural Science Broad Field Endorsement; UNL; 1982
   M.Ed-Curriculum & Instruction; UNL; 1984
   M.Ed-Educational Administration; UNL; 1993
   PhD-Leadership Studies; UNL; *in progress*

3. Professional Training and Certifications
   Nebraska Professional Teaching & Administrative Certification, Grades 7-12

4. Information Technology Areas of Expertise (Optional. List areas of expertise.)

Technical Panel Review

Date	
Action	

Agency Information Technology Projects
2013-2015 Biennial Budget

Technical Panel Meeting
October 9, 2012

**NEBRASKA
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
COMMISSION**

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY14	FY15	Total*
09-01	Secretary of State	Rules & Regulations Filing & Approval Application	$ 170,800	$ 65,800	$ 236,600
09-02	Secretary of State	Collections / Licensing Filing Application	$ 80,120	$ 12,800	$ 92,920
09-03	Secretary of State	State Records Center Web Application	$ 39,400	$ 21,900	$ 61,300
18-01	Department of Agriculture	Paperless Inspections	$ 208,250	$ 208,250	$ 416,500
22-01	Department of Insurance	Nebraska Exchange	$ 84,060,945	$ 41,490,945	$ 332,126,550
23-01	Department of Labor	Electronic Content Management for UI Programs	$ 408,000		$ 408,000
23-02	Department of Labor	State Information Data Exchange System	$ 290,300		$ 290,300
25-01	DHHS	ACA IT Implementation	$ 35,225,224	$ 34,705,337	$ 77,594,033
25-02	DHHS	ICD-10	$ 290,300		$ 290,300
25-03	DHHS	SMHP (State Medicaid Hit Plan)	$ 1,778,100	$ 653,900	$ 4,909,598
25-04	DHHS	MMIS Replacement Study	$ 802,650		$ 3,864,120
25-05	DHHS	MMIS Replacement	$ 28,400,000	$ 28,400,000	$ 113,678,560
25-06	DHHS	Medicaid Managed Care Expansion	$ 2,150,400	$ 1,075,200	$ 5,397,200
25-07	DHHS	Behavioral Health Data System	$ 1,530,000	$ 1,470,000	$ 3,000,000
47-02	NETC	Radio Transmission Replacement	$ 175,000	$ 150,000	$ 325,000
47-03	NETC	Enterprise Uninterrupted Power Supply	$ 100,000		$ 100,000
47-04	NETC	Media Services Technology Project	$ 175,000	$ 75,000	$ 275,000
47-05	NETC	NETC Facility Technical Corridor Redesign	$ 300,000	$ 200,000	$ 500,000
47-06	NETC	Facility Routing Project		$ 250,000	$ 500,000
78-01	Crime Commission	Criminal Justice Information System	$ 653,087	$ 653,087	$ 2,259,261
ESUCC-01**	ESUCC	Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System	$ 1,370,000	$ 1,265,000	$ 7,135,000

*Total may include prior year or future planned costs in addition to biennial budget request amounts.

**A voluntary review requested by the submitting entity. Not submitted as an agency budget request.

Note: No review necessary for project #47-01. The project was outside the scope of review requirements.

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-01	Secretary of State	Rules & Regulations Filing & Approval Application

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The proposed project is a multiple agency workflow and archival system for the promulgation and maintenance of proposed and current rules and regulations using the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM) provided by Hyland OnBase. Rules and Regulations (rule/s) affect virtually every citizen and business in Nebraska. The Secretary of State is the "keeper" of state agency rules. The basic process of promulgating rules is this: publication of a draft for comment by interested or affected citizens or businesses, hold public hearing, review and approval. Rules become effective, five days after filing with the Secretary of State and have the force and effect of a statute. The proposed system would begin with the post-hearing workflow and archiving.

The OnBase ECM system would provide central document storage, where documents could be: checked out for modification, electronically sent to reviewers, electronically routed to final approvers, and electronically filed. The system would also maintain archived versions of the rules and interact with our online docket to notify subscribers about pending and approved rules. The official electronically stamped regulations would be published online allowing citizens' access to the official version of all current regulations.

By moving to an electronic system we would be able to maintain consistent formatting for rules, reduce filing errors and have the documents clearly dated maintaining the documents integrity throughout the process.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$200,000			150,000	50,000	
Project Management	$25,000			15,000	10,000	
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$3,600			1,800	1,800	
Total	$228,600	$0	$0	$166,800	$61,800	$0

Other Operating Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$8,000			4,000	4,000	
Total	$8,000	$0	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$0

| **Total Request** | $236,600 | $0 | $0 | $170,800 | $65,800 | $0 |

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$236,600			170,800	65,800	
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$236,600	$0	$0	$170,800	$65,800	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	15	15	14	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	24	22	22	25
Technical Impact	20	20	18	19	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	2	7	7	5	10
Risk Assessment	3	7	7	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	20	16	15	20
			TOTAL	82	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Improvements for posting agency rules and public use are strengths. - Provides a solution for all agencies to work from. - This appears to be a great use of ECM. The creation of a standard system for all agencies to use would standardize business processes and have a single uniform system for the public. It would also appear to eliminate some very cumbersome processes involving filing and time dating, not to mention the paper and human resource savings.	- Little clarification on measuring outcomes. - Not a big deal, but the goals are listed as if the regulations already exist, it is possible for new regulations to be developed and that process should also be included in the project. It may be, but was not indicated.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Provides a good uniform and consistent product - Well thought out and presented justification.	- No analysis of ROI beyond potential .5 FTE shift to other duties. - May not address all of the unique agency processes that exist for development and modification of rules and regulations. And allow for the agency to continue using the workflow process for those situations.
Technical Impact	- Utilizing an existing Enterprise application.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- Training and change management requirements within the agency are minimally addressed in the proposal. - agencies are consulted but not part of the team, states agencies would use only the web version of the application, for those agencies within the state domain and using the ECM, is it possible to use the other clients (more functionality to the agency). - Critical parts of this process appear to be a buy-in by all users and the associated training with a large number of agencies and individuals. This would appear to be critical for success and a timely implementation. Suggest a well drafted project management plan and training program for users emphasizing the positives of this system.
Risk Assessment	- The project is sound and will provide consistency in an area where it has not existed before.	- Risk of agency cooperation is high. Conversion and workflow adaptation are aggressively optimistic. - The risk is in obtaining buy in from multiple agencies and PRO and AG. Would suggest finding a few agencies to assist in the process to provide support for the project before approaching PRO and AG. - Again, the key element for success in this plan is the adoption by ALL agencies. Migration of the 24,000 R & Rs is a significant undertaking. The proofing process to insure all documents are migrated properly is critical and also would appear

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		to be very time consuming.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Is there an ROI for this or is this a project that ultimately is done for the greater good of both the public and private sector with an ROI very difficult to project?	- Quotes for project include 50% variance waiver. It appears that the budget request is being made to include the high end of the variance. This indicates a high level of uncertainty regarding scope of work (and cost), which should have been pointed out in the risks. - Agencies are currently doing some of the same work and incurring some of the same costs. Should explore a joint venture in the costs of the project or expand on the cost benefit to more than the SOS.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-02	Secretary of State	Collections / Licensing Filing Application

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

We are proposing to implement an Enterprise Content Management System (ECM) using Hyland OnBase to consolidate current systems, documents and processes. This project is needed to modernize the record keeping and electronic database system currently being used to operate licensing and registration of the following occupations: Collection Agency, Athlete Agent, Credit Services, Debt Management, Private Detectives, Non-Recourse Civil Litigation Funding Companies, and Truth & Deception Examiners.

OnBase ECM would allow our office to replace filing cabinets currently taking up a fourth of our office with digital storage easily accessible from each employee's desk. Our current licensing processes would also be modernized creating a business workflow within OnBase where licenses would be processed, reviewed, approved and finally issued within the system. By converting our system to OnBase ECM we can eliminate paper, automate and streamline our workflow to serve citizens faster and better, and have our documents safe and secure, centrally stored and accessible by authorized staff.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$59,820			59,820		
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$3,600			1,800	1,800	
Total	$63,420	$0	$0	$61,620	$1,800	$0

Other Operating Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$7,000			3,500	3,500	
Total	$7,000	$0	$0	$3,500	$3,500	$0

Capital Expenditures	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$0					
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$22,500			15,000	7,500	
Total	$22,500	$0	$0	$15,000	$7,500	$0
Total Request	$92,920	$0	$0	$80,120	$12,800	$0

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$92,920			80,120	12,800	
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$92,920	$0	$0	$80,120	$12,800	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	10	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	25	19	21	25
Technical Impact	20	20	18	19	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	6	8	6	10
Risk Assessment	2	7	8	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	16	19	15	20
			TOTAL	80	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are consistent with ECM strengths. - The project description and goals are sound, however, there was not much included regarding how to deal with historical. - Very thorough narrative for project. My question is: does this create an electronic application/filing process for the public or is it aimed at imaging incoming paper documents and then creating a digital work process?	- All of the existing paper does not become electronic overnight and I did not see a plan to address all of the old paper, only the moving forward process. I may have missed that component, but it is a big factor in the overall success of the project.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Existing limitations regarding number of staff and space restrictions make project very worthy. - Project can provide a great benefit.	- Historical records would be part of the benefit, but not clearly defined as to how incorporated. Moving forward, in two to three years, the historical will be less of a need.
Technical Impact	- Known and proven systems. - Building on the Enterprise solution for electronic records.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- Training and change management appear underestimated. - I believe the implementation is not well defined. Training is quite likely going to take more time than allocated and the development of training guides or manuals. Costs for the ongoing support from OCIO is not included in the document, but noted as an ongoing resource.
Risk Assessment		- Risk in implementation, workload of other ECM projects could affect timelines, transition and impact on public users, etc. - What is the risk of not having existing documents in all of those file cabinets converted to initiate this process? And how do the file cabinets get removed, if the historical documents are not made electronic.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Small project. - This project will utilize existing money. - Because of the smaller cost of this project it would appear that this project should go forward even if the additional funding is not provided because of the potential for space and human resource savings and digital efficiencies.	- Documentation does not match programming estimate in budget. Assume this is another case of high variance built into contractor's estimate. - Not sure that all costs are noted (OCIO support costs), additional work to image historical records.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-03	Secretary of State	State Records Center Web Application

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Secretary of State (SOS) serves as the state records administrator. The Records Management Division (RMD) assists state agencies in managing the creation, use, storage and disposal of records in an efficient and economical manner. The State Records Center (SRC) currently maintains and tracks over 70,000 cubic feet of state agency records. The SOS-RMD is interested in a web-based software application to maximize the efficient and cost-effective use of updated technologies in order to upgrade from a limited and somewhat unstable database system. The City of Lincoln developed a web-based records tracking system for use in the Lancaster County Records & Information Management office. They have offered to share this web application with the state for a modest investment.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$20,000			12,500	7,500	
Project Management	$7,500			5,000	2,500	
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$10,000			5,000	5,000	
Total	$37,500	$0	$0	$22,500	$15,000	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$1,800			900	900	
Travel	$12,000			6,000	6,000	
Other	$0					
Total	$13,800	$0	$0	$6,900	$6,900	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$0					
Software	$10,000			10,000		
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$10,000	$0	$0	$10,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$61,300	$0	$0	$39,400	$21,900	$0

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$61,300			39,400	21,900	
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$61,300	$0	$0	$39,400	$21,900	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	11	14	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	20	18	19	25
Technical Impact	20	12	17	16	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	9	7	10
Risk Assessment	8	5	7	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	10	17	15	20
			TOTAL	78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals and objectives of the project are clear and the move to a modern technology infrastructure has substantial benefits in both service delivery and operational efficiency. - This improved system would allow agencies access to their data in a more timely and efficient manner. - Adequately describes the project's goal to remove existing limitations to information while empowering beneficiaries.	- The evaluation process is not clearly articulated beyond suggesting that reduced latency in service delivery will be self-evident and documented by the logging of transactions. The stated benefits go beyond this and an evaluation plan would ordinarily include a clear method for constituent and stakeholder feedback. - Lacking description of the measurement and assessment methods. - The measurement methods do not include metrics regarding quantity of employee time or perceived value of more timely information.
Project Justification / Business Case	- The anticipated benefits in service delivery and operational efficiency are clearly articulated. - Client requests and business needs well stated. - Justification is based upon customer demands and the perceived value of automating the request and reporting system.	- The response failed to indicate why the proposed technology is a better fit than alternatives. - No measures were presented as to the difference in functionality between the RFP and the proposed system.
Technical Impact	- The proposed solution appears to conform with NITC standards, IT best practice and efficiencies associated with the use of existing hardware, software and directory infrastructure. - Describes the ability to leverage existing State infrastructure to enhance stability and disaster recovery.	- The technical impact doesn't appear to present additional IT burden while providing significant benefits. - No definitive explanation of the proposed infrastructure. Technical elements are too vague.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The application developers are part of the implementation team and can, ostensibly, provide unique insight into any issues which may develop in the installation, conversion and implementation process. - Appears to be an experienced team.	- A major project milestone includes a database migration from Oracle to SQL which impacts the database tier and there is no indication how the application that sits atop the database layer will be impacted by this change. It is well documented in the industry that changing the database layer typically introduces performance issues associated with the interaction between the RDBMS and the application layer. - The proposed implementation plan relies heavily on the OCIO and details, as written, are minimal.
Risk Assessment	- The proposed technology is not overly complex and presents a limited number of risks over and above the current solution.	- Migration of the RDBMS platform is non-trivial when there is a separate application layer involved. Based on the available information in the proposal there is not enough information to conclude the degree of risk created by this, but neither is there any information about what efforts have been made to mitigate the risks. - Proposal does not address inherent risk of exposing State data to the Internet. - Risk of lost data or lost physical records were not addressed in the proposal nor compared to

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		similar risks in the existing system.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- There are very few documented "moving parts" and the costs relative to the expected benefits provides an excellent cost-benefit ratio.	- Costs associated with training and mitigation of issues associated with the RDBMS and data migration are not clearly documented. - Contractual Services "Other" in the amount of $10,000 - purpose not identified; Other Operating Costs "Travel" in the amount of $12,000 - purpose not identified; Ongoing infrastructure support costs not identified. - Travel cost is assumed to be training related; however detail would have been helpful.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
18-01	Department of Agriculture	Paperless Inspections

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The department's biennium request contains an expanded budget request that includes a one time biennium cost to convert inspection activities to a paperless document flow between the office and sixty plus inspection staff home officed throughout the State. This will allow the department to perform electronic inspections, provide the opportunity for a single employee productivity/time entry system, better communications with field staff, including field staff access to central data base data, and give all employees access to the State's LINK system to comply with Administrative Services (AS) new business process. Edoucment Resources conducted a Return On Investment (ROI) study for this project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$76,500			38,250	38,250	
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$76,500	$0	$0	$38,250	$38,250	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$160,000			80,000	80,000	
Software	$180,000			90,000	90,000	
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$340,000	$0	$0	$170,000	$170,000	$0
Total Request	$416,500	$0	$0	$208,250	$208,250	$0

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$216,500			108,250	108,250	
Cash Fund	$200,000			100,000	100,000	
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$416,500	$0	$0	$208,250	$208,250	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	15	15	15	15
Project Justification / Business Case	19	23	20	21	25
Technical Impact	18	20	15	18	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	10	4	6	10
Risk Assessment	3	8	4	5	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	18	15	14	20
			TOTAL	79	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are well-stated and worthy. - Goals are well defined and project focuses on automation in an area that has been manual/paper for years. - Definitely a project of much merit. Any weaknesses noted are for the purpose of clarifying and/or providing critical description and additional information for this project.	- This appears to be a major change in how work is performed. More attention needs to be placed in developing a buy-in and training plan/program for employees and public. What impact is there on the public…are they used to a paper based product and how will they (or how easily) accept electronic inspections. Suggest attention on above to develop approaches for gaining acceptance.
Project Justification / Business Case	- ROI analysis shows tangible benefits. - Impressive ROI.	- The entire proposal is dependent on the ROI document. - Would like to have seen more explanation in this area, but more information does exist throughout the proposal. - What happens if a project of this type does not happen? Are there operations, etc. that will be negatively impacted because of the human resources used for paper handling processes, etc?
Technical Impact	- Score based on technical plan being based on OCIO expertise and recommendations. - Definitely an approach whose time has come. Great possibilities. Technically feasible.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- OCIO's management of technical implementation. - Would suggest using a detailed Project Management approach in implementing to make sure everyone is in sync.	- Lack of advance planning by Dept. of Agriculture for implementation, project scope and timelines, and training.
Risk Assessment	- The project, while not noted under the risk area, will eliminate a lot of manual processes, there by reducing the risk of entry and transposing errors during the collection of information.	-No analysis of risk concerning change management and responsibilities within the Department. - Not sure all of the risk was evaluated for the project, would like to have seen more detail rather than just pointing to the ROI as the answer to the risk of not doing the project. - Not a lot of attention paid to identifying risk factors which are critical for a project of this scope.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Overall, a great idea….just needs some more attention to planning in identified areas.	- IT detail budget does not match ROI analysis. Budget narrative anticipates federal funds for 1/3 of the project, but this is not indicated in IT detail budget. Narrative also indicates these are broad estimates that could change once actual plans are developed. - What is potential use of human resource and financial savings which appear to be significant if this project is implemented.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
22-01	Department of Insurance	Nebraska Exchange

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

Nebraska Department of Insurance is the state agency designated to administer the Nebraska Health Insurance Exchange. The Exchange is responsible for complying with the mandates required within the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), including the implementation of a Health Insurance Exchange to facilitate access to affordable health insurance coverage for citizens of the State of Nebraska.

The federal vision for the Exchange is to reduce the number of uninsured individuals, provide a transparent marketplace, conduct consumer education, and assist individuals in gaining access to insurance affordability programs, premium assistance tax credits, and cost-sharing reductions.

The State of Nebraska, Department of Insurance (NDOI) is issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP), for the purpose of selecting a qualified contractor to provide services, technical solutions, and operational support for the State of Nebraska Health Insurance Exchange to be administered NDOI.

Nebraska has completed the preliminary design phase of establishing a State-based Exchange and has a vision to develop a web-based solution that can be accessed by external customers and stakeholders on a 24 hour/7 days a week basis. Stakeholders include individual applicants/enrollees, employers, brokers, navigators, and issuers. Nebraska's Exchange system will provide a single point of access to multiple doorways based on an individual's eligibility. Nebraska has determined that the optimal strategy is one that allows the two organizations (e.g., Medicaid and Exchange) to develop and deploy their systems as independently as possible while ensuring proper data integration and consistency of user experience. Under this model, the Exchange IT systems are deployed independently from Medicaid's eligibility and enrollment and web portal systems. Further details will follow in this request.

NDOI is seeking proposals from qualified bidders to design, develop and implement a Health Insurance Exchange system which combines the Individual Exchange and the Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP) Exchange into one Exchange. The Exchange will facilitate access to affordable health insurance coverage for all Nebraska citizens in compliance with the mandates required within the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA).

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$12,000,000		6,000,000	5,000,000	1,000,000	
Programming	$85,000,000		40,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	
Project Management	$7,719,137	719,137	3,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000	
Data Conversion	$6,000,000		3,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	
Other	$20,000,000		8,500,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	
Total	$130,719,137	$719,137	$60,500,000	$46,000,000	$23,500,000	$0

Telecommunications

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Data	$6,000,000		3,000,000	2,500,000	500,000	
Video	$0					
Voice	$3,000,000		1,500,000	1,200,000	300,000	
Wireless	$0					
Total	$9,000,000	$0	$4,500,000	$3,700,000	$800,000	$0

Training

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Technical Staff	$2,500,000		1,250,000	1,000,000	250,000	
End-user Staff	$2,500,000		1,250,000	1,000,000	250,000	
Total	$5,000,000	$0	$2,500,000	$2,000,000	$500,000	$0

Other Operating Costs

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$1,398,720	126,830		635,945	635,945	
Supplies & Materials	$263,742	23,742		200,000	40,000	
Travel	$57,451	17,451		25,000	15,000	
Other	$0					
Total	$1,719,913	$168,023	$0	$860,945	$690,945	$0

Capital Expenditures

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$91,250,000		20,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	56,250,000
Software	$54,062,500		22,000,000	13,000,000	5,000,000	14,062,500
Network	$20,875,000		5,000,000	2,500,000	1,000,000	12,375,000
Other	$19,500,000		8,500,000	6,000,000	5,000,000	
Total	$185,687,500	$0	$55,500,000	$31,500,000	$16,000,000	$82,687,500
Total Request	$332,126,550	$887,160	$123,000,000	$84,060,945	$41,490,945	$82,687,500

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$82,687,500					82,687,500
Federal Fund	$249,439,050	887,160	123,000,000	84,060,945	41,490,945	
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$332,126,550	$887,160	$123,000,000	$84,060,945	$41,490,945	$82,687,500

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	12	13	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	25	25	23	25
Technical Impact	0	15	15	10	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	0	7	7	5	10
Risk Assessment	0	5	6	4	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	5	16	17	13	20
			TOTAL	67	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals make sense, yet there are still a number of unknowns that will not be answered until the RFP is issued and responses received. - Well written plan and RFP - Appropriate goals and outcomes. Beneficiaries were described elsewhere in supporting documentation.	- Until the responses from the RFP are received it will be difficult to really get a good sense that the project is doable at a cost that's reasonable. - Project requires multiple interfaces with other state and federal systems and assumes that all partners are working from the same priorities.
Project Justification / Business Case	- The justification for the health insurance exchange is rather clear and easy to understand. - Federal Mandate - This project is mandated.	- The Devil is in the details, and until the responses to the RFP are received it will be difficult to render an opinion of the probable success of this project.
Technical Impact	- Vendor built solution asking for most current and flexible technology. - The Concept of Operations document appended provided a good description of the relationship to current systems and the technical elements of the project.	- There really is no information from which to make a judgment. - RFP defines system requirements for exchange, but cannot address the technical impact on existing State of Nebraska systems until vendor solution is offered.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- There is no hard information from which to judge the appropriateness of the implementation plan and whether or not it will be successful. Once bids are received and information is provided we can make a better judgment of this part of the analysis. - Plan is driven by Federal Mandate without consideration for the scope and complexity of the project. - A lot is unknown at this time, but more information could have been provided on some items like the anticipated project team.
Risk Assessment	- Risks are identified. - Risks are well identified and significant. The mitigation strategies listed are appropriate. However, the risks to this project are still considerable.	- From reading the proposal there are indeed some very serious risks with time, potential cost overruns, as well as appropriate technology from which to build the exchange. I think this project unless carefully monitored may have some serious issues with meeting its schedule. - Options available for mitigating risk are weak. - This is a huge project with a short deadline. I would not underestimate the risk of a shortage of qualified vendor resources. This has been an issue in the health information exchange environment. The risks discussed in this section focused on developing the system. Once the system is up, there will be additional risks. Security breaches will be a significant risk.
Financial Analysis and Budget		- While they do have information relative to price I do have an uneasy feeling that until the bids are received and more definitive information is

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		provided, relative to cost, this is a very troubling area and should be of major concern. - Impact on other State systems is not clear and budget for those systems is not known.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
23-01	Department of Labor	Electronic Content Management for UI Programs

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Department of Labor has invested in and implemented Electronic Content Management (ECM) for UI (Benefits and Appeals) and Employment & Training (WOTC and WIA/Wagner-Peyser) programs. This project is a continuation of NDOL's commitment to the enterprise ECM solution. It will extend ECM functionality into other UI program areas to provide a seamless workflow and document management tools for the UI program.

This project is funded by federal UI Automation funds, made available by USDOL. Funds must be obligated by September 30, 2013 and liquidated by December 31, 2013.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$100,000			100,000		
Programming	$200,000			200,000		
Project Management	$100,000			100,000		
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$8,000			8,000		
Total	$408,000	$0	$0	$408,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$408,000	$0	$0	$408,000	$0	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$408,000			408,000		
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$408,000	$0	$0	$408,000	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	12	10	11	15
Project Justification / Business Case	18	19	15	17	25
Technical Impact	18	20	16	18	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	8	8	8	10
Risk Assessment	7	8	8	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	20	10	16	20
			TOTAL	77	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The continuation of utilizing the ECM is a good goal - The intended result is definitely positive in moving towards a digital environment.	- Limited explanation of benefits. - The goals, objectives, and outcomes were very general and the statement of "will develop business requirements and project plans, leads the reviewer to believe, this project has not been completely thought out… - Is this a project that will image existing paper and convert to a digital form? Is there an electronic process in place now that eliminates paper generation for this work process in the future or will this be an ongoing process of paper to digital? Is there an impact to the public?
Project Justification / Business Case		- Lack of details in proposal. - No doubt ECM will improve operations, but the justification appears to state what has been done and how that could relate to this project, but not really justifying this project. Could be that without a detailed project plan, it is difficult to provide more than we know the ECM can provide this as a product. - The narrative appears to spend more time on the positives of an ECM system as opposed to the justification for this particular project. Suggest narrative that addresses this project in more detail and what the benefits are and for whom.
Technical Impact		
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- Generalized plan offered in proposal. Left to assume details are available in Statement of Work. - An overall project plan and timeline has been developed, but not referenced or even summarized for the proposal.
Risk Assessment		- General statements; giving allowance for planning stage of project.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Project is supported solely by federal funds which need to be encumbered. Assume the project will proceed as presented regardless of its reviews and scores. - My question is, if this project is already funded by Federal funds assuming time frames are met, how are those Federal funds impacted should this project get funded through the state process?	- What is the ROI on this project? What types of savings will be generated and approximately how much?

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
23-02	Department of Labor	State Information Data Exchange System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

In 2005 the Information Technology Support Center (ITSC) of the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA) undertook a project to evaluate, develop, and implement the State Information Data Exchange System (SIDES). SIDES utilizes a standardized format and specifications for a web service-based electronic exchange of separation information with multi-state employers/TPAs.

This project is federally mandated and supports state and federal initiatives for the integrity of the UI program and the prevention, detection, and recovery of improper UI benefit payments.

This project is funded by Supplemental Budget Request funds made available by USDOL. Funds must be obligated by September 30, 2013 and liquidated by December 31, 2013.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$207,300			207,300		
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$30,000			30,000		
Total	$237,300	$0	$0	$237,300	$0	$0
Training						
Technical Staff	$0					
End-user Staff	$3,000			3,000		
Total	$3,000	$0	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$50,000			50,000		
Total	$50,000	$0	$0	$50,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$290,300	$0	$0	$290,300	$0	$0

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$0					
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$290,300			290,300		
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$290,300	$0	$0	$290,300	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	12	14	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	25	24	25	25
Technical Impact	10	18	17	15	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	8	8	7	10
Risk Assessment	7	8	8	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	12	18	17	16	20
			TOTAL	83	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals are clear within a narrowly defined context that is less a matter of the proposed technology and more a matter of compliance. - Detailed, well-defined objectives. - Good high-level description of the project. Very clear and well organized.	- There is insufficient background, including a glossary of acronyms, to completely consider the alignment of the project goals with the proposed technology. - Not a serious weakness and common in government projects, but the benefits are articulated but not necessarily quantified.
Project Justification / Business Case	- The benefits are clearly articulated, compliance is expected and there are federal funds to offset costs to the state. - Project justification benefits well-defined. - Once again - well written section with the tangible benefits articulated.	- While the operational benefits are clearly articulated, the system implementation is not documented. - Small negative on not having the benefits quantified.
Technical Impact	- The proposed technology is, ostensibly, secure, scalable and extensible. - Good explanation of replacing a paper based process with an automated system.	- The operational benefits are clear, however, the technical impact cannot be evaluated when little more than a functional outline is presented. - No clear infrastructure explanation. - A little light on technical specifics, but most likely because the project is not to that point.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- A brief statement is provided for each of the rubric requirements. - Section covered sufficiently.	- What is proffered in the proposal constitutes little more than a list of generic project management elements and an indication that a SOW will be developed. Along with the remainder of the information, that does not, in the opinion of the reviewer, constitute a preliminary implementation plan. - No project life-cycle milestones stated.
Risk Assessment	- There is an articulation of success factors and the conditions associated with risk. - Detailed description of risk well-defined, honest and not downplayed. - Acceptable general response.	- The project would appear to be early enough in the planning stages that the responses lack any specificity. - Identified risks were described as being able to be "mitigated".
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Numbers seem reasonable but hard to know for sure without more detail.	- There is very little budget dedicated to training which may, or may not, constitute an issue and over 17% of the budget is categorized as "other operating costs" with no explanation of "other." - Contractual Services "Other" in the amount of $30,000 - purpose not identified; Other Operating Costs "Other" in the amount of $50,000 - purpose not identified; Not clear on whether there are to be any Infrastructure costs (see Technical Impact comments)

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-01	DHHS	ACA IT Implementation

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA, or as referred to in this document (ACA), signed into law 3/23/10, includes numerous provisions with significant information systems impacts. It expands healthcare to the uninsured through a combination of cost controls, subsidies and mandates. Key provisions include minimum benefits required of health plans, creation of health care exchanges, expansion of coverage to uninsured, elimination of pre-existing condition exclusions, continued coverage for adult, unmarried children to the age of 26, and many other changes affecting insurers, employers, providers and beneficiaries.

Activity related to this project has been sub-divided into 6 overall groupings (Medicaid Eligibility, Expanding Medicaid Benefits, Medicaid Financing, Program Integrity, American Indian Related Provisions, and Other Provisions) which contain a total of 41 activities of various sizes and scopes. Some of the activities have been completed, some are in progress, some are in planning, and some have yet to start. With the recent Supreme Court decision related to Medicaid Expansion, it is possible some of the work related to Medicaid Eligibility could be impacted.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$53,000,000			20,500,000	32,500,000	
Total	$53,000,000	$0	$0	$20,500,000	$32,500,000	$0

Other Operating Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$12,594,033	1,663,472	6,000,000	2,725,224	2,205,337	
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$12,594,033	$1,663,472	$6,000,000	$2,725,224	$2,205,337	$0

Capital Expenditures	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$6,000,000			6,000,000		
Software	$6,000,000			6,000,000		
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$12,000,000	$0	$0	$12,000,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$77,594,033	$1,663,472	$6,000,000	$35,225,224	$34,705,337	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$7,759,403	166,347	600,000	3,522,522	3,470,534	
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$69,834,630	1,497,125	5,400,000	31,702,702	31,234,803	
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$77,594,033	$1,663,472	$6,000,000	$35,225,224	$34,705,337	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	19	11	11	14	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	19	25	23	25
Technical Impact	0	15	15	10	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	7	6	10
Risk Assessment	5	7	7	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	15	15	13	20
			TOTAL	73	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are well stated - Projects proposed appear to be in initial planning stage, little detail is available	- Planning stages - Proposal states there are 41 activities included in proposal. Proposal accurately states that complete listing of goals, objectives and outcomes of all would be excessive, a listing of the 41 included activities would be helpful
Project Justification / Business Case	- Project justification is a federal mandate that was signed into law on 03/23/10 - Appears to be a clear mandate	
Technical Impact	- Projects in initial planning stage	- At this stage there are too many unknowns to provide a technical assessment and as indicated in the proposal the hardware, the network and the applications will all have an impact on the success of this project.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The agency understands the need for a well-thought-out implementation plan. - Projects proposed appear to be in initial planning stage, little detail is available	- The project is still rather vague at this point and so there are not very many details on how the implementation will be carried out. - Some of the 41 activities appear to have commenced. More detail on plans for those would be helpful
Risk Assessment	- Agency understands the need for a good risk assessment. - Recognition of scope and resource contention risks seems accurate. Segmentation seems an appropriate mitigation strategy.	- Scope of this project is still unknown are unclear, causing the potential of risk to both budgets and schedules. - Some of the 41 activities appear to have commenced. More detail on risk for those would be helpful
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Projects proposed appear to be in initial planning stage, little detail is available	- Cannot really determine if the funding being requested is adequate given the lack of specifics in the project plan. The agency knows they have to do this but how it will be done is still quite vague.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-02	DHHS	ICD-10

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

In January 2009, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services released a Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Administrative Simplification Final Rule for adoption of the Tenth Revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10). ICD-10 is a coding system used to classify diagnoses and hospital procedures. As a HIPAA covered entity, Nebraska DHHS is required to comply with the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services mandate to utilize ICD-10 for medical coding effective October 1, 2014. ICD-9 codes sets used today to designate medical diagnoses and inpatient procedures will be replaced with ICD-10 code sets.

The primary impact of the ICD-10 mandate for Nebraska DHHS is anticipated to fall within the scope of the Medicaid & Long-Term Care (MLTC) division, its business processes and systems, including the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS). Significant changes to business processes, the MMIS and other smaller systems are anticipated in order to comply with the mandate.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$18,970,777	970,777	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	
Total	$18,970,777	$970,777	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$0

Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$72,641	72,641				
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$3,578	3,578				
Other	$35	35				
Total	$76,254	$76,254	$0	$0	$0	$0

Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$16,073	16,073				
Software	$964	964				
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$17,037	$17,037	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Request	$19,064,068	$1,064,068	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$1,906,407	106,407	600,000	600,000	600,000	
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$17,157,661	957,661	5,400,000	5,400,000	5,400,000	
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$19,064,068	$1,064,068	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	8	15	14	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	15	25	25	22	25
Technical Impact	10	12	16	13	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	9	7	10
Risk Assessment	5	6	8	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	4	15	17	12	20
			TOTAL	72	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives seem complete with added detail from the strategy matrix. - Goals adequately detailed as compliance and continued service.	- Measurement statement does not include a lot of detail yet. Overall strategy for MMIS yet to be determined which will have major effects on the outcome.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Compliance requirements are clear. - Justification is clearly compliance.	- Research in to alternative options has not been completed. Not sure how costs have been developed when solution direction is not set. Assume project is still in initial planning stage.
Technical Impact	- Technical solution is not complete as the plan appears to be in the initial planning stages. However, given the impact and stage of the project, the description is adequate.	- Technical impact has not been completed yet and is waiting for assessments that are underway. Not really any valid answers in this section. Further review may be necessary after more information is provided. Project appears to be in the initial planning stages, but budget indicates $1,000,000 expended.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Sponsor and project management needs are identified - Planning appears to reflect the assembly of the appropriate talent. While the plan is not complete; due to the stage of planning, the description is adequate.	- Very little detail in the plan for how it will be implemented. Again, detail is waiting for the assessment to take place. Hard to review the validity of the plan without information. Project may still be in initial planning stage.
Risk Assessment	- Internal resource risk identified. - The proposal as written has gaps regarding the planned changes that accompany enhanced metadata. However, the gaps in this planning document are largely offset by the risk associated with doing nothing. Thus, the risk assessment appears reasonable as presented.	- Again, no real detail, expanded risks not identified because real solution is not identified. Identifies knowledge of MMIS as an advantage, but yet to be decided whether MMIS will be used. Project still in the initial planning stage.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Funding is not a detailed as expected; however, given the planning stage and related risks, funding is deemed adequate.	- Budget request seems to be very basic with most future amounts listed as "other" and not based on any firm planning. Financial detail (and plan detail) seems very weak considering it indicates over $1,000,000 has already been spent on the project. Not comfortable with the total ranking being this high considering the how early it is in this project. Not enough detail anywhere to explain $19,000,000 in spending. However, compliance mandate makes this project a requirement.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-03	DHHS	SMHP (State Medicaid Hit Plan)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Nebraska Medicaid EHR Incentive Payment, program funded under the HITECH provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), provides incentive payments (100% federal funds) for providers and hospitals who acquire and become Meaningful Users of certified EHR technology. Eligibility depends upon a number of factors, including percentage of Medicaid recipients treated. Nebraska's program implemented May, 2012, with federal authority to operate through 2021. Program administration requires compliance with evolving federal rules around eligibility and Meaningful Use.

Administration of the EHR Incentive Payment program is funded with a 90/10 federal/state match. Program activities, carried out within the Division of Medicaid & Long-Term Care, DHHS, include: receiving provider and hospital enrollment documents; establishing eligibility; determining payment amount; making payments; issuing denials where appropriate; participating in a an appeal process when needed; planning for and conducting audits of participants; electronically exchanging registration, eligibility, payment and reporting information with the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS); updating program materials, funding requests, and guidance as directed.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$190,000			95,000	95,000	
Total	$190,000	$0	$0	$95,000	$95,000	$0

Training	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Technical Staff	$31,000			25,000	6,000	
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$31,000	$0	$0	$25,000	$6,000	$0

Other Operating Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$3,177,598	1,627,598	850,000	500,000	200,000	
Supplies & Materials	$67,200			33,600	33,600	
Travel	$14,800			7,500	7,300	
Other	$24,000			12,000	12,000	
Total	$3,283,598	$1,627,598	$850,000	$553,100	$252,900	$0

Capital Expenditures	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$0					
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$1,405,000			1,105,000	300,000	
Total	$1,405,000	$0	$0	$1,105,000	$300,000	$0
Total Request	$4,909,598	$1,627,598	$850,000	$1,778,100	$653,900	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$490,960	162,760	85,000	177,810	65,390	
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$4,418,638	1,464,838	765,000	1,600,290	588,510	
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$4,909,598	$1,627,598	$850,000	$1,778,100	$653,900	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	7	9	9	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	13	15	16	25
Technical Impact	15	5	10	10	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	2	3	5	3	10
Risk Assessment	8	6	5	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	16	0	10	9	20
			TOTAL	53	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Clear goals and objectives along with clear benefits for those receiving care. Clear alignment of project planning with the comprehensive federal initiative. - Goals are broad and include one short term/ immediate goal to providers and long term goals related to patient care and measures are in place related to project outcome. - Description of the needs and the federal program seem adequate.	- Evaluation plan is not aligned with the stated goals of improved access and sharing of information, improved care coordination, improved patient care, and reduced healthcare costs. - Does not clearly define details of implementation or how it will address eligible/ ineligible provider technology transitions. Would prefer concise and clearly measurable goals and no objectives were included. - I'm unclear with what I am really reviewing. Is this a review of the "federal program to provide funding to hospitals" or is it a review of the "State Medicaid Health Information Technology Plan", or is it a project to decide how to distribute the funds?
Project Justification / Business Case	- The benefits are tangible and clear and the decision to move forward is consistent with all other states. - Short and identifies some tangible and intangible concepts such as using all available dollars in Nebraska. - The results of this application are discussed and seem to be valid.	- The actual technology solution that may be implemented to "manage the increasing complexity of the latter years of the program" is, ostensibly, unknown at this point. - Limited details and vague about how this could be accomplished. Seems to be more of a philosophical statement. Not sure if the current IT in-house solution is sufficient to manage the project without more description. - It appears that considerable dollars have been expended to build the current manual enrollment, but details are weak on the future outsourced or developed solution. Information indicates all states are participating in this program, but no discussion on whether alternatives of working with other states was a possible solution.
Technical Impact	- Identifies two phases. - Current enhancement plan does not require changes to current technology.	- There is no specified technology beyond the expected need for a system to manage the increasing complexity associated with reporting requirements. It is not possible to determine the technical impact when there is no specified technology. - This piece does not appear complete in any stage. First phase seems to be focused on manual processes. No other solution identified. - Planning a study to determine where this project should go in the future, so very little detail on what is needed and where it is going.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Lead change agents identified. - Sponsors are identified and seem reasonable.	- With the exception of listing the executive sponsors, there is no other information to consider. - No plan identified. - Most of the real detail of the project still needs to

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		be developed. Not much to evaluate at this point.
Risk Assessment	- Risk associated with the sufficiency of human capital are articulated and there is a framework in place to assuage issues associated with resource contention - Recognition of possible barriers. - Personnel availability risks have been identified	- It is difficult to assess risk with such a scant narrative. - In previous sections identification of using internal resources "in-house" expertise. This section refers to acquiring outside resources. Unclear what the plan or commitment to this project is. - Other risks seem likely.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Most budget considerations appear to have been documented and the state match of 10% means any substantive benefits are obtained at very low cost to the state.	- There is practically nothing in the narrative that allows the reviewer to "connect the dots" relative to the proposed budget. - Future plan is not complete. Financial information is estimated and based on factors unknown or not documented.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-04	DHHS	MMIS Replacement Study

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Nebraska legacy Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) was certified by The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) in 1978 and has been in operation for over 30 years. The legacy MMIS was designed primarily to process Medicaid claims, which it does with reasonable efficiency for the fee-for-service (FFS) sector of Medicaid operations. However, over the past 33 years, the business of Medicaid has changed significantly. Many new Medicaid business functions have been added, expanding services beyond the typical FFS to include waiver services, capitated managed care, accountable case services, and varying benefit categories.

The legacy MMIS does not have the flexibility to take advantage of current technology to reduce manual processing, improve data integrity, support data analysis, and increase quality. The MMIS file structure is too limited to allow CMS mandates to be fully implemented without extensive, costly modifications. Lack of compliance with these mandated initiatives places Nebraska at risk of a reduced Federal Financial Participation (FFP).

The Department contracted with Public Consulting Group (PCG) through request for proposal 3226Z1 to conduct an MMIS Replacement Study. The contract deliverables include a Nebraska Medicaid Systems Replacement Plan and Nebraska Medicaid Systems Procurement Package. In completing the Replacement Plan, PCG will conduct an Alternative Analysis to compare the legacy MMIS capabilities, as well as maintenance and operations costs to the Medicaid Enterprise System marketplace. The analysis will consider various options and cost benefits to assist DHHS in selecting the best strategy regarding the legacy MMIS. The options considered range from continuing to operate the legacy MMIS with no enhancement to a full replacement of the MMIS using a vendor solution. This analysis is due to be completed in October 2012.

The Procurement Package deliverable will be based on the option selected from the Alternatives Analysis. If the decision is made to replace the legacy MMIS, PCG is tasked with drafting business requirements and developing a request for proposal (RFP). The RFP details the scope of work and contractual requirements for the vendor bidding process.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$3,864,120	1,761,470	1,300,000	802,650		
Total	$3,864,120	$1,761,470	$1,300,000	$802,650	$0	$0
Total Request	$3,864,120	$1,761,470	$1,300,000	$802,650	$0	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$386,412	176,147	130,000	80,265		
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$3,477,708	1,585,323	1,170,000	722,385		
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$3,864,120	$1,761,470	$1,300,000	$802,650	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	15	14	14	15
Project Justification / Business Case	24	25	23	24	25
Technical Impact	0	15	20	12	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	1	6	8	5	10
Risk Assessment	0	6	8	5	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	13	18	15	20
			TOTAL	75	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals appear to be well stated. - Goals are defined. - Study underway - goals pretty well defined	
Project Justification / Business Case	- The rationale and justification all appears to be very sound. Replacing their current system that is hard to maintain and not meeting all of their requirements makes perfect sense. - Study a pre-cursor to strategic direction decision for replacement.	
Technical Impact	- This is not a technical project, it evaluates and defines business requirements. - For a study - no impact	- Given the unknowns in this area is impossible to render a score at this time.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Not really applicable since it's funding for a study for formulating direction and RFP.	- While understanding an implementation plan will be developed as part of this project coupled with the fact that the agency identified a project sponsor, there is still little to no detail from which to render a meaningful score. - Project is not complete until RFP is developed.
Risk Assessment	- Project is in the planning stages	- While the agency recognizes that there will be risk, one cannot render a score as the agency admits that risk will be determined by the approach selected. - Is one of the risks that Replacement plan may not cover all aspects/considerations?
Financial Analysis and Budget	- I believe the cost estimate is generally appropriate assuming this is a consultancy arrangement - To complete study - costs should be accurate.	

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-05	DHHS	MMIS Replacement

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Nebraska legacy Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) was certified by The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) in 1978 and has been in operation for over 30 years. The legacy MMIS was designed primarily to process Medicaid claims, which it does with reasonable efficiency for the fee-for-service (FFS) sector of Medicaid operations. However, over the past 33 years, the business of Medicaid has changed significantly. Many new Medicaid business functions have been added expanding services beyond the typical FFS to include waiver services, capitated managed care, accountable case services, and varying benefit categories.

The legacy MMIS does not have the flexibility to take advantage of current technology to reduce manual processing, improve data integrity, support data analysis, and increase quality. Transactions are being processed using several disparate software applications because the MMIS cannot support the electronic data exchange of the various records. The manipulation and transformation of incoming data from a standardized format to a legacy MMIS-acceptable format results in the loss of data for processing and reporting.

CMS has mandated the implementation of several initiatives such as ICD-10, HIPAA, NPI, 5010 and most recently the CMS 7 Standards and Conditions. These implementations have been challenging in a system with restrictive record layouts and hard-coded logic. The legacy MMIS technical staff often has had to design stop-gap type logic to be able to accept new standardized transactions. The MMIS file structure is too limited to allow for these mandates to be fully implemented without extensive, costly modifications. Lack of compliance with these mandated initiatives place Nebraska at risk of a reduced Federal Financial Participation (FFP).

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$39,142,288			9,785,572	9,785,572	19,571,144
Programming	$39,142,288			9,785,572	9,785,572	19,571,144
Project Management	$10,735,560			2,683,890	2,683,890	5,367,780
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$89,020,136	$0	$0	$22,255,034	$22,255,034	$44,510,068
Training						
Technical Staff	$3,924,988			981,247	981,247	1,962,494
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$3,924,988	$0	$0	$981,247	$981,247	$1,962,494
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$11,045,580			2,761,395	2,761,395	5,522,790
Other	$0					
Total	$11,045,580	$0	$0	$2,761,395	$2,761,395	$5,522,790
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$978,464			244,616	244,616	489,232
Software	$6,098,392			1,504,958	1,504,958	3,088,476
Network	$1,500,000			375,000	375,000	750,000
Other	$1,111,000			277,750	277,750	555,500
Total	$9,687,856	$0	$0	$2,402,324	$2,402,324	$4,883,208
Total Request	$113,678,560	$0	$0	$28,400,000	$28,400,000	$56,878,560

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$4,360,000					4,360,000
Cash Fund	$7,000,000			2,840,000	2,840,000	1,320,000
Federal Fund	$102,318,560			25,560,000	25,560,000	51,198,560
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$113,678,560	$0	$0	$28,400,000	$28,400,000	$56,878,560

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	15	13	14	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	19	22	22	25
Technical Impact	0	13	15	9	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	0	6	7	4	10
Risk Assessment	0	5	7	4	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	0	12	15	9	20
			TOTAL	63	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals are very clear and very well laid out. Obviously anything that can be done to eliminate manual operations, improve efficiency and satisfaction are goals that should be aggressively addressed. - Multiple benefits listed	
Project Justification / Business Case	- The project justification is well stated benefits have been identified in a course of action has been chosen.	- We won't know until October 2012 the outcome of the analysis. - Would include more verbiage to strengthen concept that mandates are driving change in systems.
Technical Impact		- Unable to make any determination as to the technical impact of what the MMIS solution might be. - Project is in planning stages, technology is not known.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- While I'm sure there will be a well-developed implementation plan at some point I am unable to provide any meaningful rating at this time , given the lack of any specific information
Risk Assessment		- Again given that no solution has been identified yet it is again impossible to provide a risk value to this project. The project will require some amount of skilled resources; however those skilled requirements are yet to be understood given that a solution has not been clearly identified. - Requires new technology and business processes that do not exist today.
Financial Analysis and Budget		- Estimates where provided of what this potential MMIS replacement plan might cost, upwards of 100+ million dollars. However it is impossible to know how accurate those estimates are given that we've not received the results of the analysis or what direction the project will ultimately take in its design and use of technology. - Without completing RFP process costs are estimates based on other states solutions. - New project - total cost estimate likely subject to variability with decision & negotiation.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-06	DHHS	Medicaid Managed Care Expansion

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Medicaid & Long-Term Care (MLTC) division has undertaken a multi-phase project to expand utilization of managed care for delivery of Medicaid services to Nebraska recipients. Expansion requires significant enhancements to the Nebraska MMIS to support integration of new Managed Care Organizations (MCOs), recipient plan assignment functionality, recipient notification/enrollment/disenrollment/reenrollment activities, revised capitation payment functionality, revised encounter data editing/management and expanded management reporting.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$5,349,903	377,831	1,746,472	2,150,400	1,075,200	
Total	$5,349,903	$377,831	$1,746,472	$2,150,400	$1,075,200	$0

Other Operating Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$47,297	47,297				
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$47,297	$47,297	$0	$0	$0	$0

Capital Expenditures	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$0					
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Request	$5,397,200	$425,128	$1,746,472	$2,150,400	$1,075,200	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$1,349,300	106,282	436,618	537,600	268,800	
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$4,047,900	318,846	1,309,854	1,612,800	806,400	
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$5,397,200	$425,128	$1,746,472	$2,150,400	$1,075,200	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	10	14	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	16	23	21	25
Technical Impact	5	12	20	12	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	7	9	8	10
Risk Assessment	8	7	9	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	15	18	14	20
			TOTAL	**77**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are well stated - Clear goals and rationale	- It appears, from part three of the goals portion of the proposal, that this project will rely very heavily on those MMIS enhancements that will be developed sometime in the future. - Continues to modify old system increasing complexity and risk.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Project justifications are well stated. - Benefits tough to quantify but well defined. ROI included.	- Again it appears that the success of this project is somewhat dependent on the MMIS enhancements that have yet to be developed. - Project not part of any mandate, ROI is not defined, other solutions not considered.
Technical Impact	- Leverages existing resources and infrastructure	- Very little detail in the project proposal about the technical elements of the project. While the author states the enhancements required are compatible with both the existing MMIS and state infrastructure, there's no evidence to support that statement, at least in the project form. - Does not address the technical impact to system, describes the business side not technical impact.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- Not knowing the technical approach and design it is somewhat difficult to give a higher score. That said I have no doubt that the department will in fact have a sound implementation plan given their past history. - Lacks requirements needed to estimate implementation details, currently in the planning stages
Risk Assessment	- The department has identified the fact that there could be significant risks in a number of areas, be it development staff capacity and/or the ability to get significant staff augmentation. - Pretty clear on risks	- The proposal does not indicate, in any detail, what strategies have been developed to minimize the risks, at least not at this juncture. - Other options not considered, modifies existing system.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Funding plan looks very reasonable.	- For a $5.3 million project the information in the financial portion of the project proposal seems to be rather vague given that the bulk of the money is in a category known as "Other". I can't determine what the rational is for $47K of personnel cost, is it a programmer or staff person? - Requirements not defined, it could take longer and cost more.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
25-07	DHHS	Behavioral Health Data System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The Division of Behavioral Health (DBH) faces substantial obstacles in collecting, organizing and accessing data, from behavioral health regions and providers. The data is necessary for DBH to efficiently, accurately and completely fulfill its obligations for reporting, monitoring and managing care in the Nebraska Behavioral Health System. Data is held in multiple different forms, systems and data bases, causing data aggregation to be an ever increasing difficulty for DBH and necessitating multiple verification processes that result in delays discharging its responsibilities.

Personnel at DBH and in the behavioral health regions spend many hours combing data from paper reports, spreadsheets and disparate databases and lack quick, reliable access to information. In addition to its planned reporting, a wide variety of requirements and report breakdowns for various funders and stakeholders are often requested on an ad-hoc basis.

A new centralized data system (CDS) is necessary to overcome these immediate challenges in data access and reporting compliance while also providing DBH, behavioral health regions and providers with data necessary to improve the NE public behavioral health system, especially in an environment of health information exchange and performance monitoring.

The NE DHHS Division of Behavioral Health (DBH) Centralized Data System (CDS) will track outcomes of managed care, measure performance of managed care (in real time), measure funding for managed care, provide for greater fiscal accountability for managed care, meet reporting needs of DBH to Federal and State entities, unify existing databases and technology, fill data gaps for improved management of care and utilize health information exchange efficiencies by interfacing with the State Health Information Exchange (HIE). An example of improvement: data driven, evidence-based, incentives to providers for improved performance.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2014 (Year 1)	Request for FY2015 (Year 2)	Request for FY2016 (Year 3)	Request for FY2017 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs	$ -	$ 485,000.00	$ 485,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 970,000.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design	$ -	$ 102,000.00	$ 102,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 204,000.00
2.2 Programming	$ -	$ 51,000.00	$ 51,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 102,000.00
2.3 Project Management	$ -	$ 180,000.00	$ 180,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 360,000.00
2.4 Other	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
3. Supplies and Materials	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
4. Telecommunications	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
5. Training	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
6. Travel	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
7. Other Operating Costs	$ -	$ 102,000.00	$ 102,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 204,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware	$ -	$ 60,000.00	$ 60,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 120,000.00
8.2 Software	$ -	$ 500,000.00	$ 490,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 990,000.00
8.3 Network	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
8.4 Other	$ -	$ 50,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 1,530,000.00	$ 1,470,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00
General Funds	$ -	$ 1,530,000.00	$ 1,470,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00
Cash Funds	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Federal Funds	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Revolving Funds	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Other Funds	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 1,530,000.00	$ 1,470,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,000,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	13	11	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	22	22	20	21	25
Technical Impact	14	15	8	12	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	8	8	10
Risk Assessment	9	8	8	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	18	15	17	20
			TOTAL	80	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Answers seem thorough and well laid out. - Goals, beneficiaries and outcomes were well-defined. - New requirement and unknowns, but goals pretty clear	
Project Justification / Business Case	- It is apparent that the proposed project will result in cost savings to the agency and provide improved reporting capabilities. Significant investments have been made in eBHIN by the regions and federal agencies. There may be ways to leverage this investment. Information from Heather Wood indicates that there have been discussions within DHHS about this. - New project - Assessment of alternatives very strong	
Technical Impact	- Technical impact planning is taking place now. Although it is too early in the plan to have all of the information, document clearly states some of the thoughts that have been in to this plan.	- Too early in the plan to have the real impact. - Not a lot of detail was provided. The implementation section mentions hardware acquisition. Was a cloud or shared server solution discussed?
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Well documented as to the needs of the project - Significant work has been done in the development of this proposed project including a needs analysis, the development of business requirements, solution discover, and the development of preliminary budget estimates.	- Still waiting on solution for final timeline, but seem well prepared for that effort. - No time frames were included for next steps.
Risk Assessment	- Obviously an experienced writer answering these questions. Well thought out. - Data risks well defined	- Most health information data breaches have been due to the theft or loss of unencrypted devices. This wasn't specifically addressed as a risk. This is probably addressed in the DHHS security policies. - Since this would be a new system would another inherent risk be finding a solution that will meet the requirements and timely?
Financial Analysis and Budget		

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	Unknown	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible?				
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project?				

3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-02	NETC	Radio Transmission Replacement

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The replacement of aging FM translators K227AC (Culbertson 92.7 FM), K224CH (Max 93.3 FM), K208CB (Harrison 89.5 FM), K219CE (Fall City 91.7 FM) and FM Antenna and Feed Lines at KHNE FM (Hastings/Grand Island 89.1 FM) and KXNE FM (Norfolk 89.3 FM). These replacements would be done to reduce rising maintenance costs and to reduce downtime. The NET Radio system is the State Primary and State Relay for the Nebraska Emergency Alert System (EAS).

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$0					
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$75,000			37,500	37,500	
Total	$75,000	$0	$0	$37,500	$37,500	$0

Capital Expenditures	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$160,000			92,500	67,500	
Software	$0					
Network	$90,000			45,000	45,000	
Other	$0					
Total	$250,000	$0	$0	$137,500	$112,500	$0
Total Request	$325,000	$0	$0	$175,000	$150,000	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$325,000			175,000	150,000	
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$325,000	$0	$0	$175,000	$150,000	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	15	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	17	23	20	25
Technical Impact	17	20	19	19	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	9	8	10
Risk Assessment	8	10	9	9	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	18	20	19	20
			TOTAL	87	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are very straightforward and the required service to the citizens well stated. - Project description is concise, stakeholders are identified, and expected outcome is clear in general terms.	- Measurement and assessment is vague, as are benefits expected to be realized. No clear relationship to IT plans is stated, and identifying this work as an IT project is questionable based on the project attributes.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Reliability of this service is important to the citizens so it is imperative that technology is kept current. - Probability of reliability issues and high maintenance costs and the need for equipment replacement seems obvious based on age. Service in support of Emergency Alert System broadcasts implies a mandate.	- In general, no quantitative data is provided regarding benefits of equipment replacement such as numbers of listeners affected, downtime impacts avoided, and operating cost reductions (actual maintenance and operations costs compared to expectations for new equipment.)
Technical Impact	- Clearly part of a continued operations improvement strategy which considers industry standards as well as integration with other operating components. Technical elements are clearly described.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The plan generally addresses all necessary roles for the work to be performed and timeline for completion.	- Responsibilities of project management were vague, and preliminary/planned milestones by site/phase are not provided.
Risk Assessment	- Risks appear limited, and mitigation strategies are sufficiently addressed for this stage of project planning.	- Don't know how much downtime will be incurred during the eight day changing out of equipment.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Budget request appears to be likely reasonable for work required. - Project cost components are defined in sufficient detail to support the proposed total, and component breakdown appears to cover all aspects of the project.	- Does part of this budget include moving to the new shared tower in Harrison. - Identification of specific vendors at the project proposal stage may be premature.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-03	NETC	Enterprise Uninterrupted Power Supply

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

NET is requesting funding to install an Enterprise Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) in the central equipment room at the 1800 N. 33rd, Lincoln NE location. With NET being responsible for streaming content, statewide Emergency Alert System (EAS) and distribution of PBS and NET generated content an enterprise solution is being requested. NET feels this is a more effective approach at providing the necessary failure protection for a media management organization.

The central equipment room consists of over 1700 square feet of environmentally controlled technical space. Traditionally this space has housed the necessary equipment to support the NET core content distribution systems. During the past biennium NET has become more active in creating partnerships with agencies and educational institutions. These relationships are being formed to assist to help support their mission to also distribute content. These partners include the University of Nebraska system, Nebraska Department of Education, NE State Legislature and the NE Supreme and Appellate Courts. This requested UPS solution will add stability to an area that is crucial in supporting Nebraska's mission of transparency in State Government.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$5,000			5,000		
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$5,000	$0	$0	$5,000	$0	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$5,000			5,000		
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$5,000	$0	$0	$5,000	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$80,000			80,000		
Software	$0					
Network	$0					
Other	$10,000			10,000		
Total	$90,000	$0	$0	$90,000	$0	$0
Total Request	$100,000	$0	$0	$100,000	$0	$0

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$100,000			100,000		
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$100,000	$0	$0	$100,000	$0	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	14	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	17	15	23	18	25
Technical Impact	20	17	20	19	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	7	8	8	10
Risk Assessment	6	4	7	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	16	18	18	17	20
			TOTAL	80	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals, beneficiaries and outcomes and ability to measure them were related specifically to current maintenance and expected future maintenance of UPS for NET's IT systems - Clean, limited project proposal	- The proposal has a sentence about a "change in power management" but does not identify what that change was. - I thought the goals and assessment sections were pretty generic. More detail could have been spent on these areas. - Project benefits include improvements in costs and reliability, but no metrics in either category are provided - it will be difficult to determine if these benefits are realized.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Identifies that a second solution was identified as continuing to operate rack by rack. - Identifies advantages from budget standpoint.	- This area of the proposal was a little weak. The explanation states that this will supply "a more effective back up power solution" but never explains how to the reader. It looks like it assumes that whoever reads this will understand what the UPS does and how a enterprise UPS will be more efficient than the current rack based system. - Not very much detail in any explanation. Mention reducing a current budget maintenance situation but how severe is it? - High financial burden of current solution is cited, but no cost data is provided.
Technical Impact	- Impact is tied directly to Section 8-201, Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery and supported by the fact that NET uses similar technology to support PBS. - Could have been a little more descriptive on some things but overall I thought it was well explained. - Fully covers this category	- Although mentioned that the "existing approach requires NET to budget for battery replacement on an annual basis", there are no dollar figures to support the premise of this being less costly to maintain.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Steps identified as preliminary steps and milestones for implementation.	- The project manager needs to be an individual, not a team as stated in the implementation plan. Too easy for a team to "assume" that others will take responsibility. - Timeline for all tasks is the same date. More detailed timeline would be preferable.
Risk Assessment	- Plans to use the State Purchasing to ensure that the project follows the rules.	- No mention of how they plan to mitigate the risks associated with assuring they get a "qualified" contractor that understands data centers. Also there is a risk to the switch from current rack mounted UPS to the enterprise UPS as far as down times, etc. - Based off of the response it makes me believe that this is a nice to have but not a need. What is going to happen if this is not approved? - Does not identify vendor performance as a project risk, however project appears dependent

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		on vendor implementation and ongoing support (and proposal identifies use of state procurement process as a risk mitigation strategy).
Financial Analysis and Budget		- Not sure there is sufficient planning dollars - but assume the agency has gotten preliminary numbers from someone qualified to make this estimate.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-04	NETC	Media Services Technology Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

Nebraskans are expanding their use of online video to access information important to them as citizens and individuals. The rising demand for streaming content also puts pressure on the systems, networks and personnel who manage and provision these services that the public is using. To effectively manage these resources efficiently and expand services, changes are necessary to grow and extend these services. Integration of scheduling systems to a single interface will reduce entering data in multiple databases and potential mistakes that could result from this practice. The provisioning of additional LTO (Linear Tape Open) storage will decrease the cost of maintaining important video archival collections and content. The integration of existing asset management systems to seamlessly address routine video production and distribution tasks by centralizing and repurposing the metadata for capturing, logging, editing, transcoding, archiving and provisioning content rights will optimize the state's investment to manage these resources.

NET has made strides to distribute video content on the web with the launch of a new web site, NetNebraska.org. In addition, the State of Nebraska's Video Conferencing Network will soon be providing live streaming for video conferences and media management services. In order to viably increase and provision the amount of content that will be streamed on the web, to smart phones and personal media devices, NET needs to expand the capacity of their existing platforms and reduce the complexity of managing these systems to leverage this technology more effectively. The results will enable NET to distribute information and content important to Nebraska's civically and culturally-engaged individuals and organizations.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$20,000			20,000		
Programming	$25,000			25,000		
Project Management	$10,000			10,000		
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$55,000	$0	$0	$55,000	$0	$0
Training						
Technical Staff	$15,000			15,000		
End-user Staff	$0					
Total	$15,000	$0	$0	$15,000	$0	$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$0					
Travel	$5,000			5,000		
Other	$0					
Total	$5,000	$0	$0	$5,000	$0	$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$145,000			70,000	50,000	25,000
Software	$55,000			30,000	25,000	
Network	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$200,000	$0	$0	$100,000	$75,000	$25,000
Total Request	$275,000	$0	$0	$175,000	$75,000	$25,000

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$275,000			175,000	75,000	25,000
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$275,000	$0	$0	$175,000	$75,000	$25,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	15	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	17	22	20	25
Technical Impact	16	16	18	17	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	6	9	8	10
Risk Assessment	7	7	8	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	14	16	16	20
			TOTAL	**80**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Project well defined and there is a need for it. - Developing this video on demand streaming service would increase the value of interactive videoconferencing for later playback, as well as the capacity to search and play streaming video programs. - Goals are well described with metrics measuring efficiency and engagement.	- While this project increases a singular facet of NET's technology potential, it does not go far enough in coordinating and integrating the storage and retrieval of other media types (e.g. still images, audio files, documents).
Project Justification / Business Case	- Contractors assessment assists in justification of timing and opportunities.	- The Office of the CIO offers storage as a shared service. Do not know if that was considered as an alternative for storage costs. Also use of VMWare is mentioned. The Office of the CIO also has an enterprise virtual environment. Was that taken into consideration? - The project proposal fails to address the tangible benefit of economic return on investment. How and how much will entities be charged for this service? Will the cost recovery make the project sustainable? While NVCN generates some administrative sessions that have value in being recorded, the real potential market would reside within the live event recording of K-20 entities (i.e. sporting events, graduations, fine arts events). Will this expanding market be sought?
Technical Impact	- Sufficient documentation around the technical impact of implementing this solution. - Most technical elements have been addressed. - Content delivery appears scalable, compatible, reliable and secure.	- Although metadata is mentioned, it is not explained how it will be assigned, and by whom? Will there be a Metadata wizard incorporated at the moment of file transfer? From entities outside NET, will there be a workflow wizard to make sure proper vetting of content is addressed, if needed?
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good description of implementation of project. - Project milestones and deliverables appear reasonable. - Team appears capable with resulting efficiencies redirected to new duties.	- A key consideration, stakeholder acceptance, was not addressed. What assurances are there that this new service will be welcomed by state agencies, education entities, and the general public?
Risk Assessment	- Several major risks were listed and addressed.	- Under Project Justification, item 1e states that NET does not have internal talent on staff to develop the code. This could be perceived as a risk in addition to staff turnover. - Risk (b) of "not using the streaming and content management systems" was not properly addressed, as this is a function of awareness, duplicated services, and cost. Awareness was addressed, but not the threat of duplicated services and cost. - Risks to the NET's brand due to a technical failure of the solution is not addressed beyond project cost.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Budget seems likely reasonable for project as defined. - Total Costs appears reasonable.	- Are software and maintenance costs included in the budget? - Is this system predicated on any type of cost recovery via participant contributions? OR, is this a free service to be provided by the State through NET? - Proposal appeared to indicate personal costs would increase due to skill, training or increased responsibilities.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-05	NETC	NETC Facility Technical Corridor Redesign

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The project is to modify the NET technical corridor in order to support the new work flow of the network operations center. Through this redesign we would blend the new and existing responsibilities of the facility and personnel. By applying new and repurposing existing technology we are able to expand the use of this area for remote content control spaces.

This project is being proposed to support existing and future partnerships with organizations much like our relationship with the Nebraska Legislature, Nebraska Department of Labor and the Supreme Court.

Through this project we feel we will expand our ability to manage, control and distribute media more efficiently. In the design we plan to use routing technology to manage a video switching environment to control content established through broadband connections. This project includes physical construction modifications to the existing area 1st floor south corridor.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$10,000			10,000		
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$0					
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$150,000			150,000		
Total	$160,000	$0	$0	$160,000	$0	$0

Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	$231,000			140,000	91,000	
Software	$30,000				30,000	
Network	$55,000				55,000	
Other	$24,000				24,000	
Total	$340,000	$0	$0	$140,000	$200,000	$0
Total Request	$500,000	$0	$0	$300,000	$200,000	$0

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$500,000			300,000	200,000	
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$500,000	$0	$0	$300,000	$200,000	$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	9	11	10	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	18	16	18	25
Technical Impact	15	19	16	17	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	5	6	6	10
Risk Assessment	6	3	6	5	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	16	18	16	20
			TOTAL	**72**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes		- Project not well defined. We believe we understand the goal is to enhance this area, both physically and technically, so that NET can provide more services - A little generic and may require some background understanding of NET roles, work flows and processes.
Project Justification / Business Case		- We think we understand project benefits are understood, but they are not described very well. - Seems that the benefits are a little generic at this point
Technical Impact	- Decent overall explanation.	- Not a clear description of how this will benefit customers and citizens going forward.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- If NET does not make desired management changes prior to the space modifications, does that impact the success of this project. As new roles are reassigned to staff, will there be an impact to service delivery. - Milestones are very broad. Not clear to me on everyone who must be involved. - Appears to be in an initial planning stage as dates are pretty generic (at FY level).
Risk Assessment		-If funding is a barrier and it is not received, what is the mitigation plan. - Take a look at the last paragraph in Section 5. Elaborate on the consequences if this project is not approved. Other items mentioned in the Executive Summary and other sections could assist in identifying risks if the project is not approved as well. - Only generic procurement and financial risks noted - assuming this is due to being in a planning stage.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Decent level of detail on forecasts provided.	- Because justification of request is not well understood, we are unsure as to whether the budget is sufficient. - Everything seems reasonable except the construction estimate. The only information on what this entails is the last sentence in the executive summary. With not much detail I don't know if it is reasonable or not.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist		Technical Panel Comment

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
47-06	NETC	Facility Routing Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

As the landscape of media changes, NET is serving audiences using content on multiple platforms. This makes routing that content in our facility crucial to be efficient. Proper routing capacity allows content managers, creators and distributers the ability to rout sources from different production areas in the building. For example, if a live show is taking place in our studio we use wide band routing to gain access to a piece of equipment in network operations so that we do not have to purchase a duplicate system in both areas. Or, when content is created outside the NET facility, we use routing to feed content to streaming encoders and the broadcast encoders at the same time so that we are not required to have two separate paths.

We currently operate a routing system that is 512x512 which is 512 inputs and 512 outputs. This system is 11 years old, beyond the need for a larger system and we have been informed support for this gear has ended.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Design	$25,000				25,000	
Programming	$0					
Project Management	$25,000				12,500	12,500
Data Conversion	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$50,000	$0	$0	$0	$37,500	$12,500

Other Operating Costs	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Personnnel Cost	$0					
Supplies & Materials	$50,000				50,000	
Travel	$0					
Other	$0					
Total	$50,000	$0	$0	$0	$50,000	$0

Capital Expenditures	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
Hardware	$250,000				125,000	125,000
Software	$125,000				37,500	87,500
Network	$0					
Other	$25,000					25,000
Total	$400,000	$0	$0	$0	$162,500	$237,500
Total Request	$500,000	$0	$0	$0	$250,000	$250,000

▼Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY13 Appr/Reappr	FY14 Request	FY15 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	$500,000				250,000	250,000
Cash Fund	$0					
Federal Fund	$0					
Revolving Fund	$0					
Other Fund	$0					
Total Funding	$500,000	$0	$0	$0	$250,000	$250,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	11	13	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	21	16	14	17	25
Technical Impact	18	14	17	16	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	7	6	7	10
Risk Assessment	7	7	6	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	18	17	18	20
			TOTAL	77	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Decent explanation of what is to be accomplished and why.	- I thought section 2 and 3 could have been a little more detailed.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Project justification well stated.	- Benefits seem a little questionable. However replacing 11-year technology does not seem that unreasonable and supporting EAS and Amber Alerts were noted.
Technical Impact	- A little generic but did provide some detail and rationale.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Good explanation of "how" the project would be implemented	- No timeline provided. -Lacking in the "when" the project would be implemented.
Risk Assessment		- Due to it being an 11 year old piece of equipment and manufacturer is already not supporting, should the timeline for replacement be moved up? Don't know as we don't know what that time line is. - Only generic procurement risks noted - assuming this is due to being in a planning stage.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Budget information provided appears to be likely reasonable. - Numbers seem reasonable but hard to know for sure without more detail.	- My only question is the project management fee since it is stated that NET will be the project manager for this project.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
78-01	Crime Commission	Criminal Justice Information System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)
[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) refers to a cooperative effort hosted by the Crime Commission with the participation of about 27 state and local entities. It is necessary to build ways for agencies to efficiently share criminal justice data. There is a great need for communication and sharing between systems as well as automating several key components of the criminal justice system in Nebraska. This has included the development of a secure data sharing portal called NCJIS which is the most visible project and what people often think of as the primary CJIS initiative. Other efforts include helping local agencies obtain standardized record systems, developing interfaces across stages in the CJ system and doing multi-state data sharing.

The primary purposes of CJIS are (1) to promote the sharing and availability of data among agencies, (2) to implement programs and systems that assist state and local agencies in the performance of their duties, and (3) to provide an inter-agency forum for issues.

NCJIS (the Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System, a secure online data portal providing access to a wide variety of state, local and federal data)has provided the thrust for goal 1 and will continue to be a cornerstone of CJIS operations and a component relating to other projects. It has grown in use since its inception in May, 2000 and is now considered to be one of the premier systems in the nation. NCJIS also acts to route data and serves as a hub for data sharing among agencies.

Goal 2 has largely been targeted through implementation of standard automation for local agencies as well as developing interfaces across systems. We have helped implement automation for jails, law enforcement and prosecutors as well as electronic citation software for locals and NSP.

CJIS efforts are ongoing and continue to evolve based upon need and available funding. Because NCJIS is at the core of the bulk of our efforts (either through a dominant search role or as a hub for data exchange) further comments in this proposal will focus on NCJIS.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2014 (Year 1)	Request for FY2015 (Year 2)	Request for FY2016 (Year 3)	Request for FY2017 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs	$ 127,314.00	$ 127,314.00	$ 127,314.00				$ 381,942.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design	$ 50,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00				$ 100,000.00
2.2 Programming	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00				$ 900,000.00
2.3 Project Management	$ 50,000.00	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00				$ 100,000.00
2.4 Other	$ 355,289.00	$ 105,289.00	$ 105,289.00				$ 565,867.00
3. Supplies and Materials	$ 600.00	$ 600.00	$ 600.00				$ 1,800.00
4. Telecommunications	$ 4,484.00	$ 4,484.00	$ 4,484.00				$ 13,452.00
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel	$ 3,000.00	$ 3,000.00	$ 3,000.00				$ 9,000.00
7. Other Operating Costs	$ 59,800.00	$ 59,800.00	$ 59,800.00				$ 179,400.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							$ -
8.2 Software	$ 2,600.00	$ 2,600.00	$ 2,600.00				$ 7,800.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 953,087.00	$ 653,087.00	$ 653,087.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,259,261.00
General Funds	$ 142,453.00	$ 142,453.00	$ 142,453.00				$ 427,359.00
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds	$ 810,634.00	$ 510,634.00	$ 510,634.00				$ 1,831,902.00
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 953,087.00	$ 653,087.00	$ 653,087.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,259,261.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	12	10	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	23	20	17	20	25
Technical Impact	16	16	13	15	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	6	8	10
Risk Assessment	9	8	6	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	19	20	15	18	20
			TOTAL	**81**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals are clearly articulated and show specific outcomes, beneficiaries and state the reason for the request. - This request is for a continuation of expenditures. - Proposal appears to meet real needs	- The documentation does not provide specifics for projects or outcome measurements. - Project seems to be primarily for funding support for maintenance and extension of a current system. It is difficult to identify a discrete project or set of projects that will be accomplished.
Project Justification / Business Case	- Business case is strong with specific benefits for current and future customers. - This request is for a continuation of expenditures. - Expansion of data sharing with other states, building on electronic citations, and implementing e filing of criminal and traffic citations seem to have real benefits	- There is no mention of the possibility of other sources of funding. For example, getting accident report data and images from Roads - are there any funds through NDOR to help accomplish this? I don't know the answer but it may be something the agency wants to address that they will explore? - It isn't clear to me that the functions identified above are the primary purpose of the proposal
Technical Impact	- Describes the current environment well and the strengths. - Continuing to examine web based solutions and to establish cost efficient solutions for small Agencies seems appropriate goal	- Not sure what the paragraph about local automation is trying to tell us. It almost sounds like some of the dollars will be used to help local standardize their systems? I don't think that is what is meant but that may need to be clarified.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Describes the on-going environment and the need to maintain it. - Continued operation of NCJIS and current and discussed projects is primary goal.	- This seems to provide ongoing support for activities, rather than being a project based proposal
Risk Assessment	- Biggest risk is loss of grant funds that is the primary source of funding for NCJIS. - Identification of risks of grant based funding, and impact on consistency of staffing and ability to develop functions over time seems accurate.	
Financial Analysis and Budget	- We assume the agency knows the dollars that are needed to ensure the continued operation of the system. - Continuation of prior years are requested. - Budget appears to be based on past experience. Since proposal seems largely to support continued activities, this seems an appropriate way to estimate.	

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist	Yes	No	Unknown	Technical Panel Comment
1. The project is technically feasible?				
2. The proposed technology is				

appropriate for the project?				
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
ESUCC-01*	ESUCC	Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System

*A voluntary review requested by the submitting entity. Not submitted as an agency budget request.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/index.html]

The goal of Nebraska's BlendEd eLearning System is to implement instructional and content technologies to enhance teaching and learning to support all modes of blended instruction. Blended education has been promoted by educational researchers as a one of the most promising recent innovations in education because it calls for making strategic choices about when face-to-face (synchronous) instruction is needed and when and how online (asynchronous) instruction can be best used to provide elements of student control over time, place, path and pace and provide more equity, efficiency and flexibility. Heather Staker and Michael B. Horn of the Innosight Institute offer this definition of Blended Learning-

> "Blended learning is any time a student learns at least in part at a supervised brick-and-mortar location away from home and at least in part through online delivery with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace."- http://www.innosightinstitute.org

Full text of the proposal: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2013-15/ppf/ESUCC-01.pdf

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2013-14 (Year 1)	Request for FY2014-15 (Year 2)	Request for FY2015-16 (Year 3)	Request for FY2016-17 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs		$ 255,000.00	$ 155,000.00	$ 50,000.00	$ 50,000.00	$ 50,000.00	$ 560,000.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other		$ 40,000.00	$ 10,000.00				$ 50,000.00
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel							$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware		$ 430,000.00	$ 225,000.00	$ 120,000.00	$ 95,000.00	$ 75,000.00	$ 945,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 645,000.00	$ 875,000.00	$ 1,140,000.00	$ 1,420,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 5,580,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 1,370,000.00	$ 1,265,000.00	$ 1,310,000.00	$ 1,565,000.00	$ 1,625,000.00	$ 7,135,000.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes				#DIV/0!	15
Project Justification / Business Case				#DIV/0!	25
Technical Impact				#DIV/0!	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation				#DIV/0!	10
Risk Assessment				#DIV/0!	10
Financial Analysis and Budget				#DIV/0!	20
TOTAL				#DIV/0!	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes		
Project Justification / Business Case		
Technical Impact		
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		
Risk Assessment		
Financial Analysis and Budget		

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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