

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #09-01
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-01	SECRETARY OF STATE	Business Services Filing System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing custom software utilized by the Business Services Division of the Secretary of State's Office.

The existing business services software is used to file and generate a variety of documents within the Secretary of State's Office. These documents include all corporate filings and filings made pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), revised article 9. The software is also utilized to file federal and state tax liens, farm product security filings, trade names and trademarks, and a variety of other statutory filings. The software also interacts with an image library, online filing services, and an accounts receivable system.

The existing business services software is 15 years old and is extremely difficult to modify and support. It was written in Visual Basic (VB6) which was released in mid-1998 and has been unsupported by Microsoft since April 2008. The company that initially developed our filing system stopped providing ongoing support, maintenance and enhancements in 2011. Programming and technical support is nearly extinct. The OCIO's office does not have programmers to support this system. We are at the mercy of a part-time contracted programmer who assists us outside of regular business hours 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM due to having other full time employment. This makes communications, updates, enhancements and support very difficult and costly. Having minimal support often makes it difficult to meet statutory changes for business processes. Replacement software is needed at this time in order to prevent system failure and to continue to provide the level of service currently expected by the business community.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$180,000			40,000	140,000	
Project Management	\$0					
Data Conversion	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$180,000	\$0	\$0	\$40,000	\$140,000	\$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	\$0					
Software	\$2,000,000				700,000	1,300,000
Network	\$130,000					130,000
Other	\$320,000					320,000
Total	\$2,450,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700,000	\$1,750,000
Total Request	\$2,630,000	\$0	\$0	\$40,000	\$840,000	\$1,750,000

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$0					
Cash Fund	\$2,630,000			40,000	840,000	1,750,000
Federal Fund	\$0					
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					
Total Funding	\$2,630,000	\$0	\$0	\$40,000	\$840,000	\$1,750,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	12	15	14	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	19	25	23	25
Technical Impact	5	16	20	14	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	10	7	10
Risk Assessment	2	7	10	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	5	20	20	15	20
			TOTAL	79	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goals appear to be logical, realistic and straight forward - Good project, desire to integrate all aspects of the process. - Well written and easy to understand. This project has a significant profile and has the potential to impact the public and the State in a very positive manner. It is far reaching in the customer base it serves. The information is critical to both the public and the State. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project appears to be headed in the same direction as the existing. If a solution is picked using similar software that could become outdated like the existing process. With 3 years to develop, existing items within the office may no longer be useable.
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential revenue, from filings is estimated to be 10 Million per year per the report - Well written and the metrics provided are valuable in determining the size and scope of this project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unsure what benefits are new to the proposed system versus what may already exist. The document sounds like all of these benefits are new and will be achieved with the project, yet filings were completed and fees collected. (configured by non-IT staff, yet changes to the application would quite likely require programming/application changes, confusing statements)
Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I did not get the sense that the Agency knows if a solution is actually available. While they know what they want - is there an off the shelf solution or are we looking at creating something? - Numerous vendors and applications available, yet only one mentioned in the prior section for justification.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on what I read, I think the Agency needs to do a lot more research. Is there a solution or do they need to build one.
Risk Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While the project is well intended there are just not enough facts to assign a level of risk to the project. When they have a vendor in mind or a more definitive solution they should re-submit.
Financial Analysis and Budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From what I read these budget numbers cannot be justified.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
09-02	SECRETARY OF STATE	Collection Agency Online Renewal Application

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

The Secretary of State's Office is requesting funding to develop an online renewal application for collection agency licenses. The online renewal application will allow collection agencies to renew their license online, update relevant contact information with the State and submit the required renewal documentation. Most licensed collection agencies are not physically located in Nebraska and desire the ability to communicate with the State licensing office electronically.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appri/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$40,275			40,275		
Project Management	\$25,680			25,680		
Data Conversion	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$65,955	\$0	\$0	\$65,955	\$0	\$0
Total Request	\$65,955	\$0	\$0	\$65,955	\$0	\$0

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appri/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$0					
Cash Fund	\$65,955			65,955		
Federal Fund	\$0					
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					
Total Funding	\$65,955	\$0	\$0	\$65,955	\$0	\$0

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	23	23	24	25
Technical Impact	20	16	20	19	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	8	10	9	10
Risk Assessment	10	7	8	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	20	20	20	20	20
TOTAL				94	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The goals are well expressed and make sense. - Well written, easy to understand and all points addressed.	
Project Justification / Business Case	- The project justification is sound and reasonable. - Well written, easy to understand and all points addressed.	
Technical Impact	- Use of Nebraska.Gov makes very good sense from a technical perspective. - A good approach to the development of this	

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	project.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Implementation plan looks to be solid.	
Risk Assessment	- Plan to minimize risks looks appropriate.	
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Financial proposal appears appropriate.	

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #18-01
Page 1 of 2

Project #	Agency	Project Title
18-01	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE	Paperless Inspection Project

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

Phase II of the paperless inspection project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$260,000	0	200,000	30,000	30,000	
Project Management	\$0					
Data Conversion	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$260,000	\$0	\$200,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0
Total Request	\$260,000	\$0	\$200,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0

▼ Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$260,000		200,000	30,000	30,000	
Cash Fund	\$0					
Federal Fund	\$0					
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					
Total Funding	\$260,000	\$0	\$200,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	9	11	15
Project Justification / Business Case	19	23	20	21	25
Technical Impact	16	19	15	17	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	9	5	7	10
Risk Assessment	7	8	4	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	19	18	12	16	20
			TOTAL	78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase I must have gone well enough that Dept. of Ag is ready to make enhancements. - Had to look at the phase I document to understand the phase II work. When reviewed together, the project was easier to evaluate and understand. Without the phase I information, the scores would have been much lower. - A very worthy project but I felt the narrative for this project shown on the 2015-2017 request to be lacking in detail and substance. A link to the 2013-2015 request would be essential to understand the scope of this project. As a result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could have been a bit more description on what these enhancements are to be as well as new ones being developed that were not a priority during Phase I.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	my scoring is based on a review of both request documents. In the Executive Summary for 2013-2015 it was cited as a 'one time biennium cost' which would appear to raise a question of why the 2015-2017 request is made. I also think it would be appropriate to provide the status on the development of this project. My understanding is that the Department would be the recipient of most of the efficiencies as opposed to the public.	
Project Justification / Business Case	- If the project justification provided in the FY 14/15 budget submission is still valid, this continues to be a good use of technology for Agriculture.	- It would have been beneficial for the Dept of Ag to provide more information about what has been accomplished on this project through the funding provided in FY 14/15. No indication if this is a result of a state or federal mandate although in the last submission there is a statement that alludes to good cooperation between state and federal.
Technical Impact	- If the technical impact provided in the FY 14/15 budget submission is still valid, this continues to be a good use of technology for Agriculture. They are using the solution required by the NITC.	- It would have been beneficial for the Dept of Ag to provide more information about what has been accomplished on this project through the funding provided in FY 14/15.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		- It is hard to determine if the preliminary plan is adequate as no detail has been provided on what has been accomplished to date. - Current status of the project would be very helpful in determination. I found that the various phases were not very well defined nor was the expected completion date, as 2013-2015 request indicated full implementation by January 2015.
Risk Assessment	- If the risk justification provided in the FY 14/15 budget submission is still valid, this continues to be a good use of technology for Agriculture.	- It would appear that the risks are minimal but due to lack of detail regarding the status of Phase I, it is difficult to determine. - I did not find that risks were enumerated in either request.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- It would appear that projects were not completed in Phase I, causing the \$200,000 re-appropriation. That in addition to the \$60,000 they are requesting, appears to be reasonable.	- It would appear that the funding is adequate, but due to lack of detail regarding the status of Phase I, it is difficult to determine. - The narrative is confusing.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #24-01
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
24-01	DEPT OF MOTOR VEHICLES	Nebraska Systems Update and Modification (NSUM)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is beginning the process of developing a single DMV system that will, over time, host all DMV services. The system will be 'customer centric' and be designed to provide a single, fully integrated access point for all customers to conduct business with the DMV.

This project will be approached from the view point of the customer's needs and expectations. Applications and technologies will be built to support redefined and modernized business processes. Although the entire project will span several budget periods, this project phase will focus on the preliminary events required for the recreation of the DMV Vehicle, Title and Registration (VTR) business processes, applications and technologies.

In 2014 LB 905 was passed by the Nebraska Legislature and states; "There is included in the appropriation to this program for FY2014-15 \$271,128 Cash Funds to identify a replacement vehicle title and registration system, associated costs, and financing options."

"The VTR system, now over 20 years old, no longer meets the evolving business requirements of stakeholders and expectations of Nebraska residents. Implementation of a new VTR system should be considered. Revenues to support a new VTR system may be derived from a variety of sources. ... The DMV should move immediately to collaboratively develop a funding model that is supported by key stakeholders. Upon approval, the DMV should create a project structure, conduct a business process analysis, and further refine the analysis with a concept of operations and system requirements. With that information, the DMV and its stakeholders will be positioned to evaluate how it will approach VTR system replacement. Upon determination of a direction, a project plan will be further developed and the contracting/tasking of VTR system development and implementation will be undertaken. Based on the experience of other states, VTR system implementation projects typically have taken between 4 to 10 years from initial planning through implementation of the production system." (1)

(1) Excerpts from: "2013 DMV VTR Business Case" - Prepared for the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles by Nancy Shank, PhD, MBA, Associate Director, University of Nebraska Public Policy Center.

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appri/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$0					
Project Management	\$1,677,806	127,500		383,000	385,848	781,458
Data Conversion	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$1,677,806	\$127,500	\$0	\$383,000	\$385,848	\$781,458
Other Operating Costs						
Personnel Cost	\$875,032	132,418		180,530	184,592	377,492
Supplies & Materials	\$8,500	2,500		3,500	2,500	
Travel	\$44,890	8,710		16,745	10,835	8,600
Other	\$0					
Total	\$928,422	\$143,628	\$0	\$200,775	\$197,927	\$386,092
Total Request	\$2,606,228	\$271,128	\$0	\$583,775	\$583,775	\$1,167,550

Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appri/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$0					
Cash Fund	\$2,606,228	271,128		583,775	583,775	1,167,550
Federal Fund	\$0					
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					
Total Funding	\$2,606,228	\$271,128	\$0	\$583,775	\$583,775	\$1,167,550

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	25	15	25	22	25
Technical Impact	15	13	15	14	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	5	10	8	10
Risk Assessment	8	5	8	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	5	15	12	20
TOTAL				75	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning approach appears sound. - The Business Case document was a comprehensive look at the issues with the current system. It articulates all users of the information and a nice review of what other state are doing as well as emerging trends. - The DMV VTR business case is well written. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measurable efficiencies and ROI could use more definition. - Neither the Project Proposal Report nor the Business Case document clearly articulated the goals and problems to be resolved. IT Project Proposal did not list beneficiaries, outcomes or assessments. It was focused on the tasks needed to get to the project plan stage, not why the project is needed. It is implied through the faults of the current system. While this project is in the early planning stage, and "how" it is to be accomplished is not yet determined, the project will have better success if it the organization clearly articulates what they want to accomplish and what problems they intend to solve. That will also give them a better assessment tool to measure success. - A broader "green field" approach with more collaboration of stakeholders should be considered.
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of the business case document demonstrates a thoughtful and thorough approach to the project. - Identifies that older technology is expensive to maintain and is not adaptable to our changing business needs. - Clearly, although there is no mandate, an alternative to the existing DMV VTR system is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While this is in the initial phase of the project and there are still many questions, the proposal does not articulate the customer centric reasons to justify the project. - (As the project evolves provision should be made to consider new alternatives approaches.)
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compliance with state systems, standards and management practices is a notable strength. - The project will conform to NITC standards and utilize OCIO facilities and resources. - Good approach by designing with guidance from the OCIO - and looking at what some other states are doing in this area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical impact difficult to assess in this stage of the process. - Vague in approach; however, that will be determined as part of the initial phase of the project. - More research should be done to determine current "state of the art" alternative approaches being considered in other similar collaborative efforts.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusive of stakeholders. Governance model seems very reasonable. - Input from user/stakeholder team that includes private industry is a positive element. Additional staff approved prior to the project, more resources. - Good overall implementation timeframe and related objectives - need to ensure commitment of stakeholders as project evolves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No description of project team roles. Who is the project champion? Executive sponsor? - More detail needed - (as an example) - footnote comment #26 from the 2013 AAMVA conference.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scoring for this stage only: funding solution is project's largest risk. - They have studied other projects and know some of the pitfalls. They plan to utilize outside resources. - This area is a significant revenue generator for the state, and the current system is outdated and unsustainable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No solution for their largest and most immediate obstacle - funding. - Conversion to a new system will be complex and must be done with minimum impact to the state revenue streams.
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No request for general funds. Seeks authorization for cash funds. - Year 1 is exploration. It is good that they are taking the time to explore and plan before jumping in to the project. They have funding for the exploration. - Some budget estimates from the experience of other states for "similar projects" were considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cash fund model is one of the deliverables, in form of future legislation. Lack of detail regarding our project management estimates. - The Business Case document suggests the project will cost \$13-50 Million and take from 4 to 10 years to complete; however, the budget is less than \$3 million over a 4 year period. Based on the Business Case document and research, this seems inadequate and not sustainable. Consider allowing more time and more money to complete the project. - More detailed budget planning needs to be done to identify project financing options - with active participation of all project stakeholders.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

Project #	Agency	Project Title
40-01	MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY LICENSING	Replacement Software Program

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

Effective January, 2015, the software program "FOXPRO", that Agency 40 uses to license all of our members, will no longer be supported.

This agency, along with other agencies, are in the planning stage of how to go about replacing FOXPRO with a new software program.

FUNDING SUMMARY

[No information provided.]

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	8	9	9	15
Project Justification / Business Case	15	10	15	13	25
Technical Impact	0	10	12	7	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	0	0	5	2	10
Risk Assessment	0	0	5	2	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	12	4	20
			TOTAL	37	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency is aware of the need to replace an old software program that is no longer supported. They are also cognizant of the need for something that is user friendly. - Awareness that their existing licensing software needs to be replaced due to the end of support effective 01-01-2015. - Rationale for project pretty straight forward - application vendor support expiring. Since vendor support expires January 2015 will need to be addressed in some fashion but also too early in the process to have all the information at submission. Minimum Score only reflects fact that information not available and not relative importance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency does not describe in a clear manner what the goals are that the new system will need to address. Is there a need for self service? Is there a need for reporting to another agency or partner? Are they looking for a website with a database behind it or a fully functioning application? - No separate IT Plan was submitted.
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency states clearly that they are attempting to serve the licensees and the car buying public in a timely manner. - Acknowledgement that in order to continue to provide services to the Auto industry a replacement app is required and needs to be as good or better than their current application and that it needs to serve their customers in a timely manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no detail behind why the agency needs to provide this software program. Is it a legislative mandate? Something that tracks information for the agency and the state and is required (and by who)? Or is this a nice to have item? - Unknown as to whether other solutions have been considered.
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is a known requirement that the licensing software application needs to be replaced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency does not address any technical elements. - Currently, no proposed replacement.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agency states this is not applicable. - No implementation plan presented.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Risk Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency states that this is not applicable. - No replacement plan proposed.
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Motor Vehicle Industry Licensing Board did participate in a meeting held at the Office of the CIO with other Licensing agencies, to discuss common interests in a replacement licensing software product. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no costs addressed, nor does the agency address how they would support a new system financially. - No estimated dollars included.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #41-01
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
41-01	REAL ESTATE COMMISSION	Licensee Database

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

The Nebraska Real Estate Commission is seeking funding for the replacement of the current real estate license database, which was acquired in 1998. The licensee database keeps general contact information on licensees, tracks the relationship between designated brokers (licensees with authority to operate independently) and affiliated licensees (licensees with authority to act as a licensee only under the supervision of the designated broker. In addition, the database tracks and records payments for license applications, renewals and transfers. The database also generates reports and licensee lists, as well as recording and tracking disciplinary matters and generating form letters with the appropriate licensee information inserted (late renewal notices, etc.).

FUNDING SUMMARY

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$43,000		13,000	15,000	15,000	
Project Management	\$0					
Data Conversion	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$43,000	\$0	\$13,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$0
Telecommunications						
Data	\$31,500		10,500	10,500	10,500	
Video	\$0					
Voice	\$0					
Wireless	\$0					
Total	\$31,500	\$0	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$0
Other Operating Costs						
Personnel Cost	\$157,055		43,527	56,764	56,764	
Supplies & Materials	\$0					
Travel	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$157,055	\$0	\$43,527	\$56,764	\$56,764	\$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	\$14,020		7,000	3,510	3,510	
Software	\$550,500		500	550,000		
Network	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$564,520	\$0	\$7,500	\$553,510	\$3,510	\$0
Total Request	\$796,075	\$0	\$74,527	\$635,774	\$85,774	\$0

▼ Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$0					
Cash Fund	\$796,075		74,527	635,774	85,774	
Federal Fund	\$0					
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					
Total Funding	\$796,075	\$0	\$74,527	\$635,774	\$85,774	\$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	12	14	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	19	20	22	20	25
Technical Impact	15	15	16	15	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	5	7	6	10
Risk Assessment	6	5	7	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	16	18	16	17	20
TOTAL				78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency has clearly defined the overall goals of the project and the types of issues they are attempting to overcome. They also address the need to interface with other items such as payment systems and web based filing. - Well described goals and need for a replacement of their 1998 licensing system. Replacement is required due to discontinued support of Sybase. - Rationale for project pretty straight forward - need to upgrade old system (1998) to enable greater access, self-service direction, overall flexibility & functionality and ongoing support. Goals cover the key points even though selection not yet known. Need to replace existing system (16 years old?) should carry higher priority when fully vetted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency could have made a stronger case about what success looks like. For example, is the intent to have the system take an online application and move it through an automated workflow that steps the agency through each of the steps it takes to obtain a license? If given the opportunity to dream - what would the system be? - Several interfaces desired.
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agency has issued an RFI to at least find out what the potential replacement options are. - An RFI for a potential replacement licensing system was issued in 2013. Three responses were received. - Rationale for upgrade clear in ability to eliminate the need for specialized support by OCIO, simplify ongoing support, enhanced reporting capabilities and reducing costs longer term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is an old system that needs to be replaced - but what is the business case? Is it costing you too much money to support it? When is the payback of a new system? What does the agency do if it is not replaced? What happens to the agency if this system dies? - Two of the three responses indicated a replacement cost of a system to be approximately \$550,000. - Should make a stronger case upfront in narrative of the fact the Sybase/SAP support has/will go away and support critical moving forward?
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The technical impact of no longer having support for the system is large and well described. The point of the audit finding is strong support. - A new system would provide the opportunity to acquire a system that would meet state standards - including an audit finding deficiency of only one level of login/security. Potentially could provide better reporting capability to the public. - Good points made toward identifying impact/risks to the business operation and to conform to. Score assigned recognizing unknowns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the system meet any NITC standards? Not understanding the business of the agency, what is so important about disciplinary information? This would make the technical impact of a non-supported system stronger. - Did not address hardware or networking requirements. - Would some verbiage on selection options to include consideration for an SaaS model?
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency understands the need for an RFP - but may need to include more than the internal agency IT staff and the Director in the process. - If funding is approved, would draft an RFP per State Purchasing guidelines for the replacement product. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Your plan for how quickly the plan may be implemented is a bit aggressive. Additionally, since this will be an Enterprise project as defined by the NITC, the agency needs to also add the NITC process to their plan. - No other details given as relates to this section.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Rated 7 only because intent to RFP/select and information not available. As noted earlier might help to identify what options for delivery would be considered from vendors in an RFP?	
Risk Assessment	- They pledge to do a thorough assessment of any proposed replacement system and to follow policies and guidelines of the Office of the CIO. - High level risks well defined but since solution not fully known at submission made a 7. Definitive risks would likely change or new risks ID'd once defined/assessed at selection?	- Not sure the agency understands the risks of this project. What if the requirements are not clearly defined and the product does not address the main issues the agency is attempting to resolve? With a small IT staff, there is a risk that the provider chosen does not have the skills to pull the project off - and that is not known until the end of the project. Is the agency willing to change their business process to meet the needs of the solution chosen? - Acknowledgement of risk but no actual description of that risk.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Agency seems to have a plan on how they can fund this project, assuming that they don't lose licensees in the process. Also it is unclear whether this is a one-time hike or a forever hike and paying this bill over time. - Have included dollar amounts for the IT expenditures. - Understand acquisition costs not fully known yet. Inclusion of commentary on fees to support overall funding reflect "foresight" for any subsequent Appropriations discussions. Again score reflects know aspects of project at submission.	- Fee increase required in order to fund this purchase.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #81-01
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
81-01	COMM FOR BLIND & VISUALLY IMPAIRED	AWARE Client Data Tracking System Procurement

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html]

AWARE (Accessible Web Activity Reporting Environment), produced by Alliance Enterprises, is used by over 31 State Rehab Agencies to manage grants from U.S. Department of Education's Rehabilitation Services Administration.

Strengths:

Financial component can be linked to the Edge system to track obligations and payments for case services
 Required changes to federal reporting requirements are added through semiannual software upgrades
 Continuity of Operations can be assured as developments and modifications are developed by the vendor
 Nonvisual accessibility is maintained through close partnerships between vendor and software manufacturers
 Current case management system is heavily customized and updates are costly and time-consuming; it is not feasible to add financial component.

AWARE is a product of Alliance Enterprises of Lacey, WA. It is designed to specifically meet the reporting needs of Vocational Rehabilitation agencies that report to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), which is part of the Department of Education. The system is used by 31 states and other agencies to manage grants awarded to them by the RSA. The AWARE system has a financial component that creates obligations for products and services procured for clients as a part of their case services. It is our goal to utilize this component in conjunction with data exchange with the Edge system to track obligations and payments for case services. To meet our current case management needs, we are utilizing a system that was given to us by the state of Iowa, which we have heavily customized. Although the system currently performs effectively, a change to the AWARE (Accessible Web Activity Reporting Environment) would benefit us in the future from a continuity of operations standpoint, as well as ensuring that modifications to the system necessitated by changes in federal reporting requirements are not as costly or time-consuming to implement. In addition, upgrades to the system can be insured to be accessible to our blind staff as Alliance Enterprises works closely with manufacturers of screen access technology, operating systems, and backend database and related software.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(Images from the Budget Request and Reporting System.)

IT Project Costs

Contractual Services	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appr/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
Design	\$0					
Programming	\$100,000		100,000			
Project Management	\$103,000		103,000			
Data Conversion	\$50,000		50,000			
Other	\$0					
Total	\$253,000	\$0	\$253,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Training						
Technical Staff	\$6,871		6,871			
End-user Staff	\$11,353		11,353			
Total	\$18,224	\$0	\$18,224	\$0	\$0	\$0
Capital Expenditures						
Hardware	\$0					
Software	\$100,276		100,276			
Network	\$0					
Other	\$0					
Total	\$100,276	\$0	\$100,276	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Request	\$371,500	\$0	\$371,500	\$0	\$0	\$0

▼ Funding

	Total	Prior Exp	FY15 Appri/Reappr	FY16 Request	FY17 Request	Future Add Request
General Fund	\$0					
Cash Fund	\$0					
Federal Fund	\$371,500		371,500			
Revolving Fund	\$0					
Other Fund	\$0					
Total Funding	\$371,500	\$0	\$371,500	\$0	\$0	\$0

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	10	9	11	15
Project Justification / Business Case	25	18	22	22	25
Technical Impact	18	15	15	16	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	8	8	9	10
Risk Assessment	10	8	4	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	13	15	15	14	20
TOTAL				79	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goals are to update software that will allow the agency to fulfill federal guidelines. - Want to utilize a system that is easy to maintain and not be heavily customized; want to produce more accurate data. - Goals are clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start date listed at 09-01-2014 although many decisions have not been made; indication of being a sole source acquisition. - Very Brief. Didn't see how they would measure the effectiveness of the solution. Outcomes are vague.
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CFVI has significant issues in terms of accessibility. They did a good job of assessing what software could fit their requirements that is accessible. It is a part of fulfilling federal reporting requirements and has been used by other VR agencies. - Indicate they need to stay current with federal reporting requirements. (Do not specifically state it is a federal mandate.) Would provide capability of several staff knowing how to utilize the system in lieu of one or two analysts. - I thought this was very clear on the benefits and review of other solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only one other case management system was explored. - They mentioned linking this to the Payroll and Financial Center, but nothing about working with DAS. Is the assumption that they will be able to interface with no problems?
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal clearly discusses how the project enhances the current technology and the software, hardware, and communication requirements. - Indicate they are working with the Office of the CIO and the vendor to determine the best hosting solution. The system is used by 31 other states. - They are aware of the options available to them for implementing the system. They know the standards that must be followed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There could have been a clearer description of reliability, security and scalability. - Current system will need to go through a data conversion process. An interface may be required to the State's mainframe. - Too many questions as to how this should be implemented. Based on my experience, there will be a cost difference between hosting it internally and externally. Is the cost based on the most expensive option? I would have liked to see a breakdown of the development that is required.
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The implementation plan is clear. The project team is outlined and the strategies to minimize risk seem appropriate. - Milestones, deliverables, dates and Project Team are stated. Have acknowledged considerable training will be required. - Good description of training and on-going 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timeline seems aggressive since the system has yet to be purchased. - Since and interface with the Payroll and Financial Center will be required, I expected to see someone from DAS as part of the team. This isn't part of the timeline either.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	support.	
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A good description of possible barriers and of strategies to address problems. - They have identified possible barriers and risks and did identify strategies to help minimize risks. A part of that is to leave the old system in place for a number of years. - Identified a number of strategies that could be used to minimize risks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They indicate the system will be supported by NCBVI staff, the vendor and the OCIO. The type and amount of that support is not fully defined. - I don't see how the strategies are related to the risks defined. Identified risks should have strategies that explain how to minimize the risk and what will be done if the risk occurs.
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding is appears to be 100 per cent federally funded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget doesn't really explain where the numbers are coming from although the project is still in the initial planning stages. - There were no hardware or networking costs identified. Since the hosting solution has not yet been determined was not sure if the need for hardware and networking had yet been decided as well. - It's reasonable but since there are two options and they haven't decided which way to go, I'm concerned that it may cost more or they may sacrifice something in order to stay within budget.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

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