

**AGENDA**  
**TECHNICAL PANEL**  
**Varner Hall - Board Room**  
**3835 Holdrege Street**  
**Lincoln, Nebraska**  
**Tuesday, April 12, 2016**  
**9:00 a.m.**

9:00 a.m.	1. Roll Call; Meeting Notice; and Open Meetings Act Information 2. Public Comment 3. Approval of Minutes: February 9, 2016* ( <i>Attachment 3</i> )	Chair
9:05 a.m.	4. Enterprise Projects a. Project Update: Dept. of Health and Human Services, MMIS Project b. Project Status Dashboard ( <i>Attachment 4-b</i> )	Calder Lynch  A. Weekly
9:40 a.m.	5. Standards and Guidelines a. Post for 30-Day Comment Period: Amendments to NITC 3-201* ( <i>Attachment 5-a</i> ) b. Request for Waiver from the requirements of NITC 8-303 by the Nebraska Judicial Branch* ( <i>Attachment 5-b</i> )	R. Becker
9:45 a.m.	6. Technical Panel Charter Amendments* ( <i>Attachment 6</i> )	R. Becker
9:50 a.m.	7. Work Group Updates and Other Business	Chair
10:00 a.m.	8. Adjourn	Chair

\* Denotes action items.

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.

Meeting notice was posted to the [NITC website](#) and the [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on February 17, 2016. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on April 8, 2016.

[Nebraska Open Meetings Act](#)

**TECHNICAL PANEL**

Tuesday, February 9, 2016, 9:00 a.m.  
 Varner Hall - Board Room  
 3835 Holdrege Street  
 Lincoln, Nebraska

**MINUTES****MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair  
 Ed Toner, CIO, State of Nebraska  
 Christy Horn, University of Nebraska  
 Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools  
 Michael Winkle, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION**

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present to conduct official business. The meeting notice was posted to the [NITC website](#) and the [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on December 9, 2015. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on February 5, 2016. A copy of the Nebraska Open Meetings Act was posted on the wall of the meeting room.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Mr. Langer moved to approve the December 8, 2015 minutes as presented. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.**

**ENTERPRISE PROJECTS****Project Update: Nebraska Department of Education – NeSA**

Matt Blomstedt, Commissioner, Nebraska Department of Education; Jeremy Heneger, Assistant Director of Assessment, Nebraska Department of Education; John Bandy, CIO, Data Recognition Corporation (“DRC”); and Sandy Wiese, Vice President for Governmental Relations, DRC

Mr. Blomstedt provided an updated to the Panel, including information regarding the outages and other issues during the recent writing assessment testing. Mr. Bandy acknowledged and apologized for the technical issues schools and students were experiencing. There have been some outages during the testing period – one was due to inadequate patch management and the other was due to server storage issues.

Ms. Horn asked questions regarding accessibility for students with disabilities. Mr. Langer noted previous discussions about locating hardware on Network Nebraska to eliminate potential issues with commodity Internet service.

It is everyone’s best interest to have discussions and work together to solve issues. Members offered to provide any assistance they can.

Mr. Toner asked DRC if they thought the state should receive a performance credit due to the performance issues. Mr. Bandy stated he would be open to this. Mr. Toner and Mr. Blomstedt will continue discussions regarding the performance credit.

Mr. Weir asked the project to determine what were the lessons learned and what are we going to do to make sure it does not occur again.

### **Project Status Dashboard**

Andy Weekly, Project Manager

The Technical Panel comments section was added to the report at the members' request.

Mr. Weekly provided a report on the following projects: Network Nebraska; Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA); Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN); Medicaid Management Information System Replacement Project (MMIS); District Dashboards; Medicaid Eligibility & Enrollment System; and AFIS Upgrade Project. The following agencies will be asked to provide a report at the April Technical Panel meeting: NDE and DHHS.

### **TECHNICAL PANEL CHARTER**

Rick Becker, OCIO Legal Counsel

Mr. Becker discussed proposed changes to the Technical Panel Charter. Specifically, members were asked their thoughts on eliminating alternate members on the Panel. All agreed that such a change was appropriate. The revised charter will be an action item at the next meeting.

### **WORK GROUP UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS**

There were no work group reports.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

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

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
**Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

<b>Project: Network Nebraska Education</b>		<b>Contact: Tom Rolfes</b>				
Start Date	05/01/2006	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date	08/01/2016	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>Network Nebraska-Education is a statewide consortium of over 260 K-12 and higher education entities working together to provide a statewide backbone, commodity Internet, distance education, and other value-added services to its participants. Network Nebraska-Education is managed by the State Office of the CIO partnering with the University of Nebraska Computing Services Network (UNCSN).</p> <p>Project Budget (2015-16): \$702,894 (\$382,786 has been expended)</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p><b>April update:</b>  Three (3) new entities are expected to join Network Nebraska-Education prior to 8/10/2016. Minor risks and issues are addressed by the executive sponsors at the monthly CAP meetings.</p> <p>State of Nebraska RFP 5153 was released on 10/23/2015 as the largest telecommunications RFP in the history of the State of Nebraska. Bid opening occurred on 12/18/2015 and included 226 circuits for K-12, 20 circuits for higher education, 98 circuits for UNL Extension, and 3 circuits for the Nebraska Game &amp; Parks Commission. Intents to Award Contract were issued on January 13, 2016 (delayed 20 days). <b>As of the date of this writing, none of the 13 provider contracts had been posted, a delay of over 30 days from expected.</b> A separate RFP for the statewide backbone will not follow until November 2016 which will include the four segments of the leased backbone. For 2016-17, existing backbone contracts will be renewed/extended. Lincoln City Libraries went live with fiber access to Network Nebraska in late March and their Internet purchase is initially 500Mbps. Commodity Internet orders for 2016-17 were collected from K-12 and higher education entities and total orders increased by 44% over 2015-16.</p> <p>The delay in finalizing and posting the 13 provider contracts related to RFP 5153 is causing angst among many K-12 school districts as they prepare to do their federal E-rate filing before the April 29, 2016 deadline. The Office of the CIO will want to review whether co-terminus expirations of state WAN contracts is manageable and desirable in future years.</p> <p><b>Additional Comments/Concerns:</b>  The 2015-16 Participation Fee Budget has been posted above. The 2015-16 2nd quarter UNCSN invoice was submitted on February 11, 2016 by UNCSN Accounting and has been paid. With two quarters (50%) of the year consumed, the 2015-16 Participation Fee budget has reached 54.5% of budgeted expenditures. Only Software Maintenance has exceeded its categorical estimate. The 3rd quarter UNCSN invoice should be arriving soon from UNCSN. Some object codes will be changing to reflect the new State I.T. spend analysis.</p> <p>Even though the Chief Information Officer fulfilled the Legislative benchmark of “providing access (the ability to connect) to every public K-12 and public higher education entity at the earliest date and no later than July 1, 2012” [Neb. Rev. Stat. 86-5,100], the NITC Technical Panel has extended the enterprise project designation for Network Nebraska-Education until 8/1/2015 so that all public school districts that want to participate have actually connected.</p>						

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
**Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

<b>Project: Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA)</b>		<b>Contact: John Moon</b>				
Start Date	07/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2011	Revised Completion Date	6/30/2016	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>Legislative Bill 1157 passed by the 2008 Nebraska Legislature required a single statewide assessment of the Nebraska academic content standards for reading, mathematics, science, and writing in Nebraska’s K-12 public schools. The new assessment system was named Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA), with NeSA-R for reading assessments, NeSA-M for mathematics, NeSA-S for science, and NeSA-W for writing. The assessments in reading and mathematics were administered in grades 3-8 and 11; science was administered in grades 5, 8, and 11; and writing was administered in grades 4, 8, and 11.</p> <p>Project Estimate: \$7,278,025 (\$1,885,922.98 has been expended)</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p><b>April update:</b>            Test setup for eDIRECT was available to districts on February 22<sup>nd</sup> through May 6<sup>th</sup> for NeSA-RMS. The reading, math, and Science operational test window began on March 21<sup>st</sup> and will be completed by May 6<sup>th</sup>. NeSA-RMS administration training was conducted on February 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>. Score resolution will be conducted by NDE starting on June 13<sup>th</sup>. During the score resolution process Districts are contacted for all issues with NeSA-RMS results. On July 13<sup>th</sup>, districts will be provided with preliminary NeSA-RMS reports and data files. Districts have until August 8<sup>th</sup> to submit any data corrections for NeSA-RMS results.</p> <p><b>February update:</b>            The 2015-16 NeSA-Writing Window opened on January 18 and will close on February 10. The testing window was extended by three days due to weather related interruptions. As of February 5, approximately 42,000 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade students have completed online testing. Technical issues encountered are detailed in attached reports.</p> <p>Districts and students are busy using online practice tests and other preparatory tools that are design to familiarize them with the testing software. On January 25, NDE completed student data transfer to DRC for NeSA-Reading, Math and Science. The NeSA-RMS window will run from March 21 to May 6, 2016.</p> <p><b>Additional Comments/Concerns:</b>            July 2015 - Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) is a statewide assessment system mandated by Nebraska Statute. Nebraska Department of Education has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) to continue the development of the assessment system including management, development, delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, reporting, and standard setting for the online and pencil/paper reading, science, writing, and mathematics tests (NeSA-RMS) for July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. DRC will facilitate the delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, and reporting for the alternate pencil/paper reading, science, and mathematics tests during the same assessment window. During January 18 through February 5, 2016, DRC will deliver the online writing assessment (NeSA-W) for grades 8 and 11 and the pencil/paper writing assessment for grade 4 as well. The testing window for NeSA-RMS and NeSA-AA will start on March 21 and end on May 6, 2016.</p>						

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
**Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

Project: <b>Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)</b>		Contact: <b>Sue Krogman</b>				
Start Date	10/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/01/2013	Revised Completion Date	09/30/2016	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>The Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN) is a project that will connect a majority of the Public Safety Access Points (PSAP) across the State by means of a point to point microwave system. The network will be a true, secure means of transferring data, video and voice. Speed and stability are major expectations; therefore there is a required redundant technology base of no less than 100 mbps with 99.999% availability for each site. It is hoped that the network will be used as the main transfer mechanism for currently in-place items, thus imposing a cost-saving to local government. All equipment purchased for this project is compatible with the networking equipment of the OCIO.</p> <p>Project Estimate: \$10,820,003 (\$8,915,330.26 has been expended)</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p>NEMA is struggling with issues of governance and maintenance of the network. Governance would be needed at the local jurisdiction and not at the state agency (there is no state agency is heading the project, it's all run at the local jurisdiction). There is no formal governance heading the project.</p> <p><b>April update:</b>            Lincoln Dispatch to Nebraska City is complete and has been tested. Materials are being moved out of the SE Regional warehouse to Grand Island and to Nemaha County. Work is slow due to a limited amount of grant funding. FCC filings are taking 30-45 days and some materials are 4-6 weeks out.</p> <p><b>February update:</b>            The finalization for the Boone Co tower is done and all systems are up and running. This was a major event as Boone Co. built a brand new tower. Most of the SE Region is waiting on FCC licensing. Once the licenses have been received, the contractor will climb the towers one more time to configure the RF Unit. When the weather clears this week, the crew will be working on completing the Grand Island to Lexington hop. This hop will complete the connection from the West to the East.</p> <p><b>Additional Comments/Concerns:</b>            It's possible that upcoming target dates might be missed. Based on the uncertainty of the infrastructure needed for the project and the time involved in obtaining the environmental approvals to proceed with the project, any target dates are fluid. Delays are inevitable due to the weather over the winter months and the difficulty in locating adequate tower sites and negotiating leasing agreements and/or MOU's.</p> <p>New grant dollars are in effect until August of 2016.</p>						

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
**Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

Project: <b>Medicaid Management Information System Replacement Project (MMIS)</b>	Contact: <b>Don Spaulding</b>					
Start Date	7/01/2014	Orig. Completion Date	TBD	Revised Completion Date	N/A	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>Nebraska’s current Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) has supported DHHS Medicaid operations since 1977. Medicaid is an ever-changing environment where program updates occur quickly. The need for access to data is increasing and technological enhancements are necessary to keep pace with program changes. Recognizing the need to implement new technology, and with the support of the Legislature, DHHS embarked on the planning phase for replacement of MMIS functionality.</p> <p>Project Estimates: \$113,600,000* (\$4,571,755 have been expended)            *Planning Expenditures include 7/01/2014 – 12/29/2016. Estimate is a rough order magnitude estimate based on information available. As the procurements are completed, categorical details will be available.</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p><b>April update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft Data Management and Analytics (DMA) RFP has been updated based on the vendor comment review process.</li> <li>• The updated RFP and funding request (IAPD) has been submitted to CMS for approval.</li> <li>• The Independent Verification and Validation (IV&amp;V) RFP was released on March 29, 2016</li> </ul> <p><b>February update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft Data Management and Analytics (DMA) RFP for comment was released to the public on 1/11/2016.</li> <li>• The DMA RFP evaluation criteria are being updated based upon peer review comments.</li> <li>• The Independent Verification and Validation (IV&amp;V) RFP is finalized. It has been submitted to CMS, and is being routed to DAS through the standard approval process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Comments/Concerns:</b></p> <p>Many state resources are not full-time on the project and have other duties including other Legislative mandates to implement which may have a higher priority than this project. Funding for the project is 90% federal funding and 10% state funding.</p>						

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
**Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

Project: <b>District Dashboards</b>	Contact: <b>Dean Folkers</b>					
Start Date	07/01/2013	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2015	Revised Completion Date	05/30/2016	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>Made possible by a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant from the United States Department of Education in 2012, the focus of the Nebraska Ed-Fi Dashboard initiative is to provide readily available data to the Nebraska classrooms to facilitate informed decision-making. Potential users include teachers, counselors, and administrators. NDE intends to leverage the Ed-Fi dashboard solution made available by the Michael &amp; Susan Dell Foundation to provide Nebraska with an advanced student performance dashboard system to be customized for Nebraska needs. The Ed-Fi data standard will serve to define the initial data elements powering the Nebraska Ed-Fi dashboard.</p> <p>Our Plan of Work for design, development, and piloting of the Nebraska Dashboards will commence in three phases, each to proceed subsequently upon successful completion of the previous phase, between the months of September 2013 and December 2014. The phases include: Phase I - Dashboard Readiness (September 2013-February 2014), Phase II – Dashboard Development (February 2014-June 2014), and Phase III – Dashboard Deployment (June 2014-December 2014).</p> <p>Project Estimate: \$466,623.75 has been expended, grant funds only</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p><b>April update:</b>            Currently we have six pilot districts and 12 Early Adapter Program (EAP) districts running in production. Four additional PowerSchool districts have requested production keys and are starting the production load process. Pilot and EAP districts have started preparations for limited release testing with additional district end-users. The team resumed work on the draft RFQ for SIS vendors. Team is on target to release the RFQ on April 15, 2016.</p> <p>Validation of data loaded to DWH and ADM will be delayed due to resource constraints. Creation of reports for accountability pilot testing is delayed. This will push the start of accountability pilot testing into spring 2016. NDE is still in the process of realigning staff responsibilities or hiring additional staff to provide the resource capacity for statewide rollout and long term maintenance.</p> <p><b>February update:</b>            January was <u>a very exciting and transitional month</u> as the project completed several major milestones. The project completed the production environment hardware setup, software deployment and validation with ESU3/SIMS mid-month. One PowerSchool and one ESU3/SIMS district loaded production data and validated login to their dashboards. The remaining five PowerSchool pilot districts have started loading production data.</p> <p>The team also completed the production deployment of Data Warehouse and Accountability Data Mart components. NDE will start user acceptance testing in February and March with a plan for district participation April – June.</p> <p>One Infinite Campus pilot district completed loading of 14-15 data and has started their vendor certification activities. Infinite Campus districts are transitioning to 15-16 school year to complete vendor certification activities.</p>						

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission**  
**Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

Project: <b>Medicaid Eligibility &amp; Enrollment System</b>	Contact: <b>Don Spaulding</b>					
Start Date	10/28/2014	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2016	Revised Completion Date	06/30/2017	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>The Affordable Care Act (ACA) included numerous provisions with significant information systems impacts. One of the requirements was to change how Medicaid Eligibility was determined and implement the changes effective 10/1/2014. As a result of the lack of time available to implement a long-term solution, the Department of Health and Human Services implemented a short-term solution in the current environment to meet initial due dates and requirements. This solution did not meet all Federal technical requirements for enhanced Federal funding but was approved on the assumption that a long-term solution would be procured. An RFP was developed and procurement has been completed with Wipro selected as the Systems Integrator for an IBM/Curam software solution.</p> <p>Project Estimate: \$57,741,564 (\$21,301,064 has been expended)</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p><b>April update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements Phase being wrapped-up. Exit criteria documentation in final stages of completion.</li> <li>State and Vendor finalizing remaining Requirement Phase Contract Deliverables, due for completion within next two weeks</li> <li>Technical Architecture design completed</li> <li>Build out of the Sandbox environment completed, user orientation completed, actual utilization ongoing</li> <li>IMS and Design Approach document continues to be reviewed and revised</li> <li>First 45 day plan for design being initiated to address key resource allocation and strategic planning activities</li> <li>Final Design IMS due for completion within the 45 day plan noted above</li> <li>Work continues on remaining business and operational processes.</li> </ul> <p><b>February update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design Approach document reviews continue.</li> <li>Work continues on remaining business and operational processes.</li> <li>Work and review of business and technical requirements continues.</li> <li>Preliminary Architecture for Data Conversion, Data Synchronization, Audit &amp; Logging, and Management &amp; Monitoring has been completed. Work on additional subject areas is progressing.</li> <li>Build out of the Sandbox environment underway.</li> <li>Fit-gap preparation activities in progress.</li> <li>Planning for fit-gap sessions underway.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Comments/Concerns:</b></p> <p>Many state resources are not full-time on the project and have other duties including other Legislative mandates to implement. The vendor is having difficulty filling key roles on the project and does not have enough people on the project to support current work plan. The vendor is taking steps to hire additional resources.</p>						

## **Nebraska Information Technology Commission Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

The project(s) listed below are reporting voluntarily and is not considered as an Enterprise Project by the NITC.

Project: <b>AFIS Upgrade Project</b>	Contact: <b>Tony Loth</b>					
Start Date	09/09/2015	Orig. Completion Date	11/30/2016	Revised Completion Date	TBD	
	April	February	January	December	November	October
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
<b>Project Description</b>						
<p>Nebraska’s AFIS (Automated Fingerprint Identification System) is the Nebraska fingerprint database. The system is used as a repository for all criminal and non-criminal fingerprint records for the state of Nebraska. For criminal purposes the system biometrically connects an individual’s criminal arrest record to a specific individual. For non-criminal purposes, the system is used for the purpose of conducting fingerprint-based background for employment or licensing purposes. Due to rapidly improving technology and hardware lifespan, it is necessary to upgrade AFIS approximately every 5-8 years.</p> <p>This upgrade will include the following major components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrading the existing biometric identification software platform from Printrak 9.7 platform to the new and improved MorphoBIS platform.</li> <li>2. Replacement of eight (8) existing tenprint workstations and seven (7) latent workstations that will not be compatible with the MorphoBIS software.</li> <li>3. Replacement of backend servers that were not replaced during Phase I of the upgrade.</li> </ol> <p>Project Estimate: \$1,997,000 (\$829,000 has been expended)</p>						
<b>Status Report</b>						
<p><b>April update:</b></p> <p>The focus of the work for the past month has been reviewing the Acceptance Test Plan to ensure that it includes a comprehensive review of the functionality of every aspect of the new system. This full testing will be conducted during Factory Acceptance Testing (FAT) and then again during Site Acceptance Testing (SAT). FAT is on target to be completed during the last week of April and the first week of May. SAT is scheduled for mid-July.</p> <p>Additional work is being done to verify the interface between AFIS and PCH (Patrol Criminal History) has been mapped correctly and is working.</p> <p><b>February update:</b></p> <p>The Requirements Definition Document (RDD) was completed and signed off on January 28. This milestone achievement is one of five milestones that trigger an installment payment for the overall cost of the project. MorphoTrak will be invoicing NSP for \$728,500. Work has already begun on reviewing the Data Dictionary. The purpose of the Data Dictionary is to define the specifications for each field within the AFIS. The specifications include the name of each field, the number of possible characters, the type of characters, the format of the data (MM/DD/YYYY or YY/MM/DD), required fields, pick lists, etc...A target deadline for approval of the Data Dictionary has not yet been identified.</p>						

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission  
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of April, 2016**

Color Legend		
	Red	<p><b>Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement.</b>            Probable that item will <b>NOT</b> meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope.</p>
	Yellow	<p><b>Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning.</b>            Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed.</p>
	Green	<p><b>Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.</b>            Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality.</p>
	Gray	<p><b>No report for the reporting period or the project has not yet been activated.</b></p>

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

**AMENDMENTS TO NITC 3-201 (Geospatial Metadata Standard)**

1. Section 1.1 is amended to read:

1.1 Steps/Timeline for Implementation

- a. State agencies and other applicable state funded entities shall institute procedures for complying with standard for new geospatial data development or acquisition upon adoption of standard by the NITC.
- b. State agencies and other applicable state funded entities shall complete initial listing of existing, applicable geospatial data holdings within three months of the adoption of standard by NITC.
- c. State agencies and other applicable state funded entities shall complete minimum metadata ~~metadata~~ documentation of existing, applicable geospatial data holdings within six months of the adoption of standard by NITC. More information about ~~metadata~~ minimum requirements are ~~is~~ identified in ~~section 3.0~~ Appendix I. Metadata Categories and Definitions.
- d. State agencies and other applicable state funded entities shall complete ISO 19115-compliant metadata documentation of existing and applicable geospatial data holdings within 12 months of the adoption of standard by NITC. Complete metadata categories and definitions are located in Appendix I.

2. Section 3 is amended to read:

3.0 Definitions

Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata - A comprehensive national metadata standard developed and adopted by the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) under the authority of Executive Order 12906, "Coordinating Geographic Data Acquisition and Access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure," which was signed on April 11, 1994, by President William Clinton. Section 3, Development of a National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse, paragraph (b) states: "Standardized Documentation of Data, ... each agency shall document all new geospatial data it collects or produces, either directly or indirectly, using the standard under development by the FGDC, and make that standardized documentation electronically accessible to the Clearinghouse network." This standard is the data documentation standard referenced in the executive order. Since its initial development, this metadata content standard has undergone revision as deemed necessary by the FGDC, and will like undergo further revisions in the

future.

Geospatial Data - A term used to describe a class of data that has a geographic or spatial nature. The data will usually include locational information (latitude/longitude or other mapping coordinates) for at least some of the features within the database/dataset.

ISO 19115:2003 – International Standards Organization (ISO) defines the schema required for describing geographic information and services. It provides information about the identification, the extent, the quality, the spatial and temporal schema, spatial reference, and distribution of digital geographic data. It is applicable to: the cataloging of datasets, clearinghouse activities, and the full description of datasets; and geographic datasets, dataset series, and individual geographic features and feature properties. It defines: mandatory and conditional metadata sections, metadata entities, and metadata elements; the minimum set of metadata required to serve the full range of metadata applications (data discovery, determining data fitness for use, data access, data transfer, and use of digital data); optional metadata elements - to allow for a more extensive standard description of geographic data, if required; and a method for extending metadata to fit specialized needs. It is applicable to digital data, its principles can be extended to many other forms of geographic data such as maps, charts, and textual documents as well as non-geographic data.

Metadata - Data describing a GIS database or data set including, but not limited to, a description of a data transfer mediums, format, and contents, source lineage data, and any other applicable data processing algorithms or procedures.

~~Metadata-lite – A subset of the full FGDC-compliant metadata (data title, data subject matter, map projection, geographic extent, data owner and access information, etc.) used primarily for the purposes of cataloging and enabling the use of automated search tools to find and access available geospatial data. Does not fully document the dataset's variables, assumptions or development process that is commonly needed to guide appropriate use.~~

3. The following new section is added:

### **Appendix I – Metadata Categories and Definitions**

This document provides categories and definitions of metadata information required for State of Nebraska geospatial data layers. The minimum and complete metadata requirements and timelines for completion involve the following:

- **Minimum**, completed within six months of data origination (Minimum fields are indicated with a **bold (M)** throughout this document.)

*Minimum:* A subset of the ISO 19115-compliant metadata used primarily for the

purposes of cataloging and enabling the use of automated search tools to find and access available geospatial data. Does not fully document the dataset's variables, assumptions or development process that is commonly needed to guide appropriate use.

- Complete Metadata, optional categories, recommended to be completed within 12 months

*Complete Metadata:* Remainder of ISO 19115-compliant metadata beyond minimum as indicated throughout this document.

1. Overview

a. Item Description

- i. **(M) Title - *The name by which the resource is known.***
- ii. Thumbnail - *A small graphic file stored that graphically identifies the resource.*
- iii. Tags - *A set of terms that can be used to search for the resource.*
- iv. Summary (Purpose) - *A summary of the intentions with which the resource was developed.*
- v. **(M) Description (Abstract) - *A brief narrative summary of the resources content.***
- vi. Credits - *A recognition of those who created or contributed to the resource.*
- vii. Use Limitation - *Describes limitations affecting the fitness of use of the resource.*
- viii. Appropriate Scale Range - *The range of scales at which this resource should be used.*

b. Topics & Keywords

- i. **(M) ISO topic categories - *Identifies the primary ISO themes associated with the resources content.***

Utilities & Communication	Military & Intelligence	Boundaries	Farming
Atmospheric Sciences	Economy	Elevation	Biota
Environment	Geoscientific	Health	Society
Imagery & Base Maps	Structure	Inland Waters	Transportation
Planning & Cadastral	Oceans	Location	

- ii. Content Type - *Indicates how you can access a shared copy of the resource.*
  - iii. Keywords - *Keywords that associate the resource with a subject or topic.*
- c. Citation
- i. **(M) Title** – *Title of the map that describes the manner in which the resource is represented. Could represent years and general idea of extent such as county or city.*
  - ii. Presentation Form - *Indicates the form in which the resource is provided.*
  - iii. **(M) Date** - *Date when the resource was created, published or revised.*
- d. Citation Contacts
- i. Name - *The name of a person associated with the resource.*
  - ii. Organization - *The name of an organization associated with the resource.*
  - iii. Position - *The name of a role or position associated with the resource.*
  - iv. Role - *Identifies the association between the responsible party and the resource.*

## 2. Metadata

- a. Details
- i. **(M) File Identifier** - *A unique identifier for the metadata. Typically a GUID, or country code.*
  - ii. Parent Identifier - *Unique identifier of the dataset to which this metadata is a subset.*
  - iii. Dataset URI - *The Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) of the resource.*
  - iv. Function - *Identifies the function available at the specified URI for this resource.*
  - v. **(M) Date** - *The date when the metadata was created or updated.*
  - vi. **(M) Language** - *The primary language of the information provided in the metadata.*
  - vii. **(M) Country** - *The country of the location.*
  - viii. Character Set - *The character encoding used for the metadata. Typically UTF-8.*
  - ix. Hierarchy Level - *The hierarchical scope to which the metadata applies.*
- b. Contacts
- i. **(M) Name** - *The name of a person associated with the resource metadata.*
  - ii. **(M) Organization** - *The name of an organization associated with the resource metadata.*
  - iii. **(M) Position** - *The name of a role or position associated with the resource metadata.*
  - iv. **(M) Role** - *Identifies the association between the responsible party and the resource metadata.*

Roles can include: Resource Provider, Custodian, Owner, User, Distributor, Originator, Point of Contact, Principal Investigator, Processor, Publisher, Author, Collaborator, Editor, Mediator, Rights Holder

- v. **(M) Address – *The address for the point of contact.***
  - vi. **(M) Phone – *The primary phone number for the point of contact.***
- c. Maintenance
- i. **(M) Update Frequency - *The frequency with which the metadata is updated.***
  - ii. Next Update - *The scheduled revision date.*
  - iii. Scope - *The scope of data for which this maintenance information applies.*
  - iv. Contact - *Contact information for the individual associated with metadata maintenance.*
  - v. Maintenance Note - *Describes the specific requirements for maintaining the metadata.*
- d. Constraints
- i. General - *Describes limitations affecting the fitness of use of the metadata.*
  - ii. Legal - *Restrictions, limitations, or warnings on using the metadata. (If applicable)*
  - iii. Security - *Identifies any handling restrictions on the metadata. (if applicable)*

### 3. Resource

- a. Details
- i. Status - *The status of the resource. (Ex - Under Development, Ongoing, Completed, etc.)*
  - ii. Credit - *A recognition of those who created or contributed to the resource.*
  - iii. Language - *The language of the information used within the data.*
  - iv. Country - *The country of the location.*
  - v. Spatial Representation Type - *Identifies the method used to spatially represent geographic information. (Ex - Vector, Raster, Tin, etc.)*
  - vi. Scale/distance Resolution - *Level of detail provided by the resource, expressed as the scale of a comparable hardcopy map or chart.*
  - vii. Browse Graphic - *File name of the graphic that provides an illustration of the resource.*
  - viii. Processing Environment - *Describes the data's processing environment, including the software and operating system used, and the file name and size.*
  - ix. Supplemental Information - *Provides additional descriptive information about the resource.*
- b. Service Details
- i. Name - *A name identifying the type of service provided by the resource. (Ex - WFS)*

- ii. Codespace - *Identifies the authority (Ex - 1.0.0 or 1.1.0)*
- iii. Access Properties
  - 1. Fees - *Describes any fees or terms for obtaining resource.*
  - 2. Availability Date/Period - *The date and time when the resource will be available.*
  - 3. Ordering Instructions - *Describes instructions, terms, and services provided by the distributor.*
- c. Extents
  - i. Description - *Describes the extent of the resource. (Ex - Nebraska)*
  - ii. **(M) Bounding box - Extents expressed in decimal degrees longitude and latitude.**
  - iii. Temporal Period - *The start and end time period associated with the resources content.*
- d. Points of Contact
  - i. Name - *The name of a person associated with the resource.*
  - ii. Organization - *The name of an organization associated with the resource.*
  - iii. Position - *The name of a role or position associated with the resource.*
  - iv. Role - *Identifies the association between the responsible party and the resource.*
- e. Maintenance
  - i. Update Frequency - *The frequency with which the resource is updated.*
  - ii. Next Update - *The scheduled revision date.*
  - iii. Scope- *The scope of data for which this maintenance information applies.*
  - iv. Contact - *Contact information for the individual associated with resource maintenance.*
  - v. Maintenance Note - *Describes the specific requirements for maintaining the resource.*
- f. Constraints
  - i. General - *Describes limitations affecting the fitness of use of the resource.*
  - ii. Legal - *Restrictions, limitations, or warnings on using the resource. (If applicable)*
  - iii. Security - *Identifies any handling restrictions on the resource. (if applicable)*
- g. Spatial Reference
  - i. **(M) Dimension - Horizontal, vertical or temporal.**
  - ii. **(M) Code - An alphanumeric value that identifies an authoritative reference (WKID)**
  - iii. **(M) Code Space - An alphanumeric value that identifies an authoritative reference (Ex - EPSG)**

- iv. **(M) Version - An numeric value that identifies an authoritative reference (Ex - 8.2.6)**
- v. **(M) Authority Citation**
  - 1. **Title - The name by which the cited resource is known (Ex-NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_Nebraska\_FIPS\_2600\_Feet)**
  - 2. **Date - The date the cited resource was created, published or revised.**
  
- h. Spatial Data Representation
  - i. Grid Spatial, Georectified, Georeferenceable, Vector or Indirect
  
- i. Content Information
  - i. Coverage description- *Identifies the information conveyed by the raster data.(if applicable)*
  - ii. Image description - *Identifies the information conveyed by the raster data.(if applicable)*
  - iii. Feature Catalogue - *Describes OGC catalogue compliance, name, codespace, language and country. (if applicable)*
  
- j. Quality
  - i. Scope Level - *Describes the specific data to which the data quality information applies.*
  - ii. Level Description - *Identifies the instance to which the information applies.*
  - iii. Extent - *Describes the extent of the resource.*
  - iv. Report
    - 1. Report Type - *Identifies the characteristic of the data whose quality was measured.*
    - 2. Dimension - *Identifies the axis to which the spatial quality information applies.*
    - 3. Description - *A description of the evaluation method.*
    - 4. Evaluation Method - *Identifies the type of method used to evaluate the quality of the data.*
  
- k. Lineage
  - i. Statement -*Provides a general description of the resource's lineage.*
  - ii. Data Source - *A detailed description of the source.*
  - iii. Process Step -
    - 1. **(M) Description - Describes the event, transformation, or process that occurred while maintaining the resource, including any parameters or tolerances that were used.**
    - 2. Rationale - *Describes why the process step occurred.*
    - 3. **(M) Date - Identifies the date when the process step occurred.**

4. Processor - *The name of a person or organization associated with the process step.*

I. Distribution

i. **(M) Distribution Format**

1. **(M) Format Name** - *The name of the data transfer format.*
2. **(M) Format Version** - *The version of the data transfer format (if applicable)*

ii. Distributor

1. Contact- *The name of a person or organization that is the distributor.*
2. Ordering Process - *Fees and availability and instructions.*
3. Distribution Format - *Format name and version.*
4. Digital transfer options- *Units and transfer size, or online resource.*

m. Fields

i. **(M) Label** - *The name of the resource.*

1. Entity Type

- a. Object - *An indication of the resource's type. (Ex. Table, feature class)*
- b. Count - *The number of objects contained by the resource.*
- c. **(M) Definition** - *A description of the features contained by the dataset.*
- d. **(M) Definition Source** - *The authority that provided the definition.*

2. **(M) Attribute (for each column)**

- a. **(M) Label** - *The name of the field. This must match the name of a column of data in the resource.*
- b. **(M) Definition** - *The description of the data contained by the field.*
- c. **(M) Definition Source** - *The authority that provided the description of the field.*
- d. **(M) Type** - *Indicates the data type used to store values in this field.*
- e. **(M) Width** - *The number of bytes that will be used to store the data in this column for one row.*

3. **(M) Domain**

- a. **(M) Value** - *Describes one of the repeating values that may occur in the field.*
- b. **(M) Definition** - *A description of the value or code stored in this field.*
- c. **(M) Source** - *The authority that provided the description of the value.*

ii. Overview

1. Summary - *A detailed summary of the information provided by the data.*

2. Citation - *A reference to the document that provides a complete description of the features, fields, and values that are provided by the resource.*

n. References

*i. Aggregate - Citation for the aggregate information.*

*ii. Portrayal Citation - The name by which the cited resource is known.*

*iii. Application Schema Information - Citation for the schema.*

o. Geoprocessing History

--

Current version: <http://nitc.nebraska.gov/standards/3-201.html>

**Request for Waiver on [NITC 8-303: Remote Access Standard](#)  
Under [NITC 1-103](#)**

The Nebraska Judicial Branch is requesting a waiver to apply to all offices performing functions under its authority, to include, Supreme Court and Court of Appeals; Administrative Offices of Courts and Probation and all divisions and locations thereof; trial courts, including county courts, district courts and separate juvenile courts, as well as all probation field offices.

Submitted by, on behalf of the Judicial Branch:

Jennifer Rasmussen  
Deputy State Court Administrator for Information Technology  
1445 'K' Street  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
(402) 471-3049  
[Jennifer.rasmussen@nebraska.gov](mailto:Jennifer.rasmussen@nebraska.gov)

The Judicial Branch is requesting an exception under the NITC 8-303 Remote Access Standard to continue to use Adobe Connect software as the method of recording and delivery of branch educational content.

The Judicial Branch understands, that because Adobe Connect is a 3<sup>rd</sup> party cloud-hosted software with the ability to initiate remote access to a computer on the state's network, which is not listed under Attachment A for 'Approved Remote Access Products' it is not in compliance with 8-303.

The state's standard solution for WebEx, is not a viable option for the judicial branch's educational software needs for the following reasons:

Presentations recorded through the WebEx software become very low-quality, and are not full-screen when downloaded and converted to a non-proprietary file type (even when 'high' quality is selected during the conversion process). This makes them unusable for a professional- grade educational program.

While the state's WebEx solution has many features that make would make it a very viable option for the Judicial Branch Education program, until issues with recording and re-use are resolved, an exception is deemed necessary.

The Judicial Branch is willing and able to stipulate that the 'remote access' feature within Adobe Connect will not be used to access computers on the state network, and will be disabled if possible; as a method of accomplishing the security goals and intent of standard 8-303, until such time as a transition to a compliant software can be achieved.

**State of Nebraska  
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

**AMENDMENTS TO TECHNICAL PANEL CHARTER**

1. Section 6 is amended to read:

6. Membership

6.1 ~~Number of Members~~

The Technical Panel ~~may include but not be limited to~~ shall be comprised of five members approved by the Commission.

~~6.2 Representation~~

~~6.2.16.1.1~~ One representative from the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission;

~~6.2.26.1.2~~ One representative from the office of Chief Information Officer;

~~6.2.36.1.3~~ One representative from the University of Nebraska Computing Services Network;

~~6.2.46.1.4~~ One member with expertise in assistive technology; and

~~6.2.56.1.5~~ One member representing K-12 education; and

~~6.2.6 Other members as specified by the Commission.~~

~~6.36.2~~ Member Recommendations and Approval

Recommendations for membership on the Technical Panel will be considered: ~~from the agency represented for members in sections 6.2.1 through 6.2.3;~~ from the CIO of the University of Nebraska and the CIO of the State of Nebraska for the member listed in ~~section 6.2.4;~~ Section 6.1.4 and from the Education Council of the NITC for the member listed in ~~section 6.2.5~~ Section 6.1.5.

~~All members of the Technical Panel~~ The members listed in Sections 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 must be approved by the Commission.

~~6.46.3~~ Member Responsibilities; Conflicts of Interest

A Member with a potential conflict of interest in a matter before the Technical Panel or a potential interest in a contract with the Technical Panel is subject to the provisions of the Nebraska Political Accountability and Disclosure Act including ~~sections~~ Sections 49-1499.02 and 49-14,102. A Member with a potential conflict of interest or a potential

interest in a contract shall contact the Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission and take such action as required by law.

2. Section 7 is amended to read:

## 7. Meeting Procedures

### 7.1 Chair~~(s)~~

7.1.1 A Chair, elected by the members, will conduct the meetings of the Technical Panel, oversee the establishment, operation and dissolution of committees, propose meeting agendas, and maintain the general operations of the Technical Panel.

7.1.2 The Chair of the Technical Panel will serve a one-year term beginning January 1 of each year.

### ~~7.2 Quorum and Action Items~~

~~An official quorum consists of at least 50% of the members or their alternates. No official voting business may be conducted without an official quorum. Issues shall be decided by a majority vote of the members present.~~

### ~~7.3 Designated Alternates and Non-voting Alternates~~

~~Each member of the Technical Panel shall designate one (1) official alternate to be approved by the Commission. This official voting alternate shall be registered with the Office of the Chief Information Officer and NITC and, in the absence of the official member, have all the privileges as the official member on items of discussion and voting.~~

### ~~7.47.2 Meeting Frequency~~

~~The Technical Panel shall meet not fewer than four times per year (quarterly).~~

### ~~7.57.3 Notice of Meetings~~

~~Notice of the time and place of each regular meeting of the ~~Council~~Technical Panel shall be made at least seven (7) calendar days prior to the meeting. Notice shall be published on the Technical Panel's website at <http://www.nitc.ne.gov/>.~~

--

Current version: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/technical\\_panel/documents/charter.pdf](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/technical_panel/documents/charter.pdf)