

AGENDA
TECHNICAL PANEL
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege Street
Lincoln, Nebraska
Tuesday, October 11, 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: August 9, 2016* (<i>Attachment 3</i>)	Chair
9:05 a.m.	4. Enterprise Projects a. Project Status Dashboard (<i>Attachment 4-a</i>)	A. Weekly
9:20 a.m.	5. Standards and Guidelines a. Requests for Waiver - Security Related Requests i. Department of Correctional Services* ii. Department of Labor*	C. Hobbs
9:40 a.m.	6. 2017-2019 Biennial Budget - Information Technology Project Proposals - Recommendations to the NITC* (<i>Attachment 6</i>)	R. Becker
10:25 a.m.	7. Work Group Updates and Other Business	Chair
10:30 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 and timing of items 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 August 17, 2016. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on October 6, 2016.

[Nebraska Open Meetings Act](#)

Attachment 3

TECHNICAL PANEL
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
Tuesday, August 9, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ROLL CALL; MEETING NOTICE; AND OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present to conduct official business. Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on June 23, 2016. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on August 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 JUNE 14, 2016 MINUTES

Mr. Winkle moved to approve the June 14, 2016 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 Closure Recommendations

Network Nebraska-Education Project -- Office of the CIO, University of Nebraska, and NET*
Tom Rolfes, Education I.T. Manager

Mr. Rolfes provided information about the history of the project. Mr. Weir wanted to acknowledge former key players that were also instrumental in initiating the project: Lt. Governor Kim Robak; Dr. Dennis Smith; Governor Dave Heinemann; Brenda Decker; Rod Armstrong; and Bill Miller. He commended Mr. Rolfes for his role in the project.

Next steps were discussed. A presentation to the Legislature about the success of Network Nebraska was recommended. Stakeholders are asking what is next and would like to look at the application layer of Network Nebraska.

Mr. Winkle moved to recommend project closure of the Network Nebraska-Education Project to the NITC. Mrs. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Winkle-Yes, Toner-Yes, Horn-Yes and Langer-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0 and Abstained-0. Motion carried.

District Dashboards Project -- Department of Education*
Dean Folkers, Nebraska Department of Education

The project which started in 2012 officially ended on June 30, 2016. The application being used is called ADVISER (Advance Data Views Informing Student Educational Response). It is a web-based view of

student and staff data that provides educators with a quick and easy way to personalize instruction and make data driven decisions. The partners in the project were:

- Ed-Fi Alliance
- Double Line Partners (DLP) to customize Ed-Fi for Nebraska's implementation; and
- ESU Coordinating Council for data hosting and SSO integration

The dashboard provides individual student data to district level for educators and superintendents. Using metrics, there is a built-in warning system so that educators will be able to determine at risk students.

The agency has established work groups to address security and audits. Mr. Weir commended the project on analytics and stated that it would be great to collaborate with higher educational institutions to carry on their academics into college.

Ms. Horn moved to recommend project closure of the District Dashboards Project. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Toner-Yes, Winkle-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Horn-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0 and Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Project Status Dashboard

Andy Weekly, OCIO Project Manager

Projects are progressing. The Technical Panel had questions and concerns about the NRIN (Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network) project. It was suggested to have them report at the next meeting.

Discussion followed regarding the Project Status report and adding a Technical Panel stoplight to dashboard report when appropriate.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Post for 30-Day Comment Period - Amendments to NITC 8-101*

The Work Group has been working on making the Security Standards and Guidelines will be broken down into subsections so that they are more concise and easier to find.

The Technical Panel took no action on this agenda item.

Requests for Waiver - Department of Health and Human Services*

Chris Hill, Department of Health and Human Services

Mr. Hill indicated that discussion of the waiver request would require discussion of security related issues.

Mr. Winkle moved to go into closed session to discuss security issues related to the Department of Health and Human Services' Request for Waiver. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

The Chair, Walter Weir, restated that the Technical Panel will go into closed session to discuss security issues related to the Request for Waiver.

The Technical Panel went into closed session at 10:19 a.m.

The Technical Panel returned to open session at 10:36 a.m.

Mr. Weir moved to approve the Department of Health and Human Services' Request for Waiver; waiver to expire on June 30, 2018. The Panel requests that the State Information Security Officer review the issues raised by this request and report back to the Panel by July 31, 2017. Mr. Winkle seconded. Roll call vote: Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, Winkle-Yes, and Toner-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

BIENNIAL BUDGET – PROJECT REVIEW TIMELINE

The project review timeline below was shared with panel members.

WORK GROUP UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS

There were no work group updates or other business.

ADJOURN

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

Meeting was adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

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 October, 2016

Project: Network Nebraska Education		Contact: Tom Rolfes				
Start Date	05/01/2006	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012	Revised Completion Date	08/10/2016	
	June	April	February	January	December	November
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
Project Description						
<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 (\$759,244 has been expended, \$56,738 over budget (108%))</p>						
Status Report						
<p>August update: Six new entities joined Network Nebraska-Education on July 1, 2016. Request to close project for NITC reporting.</p> <p>June update: Six (6) 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 & Parks Commission. Intents to Award Contract were issued on January 13, 2016 (delayed 20 days). As of May 25, all 13 provider contracts had been posted, a delay of over 60 days from expected. A separate RFI and RFP for the statewide backbone will follow the WAN circuit upgrade in late summer, early fall, 2016. The RFP 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 was 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 caused angst among many K-12 school districts as they prepared to do their federal E-rate filing before the May 26, 2016 extended deadline. The Office of the CIO will want to review RFP terms and conditions and whether alternate language can be constructed to make future years' procurements and contracting more expedient.</p> <p>Additional Comments/Concerns: 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 8/1/2016 so that all public school districts that want to participate have actually connected.</p>						

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

Project:	Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA)			Contact:	John Moon	
Start Date	07/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2011	Revised Completion Date	6/30/2017	
	October	August	June	April	February	January
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						

Project Description

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.

Project Estimate: \$4,329,379 (\$0.00 has been expended for FY 2017)

Status Report

October update:

Technical reports for NeSA will be delivered this month.

Tests forms for ELA, math, and science were completed on September 13, 2016. The enrollment window for NeSA materials will be open from October 3rd through October 14th. Districts will need to order the number of materials for paper (students with documented need), Large Print, Contracted English Braille, Uncontracted English Braille, and paper Spanish Translation assessments in eDIRECT. NeSA-Alternate assessments will be based on the number of students identified as requiring an Alternate Assessment in the Nebraska Student and Staff Record System (NSSRS). The Alternate Assessment Flag is an entry in the Special Education Snapshot with information noted on page 51 of the Student Template.

NeSA practice tests are available. The NeSA Practice Tests Online Administration Manual and the practice test video training are available on the Assessment page. The NeSA-ELA practice test includes technology enhanced items and a practice Text-Dependent Analysis at each grade. Technology enhanced items became available on September 30th for Check4Learning.

NeSA-Math Transition workshops are scheduled for the following dates at the various locations across the state. The workshops are:

- Gering, Gering Civic Center, Oct. 11
- Kearney, Younes Center, Oct. 12
- Norfolk, Lifelong Learning Center, Northeast Com College, Oct. 13
- Lincoln, Holiday Inn Downtown, Oct. 18
- Omaha, DC Centre, Oct. 19

DRC has not billed the Department of Education for 2016-17.

August update:

The 2015-2016 contract will close with the delivery of the reports for district, school and student during August. The final task will be accomplished when the NeSA and NeSA-AA technical reports are delivered.

For 2016-2017 there will likely be no NeSA grade 11 testing, likewise no writing tests for grades 4, 8, and 11 will be

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

administered this year. The final year of the current contract started July 1, 2016. Item writing including Technical Enhanced items (TE) for both the NeSA English Language Arts (ELA) and Math assessments have been written and reviewed. These TE items will be uploaded into the item bank for field testing in the spring of 2017. The 2016-2017 Check4Learning (C4L) will be available on July 22, 2016. Forms construction for NeSA and NeSA-AA will begin in September 12 and be completed by September 23.

Key Accomplishments since Last Report:

- The State Board approved the 2016-2017 contract with DRC which started July 1, 2016.
- Scores have been reviewed to eliminate errors such as duplicates, wrong IDs, etc. during June and July based on feedback from Nebraska school districts.
- The final score resolutions will be sent to DRC on August 10, 2016.
- New items were developed with Nebraska teachers including Technically Enhanced items (TE) for math and ELA.
- NDE has released an RFP for a college entrance exam (see website for RFP).

Upcoming Activities this reporting period:

- NDE will send updated list of districts and schools to DRC for 2016-2017 assessment cycles.
- NDE staff will approve math sampler items for the math and alternate assessments practice tests.
- Along with DRC's support NDE staff will develop the test forms for the 2017 NeSA tests based on item parameters and test criteria for large scale assessments.
- NDE will approve NeSA test manuals and training for the 2017 test cycle.
- In October NDE and DRC will provide one day professional development sessions for district/school math staff members at five locations throughout the state of Nebraska on the 2018 college and career standards and the new item types to measure the more rigorous standards.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

July 2016 - 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 and mathematics tests (NeSA-RMS) for July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. 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. The testing window for NeSA-RMS and NeSA-AA will start on March 2016 and end on May 5, 2016.

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

Project: Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)		Contact: Sue Krogman				
Start Date	10/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/01/2013	Revised Completion Date	09/30/2016	
	October	August	June	April	February	January
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
Project Description						
<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: \$10,024,084 (\$8,745,330.26 has been expended)</p>						
Status Report						
<p>October update: Work is being completed between Gibbon and Kearney to finalize the linear connection of the West to the East. Other areas being worked on are from Albion to Platte Center, Bruning to Gladstone and all of Cass County. Beatrice dispatch is in the process of connecting the network for their dispatching.</p> <p>August update: Continued work on the line from Grand Island to Lexington. New structural analysis is being performed on Atlanta NET as well as towers that will also host the SRS system. Small funding allocations will be a cause for schedule delays. The allocations are a result of the SHGP grant amounts and the distribution of State and Local agreed upon funds.</p> <p><u>Key Accomplishments since Last Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The installation of 3 sites along the I-80 corridor. <p><u>Upcoming Activities this reporting period:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To complete the installation from Grand Island to Lexington and then up to Oconto. • Turn it on and get it tested. <p>Additional Comments/Concerns: 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. Additional delays will be caused by small funding allocations. FCC filings are taking 30-45 days and some materials are 4-6 weeks out. New grant dollars are in effect until August of 2018.</p>						

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

Project: Medicaid Management Information System Replacement Project (MMIS)		Contact: Don Spaulding				
Start Date	7/01/2014	Orig. Completion Date	TBD	Revised Completion Date	N/A	
	October	August	June	April	February	January
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
Project Description						
<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>						
Status Report						
<p>October update: The Data Management and Analytics (DMA) RFP was released on June 1, 2016. Five (5) bidder proposals were received on September 20, 2016. Proposal evaluation will be completed on October 21, 2016.</p> <p>A Project Coordination Committee was established to address system integration across the MMIS Replacement Projects and related systems, such as Eligibility and Enrollment.</p> <p>The Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) RFP was awarded to First Data Government Solutions, LP and is in process of contract finalization.</p> <p><u>Key Accomplishments since Last Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DMA RFP proposal evaluation process including training and selection criteria was approved by all Stakeholders. Evaluation began September 27, 2016 and runs through October 21, 2016. The Project Coordination Committee was established, consisting of key individuals across the DHHS enterprise. IV&V RFP award was protested and resolved. Contract with First Data Government Solutions, LP is currently being finalized. An update to the PAPD was submitted to CMS. <p><u>Upcoming Activities this reporting period:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder review of the DMA RFP took longer than planned. The amount of interest from the vendor community resulted in 519 questions that was much more than anticipated. <p>August update: The Data Management and Analytics (DMA) RFP was released on June 1, 2016 with bidder proposals due September 20, 2016. The Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) RFP selection has been recommended to DAS with a published intent to award to First Data Government Solutions, LP. The funding request for implementation (IAPD) has received CMS approval. NOTE: Current planning activities are funded under an approved CMS PAPD.</p> <p>Stakeholder review of the DMA RFP took longer than planned. The amount of interest from the vendor community resulted</p>						

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

in 519 questions that were much more than anticipated.

Key Accomplishments since Last Report:

- 519 DMA RFP vendor questions were received. The responses to the questions were posted on July 28, 2016.
- IV&V RFP proposals were received and scored. A Best and Final Offer (BAFO) resulted in an award recommendation with First Data Government Solutions, LP to DAS.

Upcoming Activities this reporting period:

- DMA evaluation process and materials are being developed. Evaluation team training is being scheduled.
- IV&V RFP will be awarded and contracted.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

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.

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

Project: District Dashboards		Contact: Dean Folkers				
Start Date	07/01/2013	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2015	Revised Completion Date	06/30/2016	
	June	April	February	January	December	November
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
Project Description						
<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 & 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>						
Status Report						
<p>August update: Successfully completed the pilot testing for the ADVISER dashboard. Request to close project for NITC reporting.</p> <p>June update: The contract end date was extended until 6/30/2016 to align with the end of the grant period. Currently we have six pilot districts and 12 Early Adapter Program (EAP) districts running in production. The Phase II Early Adopter Program has started and around 80 districts are participating. The team is wrapping up the dashboard pilot testing with the six PowerSchool pilot districts and 12 EAP districts. Certification testing of Infinite Campus Phase II development continues with NDE/DLP and McCook pilot district. NDE and DLP have been holding regular knowledge transfer sessions for the Accountability Data Mart (ADM) and pilot testing of the ADM implementation is in progress.</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. Pilot test of the dashboard will continue until the end of June. Pilot testing of the DWH/ADM continues until the end of June. Associated knowledge transfer for DWH/ADM continues thru June. 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. ESUCC staff is shared between multiple projects and therefore availability and allocation varies.</p> <p>Creating an NSSRS migration strategy and plan for statewide rollout. Target timeline has been identified. Team working on detailed migration plan.</p>						

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

Project: Medicaid Eligibility & Enrollment System		Contact: Don Spaulding				
Start Date	10/28/2014	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2016	Revised Completion Date	06/30/2017	
	October	August	June	April	February	January
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
Project Description						
<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>						
Status Report						
<p>October update:</p> <p>The Nebraska Eligibility and Enrollment Solution (NE EES) project is in the design phase. Design activities are being executed per the integrated master schedule (IMS). The project team has identified 2 areas of the design that are pushing out the design completion dates. Those areas are Functional Delivery Units (FDUs) and data conversion. Members of the project team are working with the project board to mitigate. Key members of the project have resigned and are no longer with the project from both Wipro and the State. Resource allocation to impacted areas of work is being assessed and staffed.</p> <p>Major areas of design work for the business are packaged in Functional Delivery Units (FDU). Business design activities are In-progress for FDU 1 (MAGI), FDU 2 (Non-MAGI) and FDU 3 (case, appeals & notices). Major technical areas of the project include data conversion, data synchronization, interfaces, environments, audit/ logging, reporting, data warehouse and security / privacy. The project follows a rolling wave project methodology. The development phase approach and integrated master schedule (IMS) activities are starting.</p> <p><u>Key Accomplishments since Last Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data conversion mapping from the source system NFOCUS to the target system NTRAC is on schedule. The team has completed the initial mapping and gap analysis is underway. File formats are being created to prepare for extract design and development. • A comprehensive security matrix has been created and is getting incorporated into all aspects of the project work. The security matrix includes CMS standards. • 15 interface control documents have been delivered and the State is reviewing, provided feedback and moving toward acceptance. • The production class data conversion environment statement is being reviewed by the State. • Conducted multiple design sessions for FDU-1 (MAGI) and FDU-2 (Non-MAGI) to define the capability of the Curam OOTB solution to satisfy business requirements. • Completed final reviews for key sections of business rules - Curam Rate Tables, MAGI Chip Eligibility, MAGI Common 						

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of October, 2016

- Financial and Non-MAGI ABD rules Group.

Upcoming Activities this reporting period:

- Data conversion mapping for entity group 3 and continued gap analysis. Extract file design and development will begin in October.
- Design JAD sessions for Audit and logging strategy - State review and provide feedback on application, middleware, database layers.
- Security and privacy operating assumptions – initial State review and feedback
- 11 Interface JAD sessions are planned for October. Continued review, feedback and acceptance of ICD documents.
- Development environment requirements and planning work sessions will be held with the State.
- Continue design activities for FDUs already in progress
- Kick-off design for FDU-4
- Commence definition of content to be included in FDU-5
- Continue work to conclude definition of additional Business Rules

August update:

The Nebraska Eligibility and Enrollment Solution (NE EES) project is executing the design phase of the project. Stakeholders from the state are participating in Joint Application Design (JAD) sessions. JAD sessions are collaborative working meetings that allow stakeholders to discuss how to incorporate Nebraska specific requirements into the design of Nebraska Timely, Responsive, Accurate, Customer Service (NTRAC). JAD sessions are held for both business and technical design.

Design activities are being executed per the integrated master schedule (IMS). Major areas of design work for the business are packaged in Functional Delivery Units (FDU). Technical areas of the project are underway including data conversion, data synchronization, interfaces, environments, audit/ logging and security/ privacy.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

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.

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

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

Project: AFIS Upgrade Project	Contact: Tony Loth					
Start Date	09/09/2015	Orig. Completion Date	11/30/2016	Revised Completion Date	TBD	
	October	August	June	April	February	January
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Quality						
Project Description						
<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"> 1. Upgrading the existing biometric identification software platform from Printrak 9.7 platform to the new and improved MorphoBIS platform. 2. Replacement of eight (8) existing tenprint workstations and seven (7) latent workstations that will not be compatible with the MorphoBIS software. 3. Replacement of backend servers that were not replaced during Phase I of the upgrade. <p>Project Estimate: \$2,020,500 (\$1,880,500 has been expended)</p>						
Status Report						
<p>October update:</p> <p>Project is nearing completion. Cutover to the new system started the afternoon of Friday, September 30. Final data migration from the old system to the new was completed over the weekend. Tenprint and latent workstations were installed at the NSP crime lab, NSP CID office, Lincoln Police Department, Omaha Police Department and Kearney Police Department. On Monday, October 3, applicant livescans were brought back on-line and applicant fingerprint submissions were allowed to be submitted to the new system.</p> <p><u>Key Accomplishments since Last Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End user training was completed for all AFIS users. • Data clean-up projects were completed. • Work queues were zeroed out. • Work stations were installed. • Cutover to the new system was completed. <p><u>Upcoming Activities this reporting period:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFIS Administrator training will be completed in October. • Go-Live punch list items will continue to be resolved. • Final System Acceptance validation will occur. • Live RISC testing to be completed. 						

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

August update:

The decision has been made to add two change orders to the scope of the project contingent on securing funding. Combined cost for the change orders is \$23,000. NSP is seeking approval from the Bureau of Justice Statistics to change the scope of the 2015 NCHIP grant to include these two change orders within the grant project.

The project continues to be on track for an October 3 implementation.

Key Accomplishments since Last Report:

- All hardware has been shipped and received in Nebraska with no issues.

Upcoming Activities this reporting period:

- MorphoTrak employees are now on site to set up the new system and to begin testing connectivity with the FBI and interfaces with other NSP systems in preparation for Site Acceptance Testing (SAT).
- Site Acceptance Testing will be on August 15.

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

Attachment 6

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

**2017-2019 Biennial Budget
Information Technology Project Proposals
Summary Sheets**

(Full text of project proposals:
http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2017-2019.html)

**Nebraska Information Technology Commission
2017-2019 Biennial Budget - Information Technology Project Proposals**

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY18	FY19	Total*
13-01	DEPT OF EDUCATION	IT Education Systems of Support	\$ 7,724,365	\$ 840,000	\$ 15,633,707
13-02	DEPT OF EDUCATION	Teacher Cert System Upgrade	\$ 275,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 550,000
23-01	DEPT OF LABOR	Modernization of UI Tax and Benefits System	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 14,000,000
39-01	NEBRASKA BRAND COMMITTEE	NBC Database System	\$ 216,000	\$ 216,000	\$ 432,000
46-01	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	CIT [Corrections Information and Tracking system]	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,400,000
47-01	EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMM	KHNE TV Transmitter	\$ 365,000	\$ -	\$ 365,000
47-02	EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMM	Radio Transmission Replacement	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 700,000
47-03	EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMM	KHNE Tower Lighting System	\$ -	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000
54-01	STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY	Storage and Preservation of 12 TB Historical Data	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 270,000
65-01	DEPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation	\$ 7,181,000	\$ 10,577,000	\$ 17,758,000

Notes:

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

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: IT Education Systems of Support

NITC ID: 13-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Dean Folkers

Agency: 13 - Department of Education

NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The primary purpose of this Shared Systems and Supports project creates a fundamental shift toward efficiency in access to digital learning resources and tools. The proposed approach reduces local and state burdens, increases equitable access to digital education, and improves the privacy and security of student information across Nebraska. The comprehensive nature of the project supports a significant need found by a recent study estimating that Nebraska's K-12 Public School districts spend approximately \$100 million annually on software licenses and staff, including over 655,000 hours each year submitting data for reporting purposes. The study also found the size of a school often determines the level of access to digital learning resources and tools. Primary reasons include costs and capacity to support.

The details in this proposal reveal alignment to NDE Strategic Priorities, to the Nebraska's Statewide Technology Plan: An Enterprise Vision for IT in Nebraska, specifically in the areas of cost savings realized through eliminating duplication, and centralizing services; and to the OCIO Top Priorities Centralize-Optimize-Standardize. Highlights in the plan include:

- Efficiencies through an estimated per-pupil cost savings of between \$100 - \$300 per pupil;
- Timely and cost effective upgrades to future technology implementations in a nimble and responsive environment;
- Targeted and coordinated professional development;
- Transitions resources from supporting technology to supporting teaching and learning;
- Enhances security and privacy of student information; and
- Provides equitable access to all services and resources to both rural and urban districts.

Building on the strong statewide success of Network Nebraska for Internet access, this project addresses the efficient availability of educational resources like software applications, training, and supports to most effectively use the network. As the Nebraska Department of Education supports and coordinates delivery of solutions meeting expectations of stakeholders, there is a need to stay current with the exponentially increasing pace of technology innovation. Shared sustainable resources allocated for continuous updates to modern and efficient systemic solutions support the future of education in Nebraska all while increasing efficiency, access, and security.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$6,020,000.00	\$6,256,133.00	\$12,276,133.00
Telecommunications:	\$20,580.00	\$21,197.00	\$41,777.00
Training:	\$70,000.00	\$79,000.00	\$149,000.00
Operating Costs:	\$1,497,585.00	\$1,553,012.00	\$3,050,597.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$116,200.00	\$0.00	\$116,200.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$7,724,365.00	\$7,909,342.00	\$15,633,707.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$7,479,223.00	\$7,672,500.00	\$15,151,723.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$245,142.00	\$236,842.00	\$481,984.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$7,724,365.00	\$7,909,342.00	\$15,633,707.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: IT Education Systems of Support

NITC ID: 13-01



		reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	15	12	14
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	22	25	20	22
	Technical Impact (20)	18	19	10	16
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	7	10	8	8
	Risk Assessment (10)	7	10	6	8
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	15	20	15	17
	Total Score	84	99	71	85

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: This proposal is well articulated, thorough and consistent with best practices regarding IT spending and development.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 22/25

Strengths: Business case is well stated and documented.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Strong partnerships with OCIO. Emphasis on enterprise solutions rather than disparate systems across the state.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 7/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Ambitious plan and schedule. Impact of not meeting proposed schedule unclear.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 7/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Scope of project and change management required during implementation implies significant risk.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: A certain level of trust is granted due to the overall excellence of the proposal.

Weaknesses: Lack of details makes close analysis difficult.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: This is probably the most comprehensive and well written proposal I've seen in many years.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: The project justification and business cases well thought out and very clearly stated. the shared systems and support model is clearly explained and it is good to see the amount of support from the partners associated with this project.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 19/20

Strengths: It is still early in this project to get any real details about the technical components of the overall project, however the intent and the direction as described do not appear, at this point to be technically unachievable.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: The proposal describes an excellent project management approach to implementing the shared systems and support project. Roles and responsibilities are clearly identified staffing considerations appear appropriate and monitoring of the implementation seems to be well thought out.

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: IT Education Systems of Support

NITC ID: 13-01



Strengths: The author of the proposal does point out that a project of this scope will require a great deal of coordination communication and skills from a wide range of participants. I did like the risk sharing comment that NDE and partners are solely responsible for all risks of the shared systems and supports project.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Based on the assumptions in the financial analysis and budget portion of the proposal there will be a tremendous amount of savings by moving to this model. The document points out they are estimating a \$31.3 million in savings per year after the third year of making the changes, that is rather significant.

Weaknesses:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: Goals are clearly articulated and aligned with industry best practices. The proposed project builds atop existing work that requires greater resources if it is to be generalized to provide statewide benefits.

Weaknesses: The goals of the project are clearly defined by the requesting agency, however, it is less clear that those goals have widespread support from the stakeholders as what is most needed to improve teaching and learning throughout the state. That is not to say that the goals aren't appropriate, only that many school districts have not been engaged in the dialogue that arrived at this set of goals.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 20/25

Strengths: The proposal provides persuasive evidence for the need to streamline the acquisition, reporting, and presentation of data. Consolidation and coalescence of efforts to develop, maintain, train and support a suite of teaching, learning and administrative applications is a necessary step to moving the focus from integrating technology to its integral use where it can be leveraged to obtain desired learning outcomes.

Weaknesses: The proposal language makes it clear that consolidation of efforts can result in greater efficiency, however, it is not clear that the level of savings can be realized. In the opinion of the reviewer, the more likely outcome is that consolidation of efforts will result in higher yield from a like or similar expenditure.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: The merits of consolidating software/hardware/application/platform/services are clear and there is little doubt that the delivery of services across the state is varied.

Weaknesses: The linkage between standardizing and centralizing technology with a shift in the focus of district personnel is an outcome that is not supported by any empirical data presented in the proposal. Additionally, the greatest threat to information security at this time is poor data sharing practices and the lack of security training for end users. There is little doubt that the proposed approach may have the desired impact from a technology perspective but without sufficient preparation of end users the approach is incomplete.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: The projects seeks to use industry standards for project management, change management, and project evaluation. The proposal outlines a number of additional staff resources assigned to expected outcomes and timelines.

Weaknesses: The project timelines are aggressive and the deliverables are articulated in general terms.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 6/10

Strengths: The proposed project management practices are designed to identify, mitigate and remediate risk.

Weaknesses: There are a host of technical and human risks associated with a project of the proposed scope. The description of risk associated with district implementation is very limited. If the proposed project is to have the enumerated outcomes, much is dependent upon the implementation with districts.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: Intended expenditures are clearly articulated.

Weaknesses: Premised savings to districts are mathematically demonstrable, however, the degree to which they can be achieved is not supported by the proposal.

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: IT Education Systems of Support

NITC ID: 13-01



Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: Teacher Certification Upgrade

NITC ID: 13-02



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Dean Folkers

Agency Priority: 2

Agency: 13 - Department of Education

NITC Tier Alignment:

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The teacher certification (TC) and licensure system operated at the Nebraska Department of Education has undergone periodic maintenance and operational retrofitting over the past 15 years. As part of a department wide focus on evaluating systems status, increasing efficiency and operations, and mitigating security risks the TC system has been identified as needing to go through an update. A portion of the licensing fees provided by users is set aside to support future updates/upgrades to the system and are targeted for the process.

The primary scope of an initial phase is the evaluation and documentation of business process, integration of other existing related legacy systems, and a recommendation for the options to move forward with the system upgrade/development. Based on these recommendations and decision will be made as to the appropriate path, costs, and project plan to complete the work.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$275,000.00	\$275,000.00	\$550,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$275,000.00	\$275,000.00	\$550,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Fund:	\$275,000.00	\$275,000.00	\$550,000.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$275,000.00	\$275,000.00	\$550,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

	reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average				
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	12	15	10	12
Project Justification / Business Case (25)	24	25	15	21
Technical Impact (20)	15	10	10	12
Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	7	10	8	8
Risk Assessment (10)	5	5	6	5
Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	15	15	15	15
Total Score	78	80	64	74

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: Teacher Certification Upgrade

NITC ID: 13-02



Strengths: Existing system is 20-25 years old and needs to be brought up to standards. Review, planning and setting requirements is a sound approach of addressing the problems.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 24/25

Strengths: This project has been anticipated, and use of cash funds that were set aside for this purpose makes sense.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Solutions are unknown until recommendations from selected vendor are reviewed.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 7/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Unclear what is being deployed in April through June.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Proposal states risks cannot be assessed until solutions are proposed.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Budget establishes "target" costs. Actuals could vary - how significantly is unknown.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: The goals and objectives are quite clear, as are the benefits of the system.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Project proposal does identify tangible benefits that will accrue based on the implementation of the system. should be noted that this is a starting point for this project and that a solution has not been identified.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: Because the solution for this project has not been identified and is very difficult to assess the technical solution.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: It is very positive to see that the NDE project management office will be responsible for overall management of the project. What's provided in the document is very well thought out and clearly identifies roles and responsibilities.

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: Somewhat difficult to assign risk when it is still not clear what the solution will be. I think risk can be assigned or reviewed once the requirements have been gathered and the solution identified.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: While the agency has identified a budget estimate for the project, it is not clear what the total overall cost will be once the solution is identified

Weaknesses:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 10/15

Strengths: The need for an update to the existing teacher certification system is clear based on the age of the existing system and desired functionality.

Weaknesses: There is very little detail in available upon which to assess the proposal, however, what is being proposed is to scope a future project.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 15/25

Strengths: The desired outcomes are desirable and would offer operational efficiencies.

13 - Department of Education

Proposal Name: Teacher Certification Upgrade

NITC ID: 13-02



Weaknesses: There is very little detail in available upon which to assess the proposal, however, what is being proposed is to scope a future project.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: The proposed update is clearly needed to replace a system based on an aged code base.

Weaknesses: At this point in the process it is nearly impossible to assess the technical impact beyond a clear need to remove the risk inherent in operating a mission critical system on such aged technology.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: The project management infrastructure is consistent with industry best practice and appears capable of addressing the requirements of managing the proposed project.

Weaknesses: There are numerous implementation differences depending upon whether the decision is to build the solution or buy it. It is impossible to make any evaluation of an eventual implementation without greater detail.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 6/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: It is impossible to make any reasonable assertions as to the assessment of risk when the project is not scoped.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: The proposed is, essentially, budget neutral in that existing funds will be diverted to cover identified costs.

Weaknesses: The proposed budget is fit to available funds rather than clearly delineating required resources.

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

23 - Department of Labor

Proposal Name: Modernization of UI Tax and Benefits System

NITC ID: 23-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Terri Slone
Agency: 23 - Department of Labor
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The Nebraska Department of Labor (NDOL) will do a total replacement of the existing unemployment insurance (UI) business systems, including the Benefit Payment System (BPS), employer portal (UIConnect), and Tax Management System (TMS). The solution will be a single UI benefits and tax system utilized by both external and internal customers (i.e., employers, claimants, third parties, and staff), fully integrated with the existing NEworks reemployment/employment and case management system and interfaced with other systems as required by the UI program. The implementation will include replacement of existing system platforms, applications, mainframe databases, and processes to support the federally funded UI and reemployment/employment programs.

Currently NDOL's systems reside on separate platforms. BPS and UIConnect are web-based Java applications on an AIX/IBM p750 Series platform with DB2 on the mainframe. TMS is a COBOL application with DB2 on the mainframe. NEworks is a COTS solution with a SQL database. The complexity of the environment requires the agency to contract for managed services to support the IBM platform. The environment requires continual care and feeding, including upgrading hardware and software, in addition to ongoing significant infrastructure costs (see Cost Justification). The integration between BPS and NEworks supports UI, as well as the NERes and RESEA reemployment programs. Because data is shared and the applications are tightly integrated, the complexity of synchronizing both often requires development and duplicity on both sides. The integration between the systems is handled through tokens and web services. A single system would remove the technical barriers described above.

The NERes and RESEA reemployment programs – getting unemployed workers reemployed sooner – are important to Nebraska's economy and to Nebraska employers as it impacts their unemployment insurance tax experience rates, and ultimately, the solvency of the unemployment trust fund.

The proposed single COTS solution would replace existing unemployment systems while providing complete transparency between unemployment and reemployment. The solution would align with the State's mission of providing solutions that make government work and grow Nebraska's economy.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$7,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00	\$14,000,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$7,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00	\$14,000,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$7,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00	\$14,000,000.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$7,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00	\$14,000,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

23 - Department of Labor

Proposal Name: Modernization of UI Tax and Benefits System

NITC ID: 23-01



		reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	12	15	12	13
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	20	20	23	21
	Technical Impact (20)	20	18	15	18
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	8	8	6	7
	Risk Assessment (10)	10	8	0	6
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	15	16	15	15
	Total Score	85	85	71	80

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Strengths: Single platform and database

Weaknesses: "Reduce support requirements" benefit needs clarification in regards to FTE/Contractor count.

Review Score = 12/15

Project Justification / Business Case

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 20/25

Technical Impact

Strengths: Technically valid modernization path.

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 20/20

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 8/10

Risk Assessment

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 10/10

Financial Analysis and Budget

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Need additional information on the ROI. Specifically - Cost of support of legacy and new systems during migration.

Level of FTE/Contractor support after migration is complete and plans to recover reduced resource support costs.

Review Score = 15/20

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Strengths: The idea of a one stop single solution will greatly improve customer experience and reduce complexity.

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 15/15

Project Justification / Business Case

Strengths: Based on the proposal cost justification is predicated on potential savings

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 20/25

Technical Impact

Strengths: While the commercial off-the-shelf solution has not been identified yet the decision has apparently been made to utilize the SQL database instead of the IBM DB2 database.

Weaknesses:

Review Score = 18/20

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Strengths: it does appear that Department of Labor does have a project management team which is good and also includes a PMO.

Weaknesses: The implementation discussion in the proposal is fairly light on details.

Review Score = 8/10

Risk Assessment

Strengths: While the proposal states that it will reduce risk, and I am sure it will once it is installed.

Weaknesses: The proposal does not address risks associated with migrating to a new system. What is their fallback position?

Review Score = 8/10

23 - Department of Labor

Proposal Name: Modernization of UI Tax and Benefits System

NITC ID: 23-01



Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 16/20

Strengths: Yes there is a financial document and highlights at a high level the approximate costs.

Weaknesses: Not sure what is all included in these costs, implementation support, training, staff augmentation etc.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The projects goals are clear and concise. Goals 1 and 4 are particularly good, due to the definition of how much the cost and numbers of systems will decrease

Weaknesses: The requestor should include details for goals 2 and 3 about measuring the change in re-employment speed and lower support requirements. For the support requirements goal, if that's also meant to be cost-specific, those two might be re-worded.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths: All costs for the current, selected and competitor solutions are clearly defined. The breakeven and savings analyses also clearly show the benefit.

Weaknesses: The cost sheet does not include any reference to enhancements or any maintenance costs that may occur over the life of the project, regardless of the option selected. Is that effort meant to be included in the "IT Staff" costs, or are those costs specific to keeping the system operational?

Technical Impact

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: The reduction of technologies and adherence to State, Federal and NITC standards are all positives, concerning the impact.

Weaknesses: Information about any considerations given to compatibility with other statewide infrastructure (Citizen Active Directory Forest, any state-level data warehouse initiatives), as well as rationale for moving to SQL from DB2 would improve this section.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 6/10

Strengths: Sufficient coverage of all responsible parties and the project start and end dates.

Weaknesses: Major milestones and intermediate deliverables would improve the plan. Additionally, a description of the provider's experience as well as any options for what the training (both public and internal) would look like would add value.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 0/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: This section is meant to highlight risks to the project, not risks avoided by implementing the project. Consider issues like: cost overruns to due integration complexity, changes on external systems (Federal systems for example) during development, changes in law. Since federal funds are being requested, another risk to cover would be if those funds were either reduced or no longer available.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: The costs provided are all reasonable, assuming the staff costs are covered in the Department's annual budget outside of the project.

Weaknesses: The project costs in the IT Project Proposal Report (23-01.pdf) requests \$14MM in Federal Funds. There's no commentary around where those funds are coming from and what their availability is.

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

23 - Department of Labor

Proposal Name: Modernization of UI Tax and Benefits System

NITC ID: 23-01



Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

39 - Nebraska Brand Committee

Proposal Name: Nebraska Brand Committee (NBC) - Database System
NITC ID: 39-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Shawn Harvey
Agency: 39 - Nebraska Brand Committee
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The Nebraska Brand Committee has a proposal from Nebraska Interactive LLC to develop a program to automate many of its functions, increase efficiencies such as reducing data entry and call volume, and implementing additional audit controls.

The program will develop a mobile brand inspection application for inspectors to include supplying mobile devices and printers. The program will also include implementation of payment processing, minimizing the need for inspectors to hold and carry or check payments. The payment data along with the inspection records will automatically be submitted to the NBC Database System, eliminating data entry, providing timely receipt and disbursement of monies, and access to inspection records.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$216,000.00	\$216,000.00	\$432,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$216,000.00	\$216,000.00	\$432,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Fund:	\$216,000.00	\$216,000.00	\$432,000.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$216,000.00	\$216,000.00	\$432,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

	reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average				
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	11	15	14
Project Justification / Business Case (25)	20	20	25	22
Technical Impact (20)	18	15	16	16
Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	8	10	9
Risk Assessment (10)	10	6	8	8
Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	15	20	18
Total Score	93	75	94	87

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

39 - Nebraska Brand Committee

Proposal Name: Nebraska Brand Committee (NBC) - Database System

NITC ID: 39-01



Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 20/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 18/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths: I believe this will be of financial value due to greater efficiency and overall reporting and analytics.	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 11/15
Strengths: Conceptually a good project.	
Weaknesses: Not sure all aspects of operation have been considered and all of the variability of devices that can or will be used.	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 20/25
Strengths: This appears to be a project consistent with the Governor goals/expectations	
Weaknesses: Not comfortable with the numbers provided for accomplishing the project. Believe the numbers may be low in the cost of the total project.	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 15/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses: concerned with the overall security or need for security of the project. Could not determine from the proposal if there was security provided at all levels of the operation or if the customer was not required to have any form of secure ID for using the system.	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 8/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses: The plan for implementation contains a lot of scoping and discovery meetings. The proposed project could change during the initial phases.	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 6/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses: If there was a better explanation of overall security, this number could be higher, but there is a concern on the overall security/ID operation of the application	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 15/20
Strengths: project income is good	
Weaknesses: projected costs may be off for development and hardware/device costs.	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 15/15
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 16/20
Strengths:	

39 - Nebraska Brand Committee

Proposal Name: Nebraska Brand Committee (NBC) - Database System

NITC ID: 39-01



Weaknesses: Connection to the internet is required by user of system, This will be a mobile systems that stores and uploads data when internet not available, not clear how data lose from device would be handled. Mobile devices should be running some type of MDM (mobile device management) for security. Will devices be used for access to other internet sites?

Technical support for devices not clearly defined.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Use of mobile devices in the field new for this agency. User training will be critical as well as call support to answer user question when running application in the field.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: cost risk to agency minimized based on fee based charges,

Weaknesses:

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: CIT - Corrections Information and Tracking System
NITC ID: 46-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Ron TeBrink
Agency: 46 - Department of Correctional Services
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The Nebraska Department of Corrections operates 10 facilities responsible for 6500 inmates with a staff of 2200 employees. Currently Inmate accounting is in the Corrections Information and Tracking system (CIT) and was developed and then implemented on May 1, 1997. This system is crucial to the stability of maintaining accurate financial records for the inmate population. This is a mainframe system that has reporting limitations from the start the system. Certain reports and data can only be obtained through Structured Query Language (SQL) which runs against the live production system. Since being developed almost 20 years ago, the advancement of technology and platforms has given us the opportunity to develop a more efficient, effective and supportable application.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$700,000.00	\$700,000.00	\$1,400,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$700,000.00	\$700,000.00	\$1,400,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$700,000.00	\$700,000.00	\$1,400,000.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$700,000.00	\$700,000.00	\$1,400,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

		reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	10	10	9	10
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	16	13	15	15
	Technical Impact (20)	12	12	10	11
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	5	5	5	5
	Risk Assessment (10)	7	10	5	7
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	13	13	10	12
	Total Score	63	63	54	60

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 10/15

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Lack of details.

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: CIT - Corrections Information and Tracking System

NITC ID: 46-01



Project Justification / Business Case

Strengths:
Weaknesses: Benefits, other than replacing outdated and inefficient system, are not articulated. Review Score = 16/25

Technical Impact

Strengths:
Weaknesses: Lack of details restricts the technical impact scoring. Review Score = 12/20

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Strengths: Implementation plan is vague and incomplete. Review Score = 5/10
Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Strengths: Risk is substantial. Review Score = 7/10
Weaknesses: Proposal scoring is limited by lack of details.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Strengths:
Weaknesses: What the financials are based upon is not documented. Review Score = 13/20

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Strengths: Understand the objective, Review Score = 10/15
Weaknesses: the description is unclear as to the final product. Written as if the reviewer already has a full understanding of NDCS operations.

Project Justification / Business Case

Strengths:
Weaknesses: No idea what NiCams is or the need for integration. Difficult to evaluate with little knowledge or understanding of how this is a beneficial move. Agree with moving from the mainframe Review Score = 13/25

Technical Impact

Strengths: Quite likely a very good project, however Review Score = 12/20
Weaknesses: Again, no understanding of the end goal and system to evaluate for value.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Strengths:
Weaknesses: Proposal needs more work and detail to provide a complete review. Review Score = 5/10

Risk Assessment

Strengths: agree with the mainframe risk Review Score = 10/10
Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Strengths:
Weaknesses: not enough info provide to support the overall project benefit.. Review Score = 13/20

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Strengths: There is little doubt that a system nearly to decades old where reporting requires direct database access is in significant need of update for information security, data privacy, human interface and efficiency reasons. While basing decisions on data is an important goal, simple operational efficiency is reason enough to consider updating the existing system. Review Score = 9/15
Weaknesses: Brevity and concision are admirable qualities, however, in this case the proposer did not provide adequate information.

Project Justification / Business Case

Strengths: Replacement of the existing system is beneficial for all the reasons previously stated. Review Score = 15/25
Weaknesses: While the business case is easily made for updating the existing environment, very scant information was provided to assess the proposal. The lack of specificity in what is being proposed makes it impossible to fully evaluate the business case.

Technical Impact

Strengths: The proposer articulates both a clear need to update the existing environment and provides a possible alternative. Review Score = 10/20

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: CIT - Corrections Information and Tracking System

NITC ID: 46-01



Weaknesses: There is no evidence provided as to what alternatives have been investigated and what ability there is to execute the proposed project.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: The articulated plan outlines a process of scoping the project based on stakeholder input.

Weaknesses: There is not adequate detail to determine what will be implemented, how it will be implemented or the project resources that will be committed.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: The need to update the existing system is clearly articulated.

Weaknesses: The proposer provides very little information as to the "what" and the "how" of getting from the current situation to the desired outcome.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Based on the available information it is impossible to determine what is being funded.

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: KHNE TV Transmitter
NITC ID: 47-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Ling-Ling Sun
Agency: 47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

NET seeks funding to replace the television transmitter at KHNE (Hastings). The present transmitter is a 21-year old Inductive Output Tube (IOT) liquid cooled model that was modified for DTV transmission in 2003. IOT transmitters are no longer manufactured and the tubes are very difficult to acquire. The IOT at KHNE was last replaced in 2014 with a spare tube that was shipped from France. The new solid state transmitter will be a much more energy efficient solid state transmitter which will be upgradeable to the impending ATSC 3.0 broadcast standard. Delaying the replacement risks significant broadcast television service outages if repairs are required due to the scarcity of parts. Any outage would also effect satellite and central Nebraska cable subscribers.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$365,000.00	\$0.00	\$365,000.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$365,000.00	\$0.00	\$365,000.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$365,000.00	\$0.00	\$365,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

		<u>reviewer1</u>	<u>reviewer2</u>	<u>reviewer3</u>	<u>Average</u>
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	14	15	15
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	24	25	25
	Technical Impact (20)	20	19	20	20
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	9	10	10
	Risk Assessment (10)	10	10	10	10
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	19	20	20
	Total Score	100	95	100	98

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: KHNE TV Transmitter

NITC ID: 47-01



Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 14/15
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 24/25
Strengths: Good justification to update obsolete hardware.	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 19/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 9/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 19/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 15/15
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: KHNE TV Transmitter

NITC ID: 47-01



Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: Radio Transmission Replacement
NITC ID: 47-02



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Ling-Ling Sun
Agency: 47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 2

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

NET is requesting an appropriation to replace aging FM antenna and feed line at FM sites KUCV (Lincoln), KTNE (Alliance), KRNE (Merriman), and KXNE (Norfolk). The antennas and feed lines at KTNE and KXNE are 26 years old, KRNE's is 16 years old and KUCV's is 15 years old. Replacing this equipment and older components would be done to reduce rising maintenance costs and to eliminate downtime. Also, the NET FM system is the State of Nebraska's primary relay system for the Emergency Alert System. This is the final phase of updating the statewide NET Radio Network. Delaying the completion of this final phase any further would just continue to increase off-air, downtime at these sites and increase annual operating expenses for repairs, maintenance and supplies. The project would begin the summer of 2017 and proceed through the fall (weather and tower crews permitting) at KUCV and KTNE. Work on the KRNE and KXNE sites would begin summer of 2018 and run thru the fall of 2018. Delaying the work heightens the risk that tower crews will be difficult to schedule and may be more expensive due to anticipated demand related to spectrum repacking adjustments on television towers and a nationwide shortage of tower crews.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$700,000.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$700,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	
General Fund:	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$700,000.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$700,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

		reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	15	15	15
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	25	25
	Technical Impact (20)	20	20	20	20
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	10	10	10
	Risk Assessment (10)	10	9	10	10
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	20	20	20
	Total Score	100	99	100	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: Radio Transmission Replacement

NITC ID: 47-02



Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 15/15
Strengths: Good justification.	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 9/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 15/15
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: Radio Transmission Replacement

NITC ID: 47-02



Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: KHNE Tower Lighting System
NITC ID: 47-03



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Ling-Ling Sun
Agency: 47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 3

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

This request is for the replacement of the Tower Lighting system at KHNE (1105 W 6 Road Giltner NE 68841). Federal Aviation Administration guidelines require structures that exceed 200 feet above ground level or are sufficiently close to an airport runway must be lit to set specifications. The KHNE tower is 1240 feet, which requires it to be lit at night and during inclement weather. The existing incandescent lighting system is 48 years old. NET intends to purchase a new LED tower lighting system which meets the requirements set forth by the Federal Communications Commission and Federal Airline Authority. The LED system is energy efficient, is more reliable, has better visibility, and does not require NET to paint tower as part of required maintenance.

This is a high priority capital construction project related to complying with federal regulations that needs to start as soon as possible. Delaying the work heightens the risk that tower crews will be difficult to schedule and may be more expensive due to anticipated demand related to spectrum repacking adjustments on television towers and a nationwide shortage of tower crews.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	\$125,000.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	\$125,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	\$125,000.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	\$125,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

		reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	15	15	15
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	25	25
	Technical Impact (20)	20	20	20	20
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	10	10	10
	Risk Assessment (10)	10	10	10	10
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	19	20	20
	Total Score	100	99	100	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: KHNE Tower Lighting System

NITC ID: 47-03



Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 15/15
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Risk Assessment	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Financial Analysis and Budget	Review Score = 19/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
<hr/>	
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	Review Score = 15/15
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Project Justification / Business Case	Review Score = 25/25
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Technical Impact	Review Score = 20/20
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	Review Score = 10/10
Strengths:	

47 - Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission

Proposal Name: KHNE Tower Lighting System

NITC ID: 47-03



Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

54 State Historical Society

Proposal Name: Storage and Preservation of 12 TB Historical Data
NITC ID: 54-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Jay Shaeffer
Agency: 54 State Historical Society
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

Establishing a basic level of digital preservation functionality via cloud storage is the first step in addressing the two critical challenges NSHS faces: (1) preservation of and (2) access to an increasing volume of data (currently ~12 TB). Statute requires NSHS to collect and preserve government records, now mostly digital-born. NSHS must make historic resources accessible, increasingly online. Aging servers show data at risk. Cloud storage and access will cost ~\$90,000/year is not currently funded.

NSHS is challenged by existing ad hoc digital storage and management. Born digital materials are increasingly generated by staff and state agencies. Planning for the long-term preservation and access of digitized historic materials and digital born records is underway. Preservation of digital data is the first step in a larger strategic effort.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$90,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$180,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$90,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$180,000.00

Comments: An additional \$90,000 was requested in future fiscal years.

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$90,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$180,000.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$90,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$180,000.00

Comments: An additional \$90,000 was requested in future fiscal years.

PROPOSAL SCORE

		reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	13	13	12	13
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	20	21	20	20
	Technical Impact (20)	16	16	16	16
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	7	8	8	8
	Risk Assessment (10)	8	8	8	8
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	18	18	19
	Total Score	84	84	82	83

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 13/15

Strengths: Need is sufficiently defined.

Weaknesses:

54 State Historical Society

Proposal Name: Storage and Preservation of 12 TB Historical Data

NITC ID: 54-01



Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 20/25

Strengths: OCIO involvement strengthens project proposal.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 16/20

Strengths: This score is based on the request for redundant storage, not on the future development project that is mentioned.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 7/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Unclear if limited IT resources at NSHS will be adequate to complete the project on time.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Proposal addresses risks and agency has undertaken appropriate research and planning.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Proposal is based on OCIO estimates.

Weaknesses:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 13/15

Strengths: Effectively stated their need.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 21/25

Strengths: Definitely a need for replacement of aging hardware. NSHS will need to ensure their data has been classified appropriately prior to moving it to any Cloud solution.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 16/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Plan seems reasonable. It will be important to make sure data is correctly classified and NSHS has full knowledge of bandwidth requirements, retention policies and back out plans.

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Appears research has been done. Might be valuable to share that information with the OCIO as you work with them on this project.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Appropriate OCIO rates have been used.

Weaknesses:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The goal of cheaper storage can be achieved with this project.

Weaknesses: The longer term goal of retrieval of stored data could prove to be more challenging and costly than budget can support.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 20/25

Strengths:

Weaknesses: project only addresses the cost to store data, access to stored data could be more costly than anticipated.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 16/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Additional technical resources may be required to complete this project. Limited agency IT staff may not be sufficient.

54 State Historical Society

Proposal Name: Storage and Preservation of 12 TB Historical Data

NITC ID: 54-01



Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Strengths:

Weaknesses: data migration could be challenging and method of public access not well defined.

Review Score = 8/10

Risk Assessment

Strengths:

Weaknesses: scope and resources required may not be available or outside of currently budget request.

Review Score = 8/10

Financial Analysis and Budget

Strengths:

Weaknesses: cost analysis is based on storage cost only.

Review Score = 18/20

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation
NITC ID: 65-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Byron Diamond
Agency: 65 - Administrative Services
NITC Tier Alignment:

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

Migrate five current disparate IT systems individually supporting human resource and benefit management, employee recruiting and development, payroll and financial functions, and budget planning to a cloud-based single enterprise platform. The migration will include implementation of two new modules: E-Procurement and Budget Planning. The end state would be the realization of operational, process, and expense synergies by moving to a single enterprise platform at the end of this migration.

Various options and alternatives were analysed to determine the best way to leverage technology to improve the business processes and reduce the overhead costs for the State of Nebraska's enterprise HRM/ERP system. The approach described herein allows us to meet our operational objectives of continuously improving efficiency and processes, reducing costs, and capitalizing on technology.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	<u>Expenditures</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual Services:	\$6,620,000.00	\$8,280,000.00	\$14,900,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operating Costs:	\$561,000.00	\$2,297,000.00	\$2,858,000.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$7,181,000.00	\$10,577,000.00	\$17,758,000.00

Comments:

	<u>Funding</u>		
	<u>Fiscal Year 2018</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2019</u>	<u>Total</u>
General Fund:	\$7,181,000.00	\$10,577,000.00	\$17,758,000.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revolving Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Requested Funding:	\$7,181,000.00	\$10,577,000.00	\$17,758,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

	reviewer1	reviewer2	reviewer3	Average
Average				
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	14	15	12	14
Project Justification / Business Case (25)	15	25	15	18
Technical Impact (20)	5	15	10	10
Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	5	7	5	6
Risk Assessment (10)	5	2	5	4
Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	8	18	12	13
Total Score	52	82	59	64

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 14/15

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation

NITC ID: 65-01



Strengths: The goals and objectives have been clearly stated. In reading the document it appears to me that DAS is looking for a (SaaS) software as a service solution cloud-based environment.

Weaknesses: I think it is important to recognize that a SaaS solution is different than other cloud models. With a SaaS solution the software keys are turned over to the selected vendor who runs all aspects of the software solution responsible for everything including application performance security upgrades access and the hardware platform. Lost will be the ability to customize software applications, which may or may not be a bad thing.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 15/25

Strengths: It is fairly clear, from reading the business case justification, that the current environment is untenable as evidenced by the challenges stated in the document.

Weaknesses: I'm not sure the risks associated with the change of this magnitude have been fully identified. I did not see anything related to a sound cloud exit strategy which I believe is very important. I'm also concerned with the integration that will be necessary with this project as it moves to a cloud environment. My assumption, after reading the document, that they want to move everything to the cloud but that will have to be done in some sort of a staged manner in my view.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 5/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: It was not much of any technical impact described within the document. Clearly they are looking for a cloud-based ERP solution. My biggest concern is with the transition process that will take time, and will be rather complex. Another major concern is we are adding complexity to an already complex technology architecture, the potential of runaway cloud transition project cost, the risk of exposing sensitive data, the risk of service disruption and risk associated with choosing a cloud vendor. Possibly more detail in the proposal would help overcome some of my concerns

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: Implementation will be conducted in two phases over a two-year period of time with everything online as of November 2019

Weaknesses: This is a very aggressive transition implementation. Did not see any discussion of staff being dedicated to this process only and nothing else. Did not see any discussion of how processes that operate one way with the current system may have to be transitioned to work in the cloud solution. Having implemented several previous ERP systems, it is safe to say nothing works quite the same in a new system as it used to.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Other than a statement that both the legacy and new systems will run in tool during the migration and up to three months after migration, nothing else related to risk was mentioned.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 8/20

Strengths: There was financial information provided

Weaknesses: While financial data was provided I did not see or have access to the subscription fee detail. I am assuming this is an RFP type of project and I am a bit concerned with the level of specificity when it comes to the subscription fees seems awfully specific.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Detailed coverage of all expected goals, financial, user-related and technical.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Project justification documents cover significant tangible and intangible goals.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: Strong description of current environment and on how the future state will be an improvement.

Weaknesses: Little commentary on migration from the current system to the future system. There is minimal description of any technical details of how the new system will integrate with remaining on-premise systems, such as Active Directory (for the Single sign-on objective), any timesheet utilities that may exist on a mobile platform and other data center-based databases or data warehouses, as well as any existing cloud infrastructure.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 7/10

Strengths: The initial two phases described are a great start.

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation

NITC ID: 65-01



Weaknesses: Additional milestones, such as data conversion timelines, training schedules (both for technical admins and end users, possibly by module) would improve schedule accountability. Experience info about project stakeholders would also improve the score in this section.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 2/10

Strengths: System concurrency is a critical way to mitigate risks for such a highly integrated migration.

Weaknesses: No discussion of any other possible risks: integration/migration, conversion, ability for vendor to integrate with any existing enterprise cloud assets, budget (especially the impact of a technically complex project and reliance on contractors to execute), schedule.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Great detail of how the projects costs and savings will be derived, module by module and year by year.

Weaknesses: Minimal description of where projected costs come from, including contingency rate and details on customizations required once the project begins.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The anticipated outcomes of greater system coherence, manageability, information security and data privacy are achievable goals with tremendous potential to improve operational effectiveness.

Weaknesses: The risk associated with a project of this magnitude is considerable and it is difficult to determine what specific alternative is being proposed.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 15/25

Strengths: The need to consolidate is clear in order to achieve the desired outcomes.

Weaknesses: Consolidation and cloud-delivered infrastructure, platform, software and data-recovery "as a service" has the potential to address many of the shortcomings associated with the current environment. That said, there is not sufficient information provided to determine the "what" and the "how" of what is being proposed. While the "why" is well articulated in the attachments, the aphorism "the devil is in the details" definitely applies and based on the proposal it is impossible to assess.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: Simplifying the existing environment has significant technical benefits.

Weaknesses: Consolidation and cloud-delivered infrastructure, platform, software and data-recovery "as a service" has the potential to address many of the shortcomings associated with the current environment. That said, there is not sufficient information provided to determine the "what" and the "how" of what is being proposed. While the "why" is well articulated in the attachments, the aphorism "the devil is in the details" definitely applies and based on the proposal it is impossible to assess.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: The preliminary plan is not documented to any significant degree. This is an enormous undertaking deserving of greater specificity as to what is being proposed and how the implementation will be successfully conducted.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: The risks are not articulated and the mitigation strategy of running the systems in parallel is, in itself, a risk with respect to information security, data privacy and data integrity.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 12/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Without considerably more detail it is impossible to evaluate the budget in the context of what is being proposed.

TECH PANEL COMMENTS

Is the project technically feasible?

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation

NITC ID: 65-01



Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?

ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Advisory Council Tier Recommendation:

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS