AGENDA
TECHNICAL PANEL
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege Street
Lincoln, Nebraska
Tuesday, June 12, 2018
9:00 a.m.

9:00 a.m. 1. Roll call; meeting notice; Open Meetings Act information.

2. Public comment.

3. Approval of the April 10, 2018 meeting minutes.* (Attachment 3)

4. Projects; enterprise project status dashboard. Andy Weekly. (Attachment 4)

5. Technical standards and guidelines.
   a. Request for Waiver 18-03, Dept. of Education.* David Hefley.
      (Attachment 5-a)
   b. Recommendations to the commission on the following proposals:
      i. Proposal 18-01, agency information technology plans.*
         (Attachment 5-b-i)
      ii. Proposal 18-02, information technology project proposals.*
          (Attachment 5-b-ii)
      iii. Proposal 18-03, revise existing documents for consistency.*
           (Attachment 5-b-iii)
   c. Post for 30-day comment period; Proposal 18-04, GIS standards for state agencies.* (Attachment 5-c)

6. Work group updates; other business.
   a. Reschedule October meeting from October 9 to October 24. (Attachment 6-a)
   b. Update on assistive technology member recommendation.

10:30 a.m. 7. Adjourn.

* Indicates an action item.

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 April 13, 2018. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on May 29, 2018.
MEMBERS PRESENT:
Kirk Langer, Chair, Lincoln Public Schools
Ed Toner, Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska
Mark Askren, University of Nebraska
Mike Winkle, Nebraska Education Telecommunications

ROLL CALL; MEETING NOTICE; AND OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Langer called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on February 23, 2018. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on April 6, 2018. A copy of the Nebraska Open Meetings Act was posted on the wall of the meeting room.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 13, 2018 MINUTES

Mr. Toner moved to approve the minutes as presented. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Askren-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

PROJECTS

Enterprise project status dashboard.

Mr. Weekly reviewed the enterprise project status report.

NRIN (Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network). The panel request an update on the following: an updated map of the tower work that has been completed, is in-progress, and remaining work; and information regarding sustainability of the system.

Oracle Fuzion (Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation). NITC commissioners Walter Weir and Dorest Havey met with Byron Diamond to discuss issues and ask questions about the project. Mr. Weir and Mr. Weekly have been invited to attend the monthly project status meetings. Mr. Weekly was asked to inquire if the state information security officer could attend the status meetings as well.

Recommendation to the NITC to designate the Centrex Replacement project (Office of the CIO) as an enterprise project.

Project Description: To secure the most cost effective Hosted Voice Over Internet Protocol Telephony (COIP) Services. This solution will replace the State’s Centrex service through the State of Nebraska. The purpose of the project is to provide phone service that includes the most up-to-date VOIP features and functionality as a hosted services with equipment ownership, maintenance and service remaining with the contractor.

The current system is a Centrex system that will sunset in 2018. There will be no capital outlay involved. No money is being requested or appropriated. The services will be charged back to state agencies. The project must be completed by end of 2019. The RFP has been released. Some providers have indicated...
they can get the work done within 3 months. There will be more information to share in the August meeting. The OCIO is voluntarily requesting that this be designated as an enterprise project.

Mr. Winkle moved to recommend to the NITC that the Centrex Replacement project be designated as an enterprise project. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Askren-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Toner-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Approve the following projects for voluntary review status: Mainframe Active-Active (Office of the CIO) and Novell to Netscaler (Office of the CIO).

The OCIO has asked that these two projects be considered for voluntary review status.

Mr. Winkle moved to approve the Mainframe Active-Active project and the Novell to Netscaler project as voluntary review projects. Roll call vote: Langer-Yes, Toner-Yes, Winkle-Yes, and Askren-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Request for Waiver 18-02, Dept. of Veterans’ Affairs.

The waiver request is for the following:
Article 3 Access control
  8-303 Identification and authorization
    (1) Unique ID
    (3) Shared IDs
Article 5 System Security
  8-504 Minimum workstation configuration
    (9) Shared Logon Accounts are forbidden

Mr. Hobbs reviewed the request and recommended approval.

Mr. Toner moved to approve the Department of Veterans’ Affairs request for waiver; waiver to expire on April 30, 2020. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Askren-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Revise or revoke existing waivers relating to security standards which were repealed by Proposal 17-01. Chris Hobbs.

Game and Parks; 8-302; January 8, 2008.

Mr. Toner moved to revoke the waiver. Roll call vote: Toner-Yes, Langer-Yes, Askren-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Department of Agriculture; 8-302; November 8, 2011.

Mr. Toner moved to revoke the waiver. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes, Askren-Yes, Langer-Yes, and Toner-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Dept. of Health and Human Services; 8-302; October 14, 2014
Dept. of Health and Human Services; 8-301; August 9, 2016, and Dept. of Health and Human Services; 8-302; August 9, 2016.

Mr. Winkle moved to revoke the waivers. Roll call vote: Askren-Yes, Langer-Yes, Toner-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

WORK GROUP UPDATES; OTHER BUSINESS.
There were no work group updates.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

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

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 the IBM/Curam software.

### Key Accomplishments

- Based on the new implementation approach, analysis was completed on the impact to interfaces. The team is now working on the design requirements from the change.
- The project team has over 100 use cases in action. The use cases explain the system requirements in detail from a business perspective. Testing, development, change management and training will utilize the use cases.
- State Policy team approved all MAGI Display rules design documents.
- The team resolved 138 out of 250 economic assistance MAGI development defects.

### Status Report Update

The Master Client Index (MCI) did not implement in April of 2018. After a thorough go/no go criteria review, the Project Board decided to not implement the MCI to allow additional time to refine the MCI design and address outstanding disaster recovery testing, service level agreements (SLA) and operations and maintenance procedures. The team has worked the issues to closure. The new MCI implementation date is August 12, 2018.

NTRAC is transitioning from a big bang project implementation to a phased implementation approach. The project Steering Committee approved a 2 phase approach to help reduce risk to citizen populations and overall impact to DHHS. The first implementation will focus mainly on MAGI populations and the second implementation will be non-MAGI populations.

Project leadership team is working toward hosting the NTRAC solution in the State data center. Currently the solution is hosted at the vendors (Wipro) data center. Impacts to the timeline to re-host are being evaluated. In addition, the State has been informed the solution hardware will be end of life in September 2019. The State is considering options for procuring a new platform.

The project Steering Committee is considering a change to the timeline based on the phased implementation and re-platform. The project team is developing the work plan and milestones. The next step is to present the project plan to the project Steering Committee.

### Upcoming Activities

The project team is working on the master schedule based on a phased implementation and re-host / re-platform.

The Master Client Index (MCI) testing phase will begin June 15th.

### Current Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project RAID Board (Risks, Actions, Issues, Decisions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Znamenacek, Brad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Project RAID Board (Risks, Actions, Issues, Decisions)**

- **Risk:** Project RAID Board (Risks, Actions, Issues, Decisions)
- **Probability:**
- **Impact:**
- **Priority:**
- **Status:** Open
- **Target Resolution:** 2/28/19
- **Owner:** Znamenacek, Brad
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.

Key Accomplishments

- Completed business, technical and certification requirement validation sessions and documentation.
- Drafted DMA data source/interface framework organizing all primary, secondary and ancillary current state DHHS data sources and interfaces.
- Continued joint project management office (PMO) operations using the Deloitte Project Management Center (PMC) tool suite.
- Implemented “DMA Office Hours” concept, allowing users to facilitate questions of the Deloitte implementation team via use of the Health Interactive pilot environment, and in keeping with requirements, user story development and design.
- Commenced deliverable expectation document (DED) reviews for the Comprehensive Test Plan, Infrastructure and Solutions Lifecycle Management Plan, Data Management Plan, Data Modeling Plan and others.
- Completed a successful State handoff of R1 Certification activities to Deloitte Consulting, LLP and commenced R2-R3 efforts including Certification Plan deliverable collaboration.
- Conducted DMA MCE Kickoff and began outreach and planning efforts with other external project and system support teams where interface development and coordination are needed.
- Began organizational change management planning.

Status Report Update

The Data Management and Analytics (DMA) project formally kicked off 02/01/18 and has completed its initial discovery and requirements activities in concert with systems integration partner and vendor, Deloitte Consulting, LLP.

The project has been divided into logical work tracks that align to the functions of the DMA and its associated systems. Each work track is now organizing sprint teams that will engage in design via joint application review (JAR) sessions and track-specific agile sprint sessions.

The project is underway. The scope of work being implemented in the original 16 month Design, Development and Implementation (DDI) schedule is being re-assessed and reallocated to the Maintenance and Operations phase of the project. The Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) deliverable will change to reflect these adjustments.

Project Description

Upcoming Activities

- Garner scope change and IMS deliverable approval.
- Commence agile development sprints and initial design activities.
- Complete initial User Story and Epic development.
- Continue review of upcoming Deliverable Expectation Documents (DEDs) and Deliverables.
- Continue Medicaid Enterprise Certification Lifecycle (MECL) Review 2 (R2) certification planning and documentation efforts using CMS’s Medicaid Enterprise Certification Toolkit (MECT) framework.
- Commence initial Data Governance Program stand up activities.
- Complete the next stage of a rolling, monthly updated, 120 day forward-looking project plan window. This includes IMS updates to the details behind hybrid-agile design, build and test sprints needed to implement functionality that will ensue from requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claims Broker Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>11/30/16</td>
<td>Spaulding, Don</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Storyboard: Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Krogman, Sue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Report Date</td>
<td>6/7/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$12,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td>$10,405,204.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate to Complete</td>
<td>83.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status Report Indicators**

- Overall
- Schedule
- Scope
- Cost and Effort

**Project Dates**

- **Plan**: Start 10/1/10, Finish 8/31/19
- **Baseline**: Start 10/1/10, Finish 8/31/19
- **Days Late**: 0

**Project Description**

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.

**Key Accomplishments**

- Finalization and testing is being done in Cass County. Tecumseh Sheriff’s Office is getting the NRIN equipment installed.
- Path Calcs are being done from KRVN to Lexington Dispatch, from Minden to Axtell and from Grand Island to Hastings. They are also being processed to finish the layout of the line from Nebraska City to Falls City to Pawnee City.
- Mappings are being done from Saunders Co to Washington Co. Mappings and Structural are also being done on 3 towers in the Valley and Custer County areas.

**Status Report Update**

- Path Calcs are being done from KRVN to Lexington Dispatch, from Minden to Axtell and from Grand Island to Hastings.

**Upcoming Activities**

- Mappings and Structural are also being done on 3 towers in the Valley and Custer County areas.

**Issues by Priority**

**Risks by Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding adequate towers to locate the NRIN system on</td>
<td>✶ ✶ ✶ ✶</td>
<td>✶ ✶ ✶ ✶</td>
<td>✶ ✶ ✶ ✶</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>Weekly, Andy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUs and Lease Agreements</td>
<td>✶ ✶ ✶ ✶</td>
<td>✶ ✶ ✶ ✶</td>
<td>✶ ✶ ✶ ✶</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>Weekly, Andy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Risks**

- More Risks...
### 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.

### Key Accomplishments

1. Overall statewide summative testing went well.
2. Some issues with technology did occur with ACT. According to ACT, different factors affected online testing, including URLs that had not been white-listed, not having completed mock administrations, and not locking down the system after the system check was completed. Use of wireless can cause connectivity issues. NDE and ACT are having conversations about some changes or more specificity in the ACT Test Accessibility User Guide and/or the ACT Test Technical Guide.
3. Several districts did complete online ACT.
4. Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) had technology representatives in several districts across the state, and also located some so they could quickly get to districts who might have been experiencing any online issues. Several district indicated that the support was greatly appreciated.
5. All testing is complete for the 2017-2018 school year, and ACT, NWEA, and Data Recognition Corporation are exchanging data to provide final reports.

### Status Report Update

#### Upcoming Activities

- **Issues by Priority**: No matching records were found
- **Risks by Priority**
- **Current Issues**
Project Storyboard: Oracle Fusion (Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Rasmussen, Michael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Report Date</td>
<td>6/7/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$12,050,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cost To Date</td>
<td>$3,821,782.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

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.

**Key Accomplishments**

- **For Program:**
  - Foresee Consulting onsite to align fusion and Unifier on 4/23 & 4/24
  - Kronos onsite 6/4 – 6/7
- **For HCM:**
  - Completed CRP1 event on 4/13
  - Working to resolve any issues found in CRP1 to prepare for CRP2
  - Completed CRP-1a & -1b during the week of 5/21
  - Continued CRP-1 issue resolution (55/57 defects resolved)
  - Defined the CRP-2 scope and began creating the test plan & event configuration
  - Continued data mapping exercises
  - Began custom security role setups
- **For FCM:**
  - Finalized the MoSCoW List: State approved
  - Initial draft of the Solution Design Document completed and under State review
  - COA Crosswalk completed (with exceptions of UNL & state colleges)
  - Defined the CRP-1 scope and began creating the test plan & event configuration
  - Identified test scenarios for all work streams with input from various agency representation
  - Began custom security role setups
- **For SCM:**
  - Final version of the Solution Design Document currently under State review
  - Finalizing MoScOw List
  - Defining CRP-1 scope and creation of test scripts and scenarios
  - Supplier communications sent out to receive updated information
  - Began to utilize agency resources to assist with workload (Data Validation & Test Scripts)

**Status Report Update**

Project approved by NITC, Governor, and was briefed to the Appropriations Committee. Migration funding and appropriations were approved for the project with both funds being transferred and appropriations made available starting on July 1, 2017.

Overall Program status on track

- HCM completed CRP1 on 4/13/18, scheduled to start CRP2 on 7/16/18
- FCM scheduled to start CRP1 on 7/30/18
- SCM completed all CRP0 sessions 4/3/18; scheduled to start CRP1 on 8/6/18

Budget: Overall Program budget on track for KPMG, Oracle, and Civic

**Upcoming Activities**

- **For Program:**
  - Foresee Consulting anticipated onsite beginning 6/18 (contract dependent)
  - (Phase 0 assessment on-site work estimated at 2 weeks with 4-6 weeks remote follow-up)
  - Obtain State sign-off for the Program Test Strategy
  - Continue to populate tasks, resources, dependencies, and milestones for rest of the Program for all workstreams
  - Schedule the remaining Technical Security Meetings
  - NDOT – Develop Phase 1 Integration Roadmap deliverable
- **For HCM:**
  - Finalize CRP-2 Test Plan
  - Continue CRP-2 configuration (including updating workbooks and test scripts)
  - Continue data mapping exercises with the Tech Team
- **For FCM:**
  - Finalize the Solution Design Document
  - Complete CRP-1 Configuration
  - Complete test scenario identification and begin updating test scripts
  - Complete custom security role setups and start unit testing

**Status Report Indicators**

- Overall: ️ ️
- Schedule: ️ ️
- Scope: ️ ️
- Cost and Effort: ️
Project Storyboard: Oracle Fusion (Enterprise Resource Management Consolidation)

For SCM:
- Finalize MoSCoW List & Solution Design Document
- Finalize CRP-1 scope and continue configuration
- Continue CRP-1 test script and scenario work

Current Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Time reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/13/18</td>
<td>Rasmussen, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>6/25/18</td>
<td>Rasmussen, Michael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 6/8/18 2:33:09 PM CDT
## Project Storyboard: Centrex Replacement

### Project Manager
- Howard, Bob

### Project Type
- Major Project

### Stage
- Design

### Status Report Date
- 5/31/18

### Status
- Approved

#### Progress
- Started

#### Estimate to Complete
- null

#### Total Estimated Cost
- Actual Cost To Date

### Project Dates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/10/17</td>
<td>6/4/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Days Late
- 4

### Status Report Indicators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Cost and Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description
To secure the most cost efficient Hosted Voice Over Internet Protocol Telephony (VOIP) Services. This solution will replace the State’s Centrex service throughout the State of Nebraska. The purpose of the project is to provide phone service that includes the most up-to-date VOIP features and functionality as a hosted service with equipment ownership, maintenance and service remaining with the Contractor.

### Key Accomplishments
- Currently on-schedule. RFP bids are due on June 5 and then the OCIO will begin the evaluation process.

### Status Report Update
- No matching records were found

### Upcoming Activities
- No matching records were found

### Issues by Priority
- No matching records were found

### Risks by Priority
- No matching records were found
### Project Description
Combination of the Novell Sunset and Novell Stabilization project.

### Key Accomplishments
- First set of WCS Url's completed
  - 5 sites moved, 51.5 to 52.4% complete
  - Discussion on Sunset

### Status Report Update
- **AM3 Stabilization**
  - P2V (physical to virtual) of AM3 backup is completed.
    - Virtual will not be running in the active mix.
    - Testing is not suggested due to possible issues with metadata sync.
    - Team suggests to focus to get off AM3 soon.
  - URL Prep for WCS (Worst Case Scenario)
    - Sets of 10-12 urls are getting sent to be established in NetScaler in case of WCS.
    - First set has been completed.
- **AM3 Premium Support**
  - Premium Support ends July 31st.
- **AM3 to AM4 Progress**
  - Increase of 51.5% to 52.4% has been moved to AM4 or Netscaler.
  - My.NE.Gov site move to AM4 postponed until 13th to allow better notification.
  - Team will try to get the 45 non-DHHS done by end of July.
  - Discussion with leadership on placing a sunset date on AM3. Suggested July 31st.
  - Request to have communication from leadership to DHHS.
- **AM4 to NetScaler Progress**
  - Centurion Blue development is going well, performing tests. Development will slow until August.
  - NetScaler upgrades to 11.1 are at 50%.

### Upcoming Activities
- **My.NE.Gov move 6/13**
- 5 more site planned to move to AM4
- Another set of WCS URL’s is being sent
- Decisions on Sunset
- Communication on Sunset

### Current Risks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Resolution</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NetScaler Support</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>4/23/18</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netscaler compatibility to replace Access Manager</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2/19/16</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication software choices</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>✭</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2/19/16</td>
<td>Nelson, Ben</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request for Waiver

Agency Name
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509

Contact Person
Katie Bieber
Director of Communications
katie.bieber@nebraska.gov
402-471-5025

Title of NITC Standard and Guidelines
NITC 7-104: Web Domain Name Standard

Description of the problem or issue
The Nebraska Instructional Materials Collaborative is a partnership between the Nebraska Department of Education and the ESUCC. We prefer the domain name to not be associated directly with either entity, but rather something neutral. We also anticipate several more partners coming on board (professional education associations, etc.) and think the requested web address would make the most sense in that regard as well.

Domain Names
nematerialsmatter.org
nematerialsmatter.com
nematerialsmatter.net
NITC 7-104: Web Domain Name Standard

Category: Network Architecture
Applicability: Applies to all state agencies, boards, and commissions, excluding higher education

1. Standard

1.1
The official Nebraska state government domain names are nebraska.gov and ne.gov. The State CIO may also allow other domain names using the .gov top level domain.

1.2
All web domain name registrations, purchases, and renewals must be made by the Office of the CIO. Top level domain names other than .gov may be registered but cannot serve content or be publicly promoted. The domain state.ne.us is a supported legacy domain which may serve content but which should not be publicly promoted.

1.3
All registered .gov domains must adhere to all federal .gov domain policies and guidelines.

2. Purpose
The purpose of this standard is to provide for consistent domain names for state government websites.

3. References
- Federal .GOV Domain Name Requirements and Guidelines
A PROPOSAL to revise the agency information technology plan form.

Section 1. The form referenced in section 1-201 is revised as follows:
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
and the
Office of the Chief Information Officer

Agency Information Technology Plan

Due: September 15, 2016

Notes about this form:

1. **Requirement.** “On or before September 15 of each even-numbered year, all state agencies, boards, and commissions shall report to the Chief Information Officer, in a format determined by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, an information technology plan that includes an accounting of all technology assets, including planned acquisitions and upgrades.” (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-524.01). This document — prepared with input from state agencies and the Technical Panel — is the approved format for agency information technology plans. This form should be treated as if it is a public record. Do not include information which would compromise information technology security.

2. **Deadline.** The Agency Information Technology Plan is due on September 15, 2016.

3. **Submitting the Form.** The form must be submitted online at [https://cioapps.nebraska.gov/ITPlan](https://cioapps.nebraska.gov/ITPlan).

4. **Questions.** Contact the Office of the CIO/ITO Help Desk at (402) 471-4636.
1. Current Assets

1.1 Hardware

1.1.1 Hardware Assets
Complete the following tables. For "current" assets, enter the total number of each item currently owned/leased by the agency. For "planned" assets, enter an estimated number of each item at the end of the biennium on June 30, 2021-2023.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linux/Unix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Google Chrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Android</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Android</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Servers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Microsoft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linux/Unix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Servers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VMware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hyper-V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Applications

### 1.2 Applications

#### 1.2.1 Commercial Off-the-Shelf Applications

Provide an estimated number of licenses for each of the following applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Suite</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Licenses</th>
<th>Version(s) (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPerfect Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenOffice/StarOffice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endpoint Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft System Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symantec/Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malware Bites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Messaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIO Lync/Skype for Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.2 Other Commercial Off-the-Shelf Applications

List other significant commercial off-the-shelf applications utilized by the agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Software Title</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Users/Licenses</th>
<th>Version(s) (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.3 Software as a Service (SaaS)

List any applications that are licensed on a subscription basis by the agency which are delivered over the Internet (sometimes called web-based software, on-demand software, or hosted software):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Software Title</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.4 Custom Applications

List custom applications used by the agency, including (a) the general purpose of the application; (b) the platform on which it is running; (c) application development tools used; and (d) how the application is supported:
1.3 Data

1.3.1 Databases
List the significant databases maintained by the agency.

Database:
Brief Description:
Types of Data (PII, HIPAA, PCI, FTI, CJIS, SSA, None of the above):
Data Classification (Highly RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIAL, MANAGED ACCESS PUBLIC, PUBLIC):

1.3.2 Data Exchange
List the significant electronic data exchanges your agency has with other entities.

Title/Description:
Other Entity:
Purpose:
Is this exchange encrypted?:

1.4 Network Environment

1.4.1 General Description
Provide a general description of the agency’s network environment. You may optionally include any related diagrams, etc. Also, describe any desktop management and/or LAN monitoring tools used by the agency.

Description:

1.4.2 Network Devices
Complete the following table. For “current” devices, enter the total number of each item currently owned/leased by the agency. For “planned” devices, enter an estimated number of each item at the end of the biennium on June 30, 202X/202Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firewalls (Hardware)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Balancers (Hardware)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Access Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS/IDS Appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-OCIO provided Switches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Delivery/Gateway (e.g. Citrix, Terminal Services appliances) (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide a brief narrative describing the reason/rationale for any significant change in the number of planned devices as compared to the number of current devices.

Narrative:

1.5 Server Rooms

1.5.1 Server Rooms
Many agencies have invested in dedicated space for housing servers and network equipment. This dedicated space provided close proximity of the equipment to an agency’s offices and support staff. During the early years of client/server technology, close proximity offered many advantages and was even essential in some situations. Changes in technology and higher network speeds have eroded the advantages of close proximity to the extent that separate server rooms often represent a duplication of costs and an impediment to good security, reliability, disaster recovery, and efficient operations. The trend in all large organizations is consolidation of servers and data centers.

The purpose of this section is to document the number and size of server rooms and encourage planning for use of shared services that would eliminate the need for most server rooms.

Please complete the following information:

1. Does your agency have servers in the OCIO data center (yes / no):
2. Does your agency have a server room (yes / no) [if no, proceed to Section 2.]
3. Where is the server room located (city, building, floor):
4. What is the size of the server room (square footage):
5. Does the room have special electrical power feeds (yes/no):
6. Does the room have special cooling capacity (yes/no):
7. Does the room have uninterruptible power supply (yes/no):
8. Does the room have backup power, such as a generator (yes/no):
9. Does the room have a separate fire suppression system (yes/no):
10. What equipment is located in the server room (number of servers, racks, network devices, etc.)?
11. What security is available for the server room?

Provide a brief narrative describing your agency’s plans to reduce or eliminate the server room or explain why it is still needed.

2. Staff and Training

2.1 Staff and Related Support Personnel
Identify staffing necessary to maintain your current IT environment, including contractor and OCIO staff supporting your agency specific environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approximate FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency IT Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIO Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 IT Related Training
Summarize the agency’s efforts to address training needs relating to information technology, including training for IT staff and users.
### 3. Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Security</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency implemented the NITC’s Security Policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency implemented other security policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency designated a Security Officer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency performed an audit of all data under your control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency classified all data under your control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency schedule vulnerability scans of servers containing sensitive information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have regularly scheduled penetration tests?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency performed a penetration test in the last year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have a security awareness program in place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency allow the use of removable media such as flash drives, external hard drives, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity

For purposes of this document, the term "Disaster Recovery Plan" refers to preparations for restoring information technology systems following a major disruption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have a disaster recovery plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your answer to the previous question is YES, have you tested your disaster recovery plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency perform regular back-ups of important agency data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your answer to the previous question is YES, does your agency maintain off-site storage of back-up data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Accessibility / Assistive Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Accessibility / Assistive Technology</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency include the Nebraska Technology Access Clause in contracts for information technology purchases? (See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 73-205. The Technology Access Clause is posted at <a href="http://mitc.ne.gov/standards/">http://mitc.ne.gov/standards/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency have procedures in place to identify the information technology related requirements of users with disabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency provide training opportunities for management, procurement, and technical personnel on how to meet the accessibility needs of users with disabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your agency evaluated its website(s) to ensure accessibility to all persons with disabilities? If yes, what tools were used to evaluate accessibility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Geographic Information System (GIS) / Geospatial Data

Does your agency have plans, over the next biennium, for the development and/or acquisition of GIS/geospatial data (e.g., Mapping, imagery, LiDAR, GPS collected data, geodatabase development, metadata, geocoding, demographic and address data, etc.) or geospatial data applications or web services?

If your answer is YES, please provide a brief description and/or reference where that description is provided in Section 4 below.

For data that is created or updated, will it follow appropriate NITC standards:
- NITC 3-201 Geospatial Metadata
- NITC 3-202 Land Records Information and Mapping
- NITC 3-203 LiDAR Elevation Acquisition Using LiDAR
- NITC 3-204 Imagery
- NITC 3-205 Street Centerline
- NITC 3-206 Address

Will your agency provide the geospatial data created or updated through the project electronically with other government agencies in the State that may have a need for such data?

Please provide a brief description with your proposed plan in Section 4.

If geospatial data and web mapping services are created or updated and is needed by other state agencies or for public consumption, will you register the metadata with NebraskaMAP.gov?

If your project incorporates web mapping services, are you willing to make use of current state resources by linking your project to web and data services that are maintained through other online state agency repositories? This would be for data not created by your project but is needed for your project to be effective (i.e., base maps such as aerial imagery, street centerlines, and other authoritative base map data provided as a service through NebraskaMAP.gov).

### 3.5 Mobile Apps

Does your agency use mobile apps to provide services through mobile devices?

---

### 4. Projects and Future Plans

#### 4.1 Projects Currently Active

List current IT projects, including a description of the project, the current project status, projected completion date and costs.
Sec.2. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Technical Standards and Guidelines

Proposal 18-02

A PROPOSAL relating to information technology projects submitted as part of the state biennial budget process; to amend sections 1-101 and 1-202; to add a definition; to modify the requirements for submission of a project proposal; to modify the project proposal form; and to repeal the original sections.

Section 1. Section 1-101 is amended by adding the following new subsection, and renumbering the existing subsections accordingly:

“Information technology project” means an endeavor undertaken over a fixed period of time using information technology. An information technology project includes all aspects of planning, design, implementation, project management, and training related to the endeavor.

Sec. 2. The following provisions constitute a revised section 1-202:

1-202. Project reviews; information technology projects submitted as part of the state biennial budget process.

This policy provides the format, minimum requirements, and review procedures for information technology projects submitted as part of the state biennial budget process. The requirements are as follows:

(1) Format. Budget requests for information technology projects that meet the minimum requirements set forth in subsection (2) must include a completed information technology project proposal form. The form provided in the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System is the approved format for information technology project proposals.

(2) Minimum Requirements for Project Submissions.
(a) Information technology projects that meet the following criteria are subject to the project review requirements of this section: (i) the estimated total project costs are more than $500,000, or (ii) the estimated total project costs are more than $50,000, and the project will have a significant effect on a core business function or multiple agencies.

(b) Exceptions. The following information technology projects are not subject to the project review requirements of this section and do not require the submission of a project proposal: (i) multi-year projects that have been reviewed as part of a previous budget submission; (ii) projects utilizing the enterprise content management system identified in section 5-101; or (iii) projects utilizing the services of the Office of the CIO for the information technology related elements of the project.

(3) Technical Review Procedures. The technical review of information technology projects submitted pursuant to this section will consist of the following steps:

(a) Individual Technical Reviewers. Each project will be reviewed and scored by three individual technical reviewers using review and scoring criteria approved by the Technical Panel. Qualified reviewers include: members of the Technical Panel, members and alternates of the advisory councils chartered by the commission, and such other individuals as approved by the Technical Panel.

Assignment of Reviewers. Individual technical reviewers will be assigned to projects as follows: (1) staff will assign three reviewers for each project based on the subject matter of the project; (2) staff will notify Technical Panel members by email of the initial assignment of reviewers; (3) members will have 24 hours to object to any of the reviewer assignments, objections to be made by email to the other members noting the specific assignment for which there is an objection and the reason(s) for the objection; (4) if there are objections, reassignments will be made and communicated in the same manner as the initial assignment.
or the Technical Panel chairperson may call a special meeting of the Technical Panel to assign
reviewers; (5) staff will provide the assigned reviewers with the project review documents; (6) in
the event a reviewer is unable to complete an assigned review, a new reviewer will be assigned
using the same process as the initial assignment; and (7) if for any reason less than three
individual reviews are completed prior to the Technical Panel's review referenced in subsection
(3)(d), the Technical Panel may complete the project review without regard to the requirements
of this subsection.

(b) Agency Response. The requesting agency will be provided with the reviewer scores and
comments. The agency may submit a written response to the reviewer scores and comments.
The deadline for submitting a response will be one week prior to the Technical Panel meeting
referenced in subsection (3)(d).

(c) Advisory Council Review. Depending on the subject matter of a project, one or more of
the commission's advisory councils may review the project and provide recommendations to the
Technical Panel and commission.

(d) Technical Panel Review. The Technical Panel will review each project including the
reviewer scores and comments, any agency response, and any recommendations by the
advisory councils. The Technical Panel will provide its analysis to the commission.

(e) Commission Review and Recommendations. The commission will review each project
including any recommendations from the Technical Panel and advisory councils. The
commission will make recommendations on each project for inclusion in its report to the
Governor and the Legislature.

Sec.3. The form referenced in section 1-202(1) is revised as follows:
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

Funding Requests for Information Technology Projects

2017-2019-2021 Biennial Budget

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

Project Title
Agency/Entity
Notes about this form:

1. Use. The Nebraska Information Technology Commission (“NITC”) is required by statute to “make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel…” Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(3). “Governmental entities, state agencies, and noneducation political subdivisions shall submit all projects which use any combination of general funds, federal funds, or cash funds for information technology purposes to the process established by sections 86-512 to 86-524. The commission may adopt policies that establish the format and minimum requirements for project submissions.” Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(5). In order to perform this review, the NITC and DAS Budget Division require agencies/entities to complete this form when requesting funding for technology projects.


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

4. Questions. Contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at (402) 471-7984 or ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov
Executive Summary

Provide a one or two paragraph summary of the proposed project. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project and the information technology required.

Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes (15 Points)

1. Describe the project, including:
   - Specific goals and objectives;
   - Expected beneficiaries of the project; and
   - Expected outcomes.

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

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

Project Justification / Business Case (25 Points)

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

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

6. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.
Technical Impact (20 Points)

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

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

Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10 Points)

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

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

11. Describe the training and staff development requirements.

12. Describe the ongoing support requirements.

Risk Assessment (10 Points)

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

14. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.
Financial Analysis and Budget (20 Points)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Exp</th>
<th>FY2019 Expend</th>
<th>FY2020 Request</th>
<th>FY2021 Request</th>
<th>Future Add Request</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-user Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Project Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet in Project Proposal Form.xlsx
Sec. 4. Original sections 1-101 and 1-202 are repealed.

Sec. 5. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
A PROPOSAL to revise existing Technical Standards and Guidelines documents for the purpose of improved document consistency.

Section 1. Staff shall revise the existing Technical Standards and Guidelines documents to improve consistency in format and structure.

Sec.2. Non-substantive revisions that may be made include the following: font, page layout, section numbering, capitalization, punctuation, sentence structure, use of defined terms, titles, section headings, and references.

Sec.3. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Technical Standards and Guidelines

Proposal 18-04

A PROPOSAL relating to GIS; to adopt standards for GIS software and the NebraskaMAP portal; to amend section 1-101; and to repeal the original section.

Section 1. State agencies shall coordinate all purchases of GIS software and software maintenance through the Office of the CIO. The Office of the CIO will provide guidance to agencies on GIS software that is compatible with the state’s enterprise GIS environment.

Sec.2. All agency geospatial data and GIS web applications that are available to the public shall be made accessible through the NebraskaMAP portal.

Sec.3. Section 1-101 is amended by adding the following new subsection, and renumbering the existing subsections accordingly:

“NebraskaMAP portal” means the state government website (https://www.nebraskamap.gov/) dedicated to providing Nebraska related geospatial data and information. The website provides a centralized location to search and locate relevant authoritative geospatial data layers in Nebraska, and to print maps and data tables. The website is hosted and maintained by the Office of the CIO, and agencies contribute authoritative data to the website.

Sec.4. Original section 1-101 is repealed.

Sec.5. This proposal takes effect when approved by the commission.
# Nebraska Information Technology Commission

## 2019-2021 Biennial Budget Review Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IT project proposals due with biennial budget requests</td>
<td>9/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project reviewers assigned and notice sent to Technical Panel members</td>
<td>9/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project review documents sent to reviewers</td>
<td>9/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Completed scoring due from reviewers</td>
<td>10/3/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reviewer scores and comments sent to agencies for comment/response</td>
<td>10/5/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>State Government Council</strong> meeting</td>
<td>10/11/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Education Council</strong> meeting</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agency response due (optional)</td>
<td>10/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Technical Panel</strong> meeting</td>
<td>10/24/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>NITC</strong> meeting</td>
<td>11/8/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Report submitted to Governor and Legislature</td>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>