

November 15, 2022

Report to the Governor & Legislature

Recommendations on Technology
Investments for the 2023-2025 Biennium



Nebraska Information
Technology Commission

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
nitc.nebraska.gov
501 S. 14th Street
P.O. Box 95045
Lincoln, NE 68509-5045
(402) 471-3560



Contents

INTRODUCTION			1
SECTION 1: NITC Recommendations - Project Prioritization			2
SECTION 2: Project Summary Sheets			3
Project #	Agency	Project Title	
09-01	SECRETARY OF STATE	Business Services Filing System	4
46-01	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	Electronic Health Records	10
46-02	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	Radio System Upgrade	18
65-01	DEPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES; STATE BUDGET DIVISION	New Budget Management and Request System	22

Introduction

This report contains the Nebraska Information Technology Commission’s recommendations on technology investments for the 2023-2025 biennium. It is submitted pursuant to the commission’s statutory responsibility 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(8).

This report contains the following sections:

- **Section 1** is a prioritized list of projects.
- **Section 2** includes the summary sheets for each of the projects.

A copy of this report and the full text of all of the project proposals are posted at: <https://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/reports/reports.html>. The project review process is described in detail in NITC § 1-202.

SECTION 1: NITC Recommendations - Project Prioritization

Category	Description
Mandate	Required by law, regulation, or other authority.
Tier 1	Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency or the state.
Tier 2	Recommended. Project with high strategic importance for the agency or the state.
Tier 3	Other. Project with strategic importance for the agency or the state; but, in general, has an overall lower priority than the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects.
Insufficient Information	Insufficient information to make a recommendation.

Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2024	FY2025	Total Project Cost †
Mandate					
None					
Tier 1					
09-01	SECRETARY OF STATE	Business Services Filing System		\$2,500,000	\$3,000,000
46-01	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	Electronic Health Records	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$1,500,000
46-02	DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES	Radio System Upgrade	\$3,324,469	\$2,576,523	\$5,900,992
Tier 2					
65-01*	DEPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES; STATE BUDGET DIVISION	New Budget Management and Request System	\$210,230	\$172,308	\$1,209,574
Tier 3					
None					
Insufficient Information					
None					

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

* Not submitted as an agency budget issue. Project will not require additional appropriations.

SECTION 2: Project Summary Sheets

Summary Sheet Contents:

- Summary of Request
- Financial Summary
- Proposal Score
- Reviewer Comments
- Technical Panel Comments
- Advisory Council Comments
- NITC Comments
- Agency Response to Reviewer Comments (if any)

09 - Secretary of State

Proposal Name: Business Services Filing System

NITC ID: 09-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Chad Sump
Agency: 09 - Secretary of State
NITC Tier Alignment: Tier 1

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing custom software utilized by the Business Services Division of the Secretary of State's Office. Our existing software has been unreliable and the vendor for this software has not been able to remedy the issues or provide adequate maintenance and support for the software. We are seeking to replace the software to prevent future outages and to enhance and increase the reliability and functionality of the system.

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

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00

Comments: \$500,000 of Contractual Services requested in future years.

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Fund:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00
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:	\$0.00	\$2,500,000.00	\$2,500,000.00

Comments: \$500,000 of Cash Funds requested in future years.

PROPOSAL SCORE

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average				
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	15	12	14
Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	23	24
Technical Impact (20)	20	20	19	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	10	10	8	9
Risk Assessment (10)	8	9	9	9
Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	20	20	10	17
Total Score	98	99	81	93

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Modern interface with built in efficiencies for users and support staff

09 - Secretary of State

Proposal Name: Business Services Filing System

NITC ID: 09-01



Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Remove reliance on unreliable vendor that has not maintained updated code or made enhancements.

Enhanced reliability

Utilized by other states

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Easy migration path and easily supported by OCIO and Sec of State

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Well done plan with realistic timelines and expectations.

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Possible dependency on existing vendor to transition existing data.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Business case is strong and realistic

Weaknesses:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Very clear and concise goals, objectives, and projected outcomes.

Weaknesses: None

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Good, clear justification. Ongoing un-resolved issues with the current system and recurring system failures a valid justifications for moving in a different direction for certain.

Weaknesses: None

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Clear and concise. Use of a proven solution, that is utilized in other states as well, is a good direction.

Cloud based solution makes solid technical sense.

Weaknesses: None

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Although aggressive, it's well thought out and clearly planned.

Weaknesses: None

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths: Good

Weaknesses: Taking a cloud solution approach invites some additional risk over traditional implementations.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Clear and concise.

Weaknesses:

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The objective to replace the existing system is clear and the selection criteria aligns with expected outcomes. The project is included in the agency's comprehensive IT plan and leverages some existing resources.

Weaknesses: The measurement criteria of system testing and monitoring deliverables is vague and doesn't account for reconciling desired outcomes with actual user experience.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths: The business case includes clear examples of existing system deficiencies. In addition to the hardship and inconvenience system outages create for State employees and online users, the potential economic impact is considerable. A "love it or list it" analysis was performed and adequate time has been committed to migrate to a new system.

09 - Secretary of State

Proposal Name: Business Services Filing System

NITC ID: 09-01



Weaknesses: There is limited information about any gap analysis beyond a comparison of the existing system shortcomings and clear benefits of the new proposed system. This work may well have been done, however, there is no specific mention to verify what is an important consideration in any system replacement process.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 19/20

Strengths: The proposed system will provide the benefit of moving to a modern, supportable infrastructure, allow for role-based access, extricate the State from unsupported software, and provide an enhanced environment for online users without the need for a separate portal. The proposed environment is specifically designed and optimized for the desired use.

Weaknesses: No assurance that the updated UI meets accessibility standards. While this is presumably addressed as part of the procurement process, it is an important enough consideration to be included in a summary of the technology impact.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: An ostensibly experienced project team that includes IT and subject matter experts. Clear set of project milestones, and plans for staff training, knowledge transfer and ongoing system support.

Weaknesses: There is no mention of data migration and verification plans. It seems unlikely that there will be no ingestion of existing data and such plans would ordinarily be documented in any preliminary implementation plan.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths: Project risks have been considered and standard risk mitigation strategies are documented.

Weaknesses: Data migration risk is mentioned but specific related mitigation steps are not.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: Apparent total project cost is listed.

Weaknesses: There is insufficient information to render any analysis. This is not to say that the authors haven't carefully considered the budget but this reviewer can't make any analysis with what little is provided.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Does the project: (a) create efficiencies; and/or (b) reduce or eliminate risks? Yes

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project? Yes

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

Tier Recommendation: Tier 1

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

See attachment (09-01 agency response.pdf) for agency response.

Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

Weaknesses Identified:

The measurement criteria of system testing and monitoring deliverables is vague and doesn't account for reconciling desired outcomes with actual user experience.

Response:

We recognize that significant system testing will be necessary to determine that all functional requirements of the system have been met. We anticipate that this will be an iterative process which will be ongoing during the implementation of the system. We also anticipate that the vendor will perform load and stress tests to determine that the system is reliable and performing efficiently. Because we know of other states that use this system, have spoken to those states, and have received favorable information regarding the system and vendor, we are confident that the system has a favorable user experience. We have also seen several demonstrations of the system, so we have seen the user experience firsthand. With respect to monitoring deliverables, we will have a detailed schedule with deliverables and payment milestones based upon acceptance of specified deliverables. Payment will not be made until the specified deliverable has been met.

Project Justification/ Business Case

Weaknesses Identified:

There is limited information about any gap analysis beyond a comparison of the existing system shortcomings and clear benefits of the new proposed system. This work may well have been done, however, there is no specific mention to verify what is an important consideration in any system replacement process.

Response:

We have a general sense of some of the areas where further gap analysis will be needed. We have discussed internally possible policy changes/legislation that may be necessary to further assist our office in processing filings and assist with system implementation. We are unable to complete this work until we have the vendor committed to the project and we begin in-depth gap analysis with the vendor. We feel it would be best to do this work in conjunction with the vendor so that we have the level of specificity and detail needed to make decisions regarding gaps that are discovered and determine the best path forward for any gaps identified.

Technical Impact:

Weakness Identified:

No assurance that the updated UI meets accessibility standards. While this is presumably addressed as part of the procurement process, it is an important enough consideration to be included in a summary of the technology impact.

Response:

We anticipate purchasing this system through a state contract which includes as part of the terms and conditions compliance with NITC standards including the accessibility policy to ensure accessibility and usability by individuals with disabilities.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Weakness Identified:

There is no mention of data migration and verification plans. It seems unlikely that there will be no ingestion of existing data and such plans would ordinarily be documented in any preliminary implementation plan.

Response:

Yes, data conversion will be a significant aspect of this project and is listed as a major milestone/deliverable in section 10 of the project proposal.

Risk Assessment

Weakness Identified:

Data migration risk is mentioned but specific related mitigation steps are not.

Response:

We will be continually auditing data migration as it occurs through the project. We will work with the vendor to develop a data conversion plan and mapping fields to the new system. The data will be available in the vendor's test application then staff will verify data, filings, and documents before moving into production.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Weakness Identified:

There is insufficient information to render any analysis. This is not to say that the authors haven't carefully considered the budget but this reviewer can't make any analysis with what little is provided.

Response:

The total amount requested, approximately \$3 million (over two bienniums), is based upon an estimate from the vendor we are considering for this project. As a predominately cash funded agency, our budget request reflects cash funds we believe will be available to use for this project over the next two bienniums. We believe our budget request is reasonable and justified based upon the estimate we have received.

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Chad Cole

Agency: 46 - Department of Correctional Services

NITC Tier Alignment: Tier 1

Agency Priority:

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

A fully integrated Electronic Health Records (EHR) system is a strategic priority of the Nebraska Department of Corrections (NDCS) in order to provide the highest quality health care to the inmates in our custody in an efficient manner at a reasonable cost to the Nebraska taxpayer. It will provide a secure and complete Health Services Case File, which allows for improved tracking and continuity of care in the areas of Medical Services, Behavioral Health Services, Substance Use and Sex Offender Services and Programming, and Social Work Services from intake through reentry back into the community.

Implementation of the EHR system began in 2019. However, shortly thereafter progress on the project was affected by COVID. Efforts are now well underway. To date, the main components completed are the Behavioral Health Intake Appraisal and the Update Appraisal, with the implementation of the Medical Intake Appraisal to occur soon. The behavioral Health Intake Appraisal and the Update Appraisal create the foundation upon which further E-HR components will be built. The Diagnosis Codes have also been completed. These efforts include 17 Behavioral Health screens, as well as Diagnosis and Document screens, which are shared by both Behavioral Health and Medical. Nine medical modules are either already in production or staged to go live in the next 60 days. Additionally, there are two Discharge Review screens included as part of the E-HR project already in production and two ADA related screens soon to be moved into production, and diagnosis codes have been updated to match current community standards.

The Nebraska Department of Corrections, working with OCIO staff, is building a tailored and efficient EHR in-house that will expand on functionality currently in the existing Nebraska Inmate Case Management System (NICaMS) to include Health Services appointment/resource scheduling and electronic charting for key clinical data and medical history. The system will be utilized by NDCS staff, telemedicine staff, and external providers who have contracted services with the department. Security protocols will be put in place to ensure confidentiality to an inmate's private health data.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00

Comments:

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00
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:	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$1,500,000.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average	Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	12	10	13	12
	Project Justification / Business Case (25)	16	12	23	17
	Technical Impact (20)	13	10	20	14
	Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	5	5	8	6
	Risk Assessment (10)	6	5	9	7
	Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	13	10	20	14
	Total Score	65	52	93	70

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 12/15

Strengths: The project has merit and will achieve many of the objectives outlined for improvement.

Weaknesses: I want to see clinical assessments happen quicker than 30 days of intake. For many people with severe medical conditions, a lot can happen in 30 days.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 16/25

Strengths: The project will reduce paper documentation and medical error.

Weaknesses: Developing the product in-house will significantly increase the project timeline and risk, as in-house developers get tasked with other duties and responsibilities. How will the code be scanned for deficiencies and security flaws?

Technical Impact

Review Score = 13/20

Strengths: I have no doubt that NDCS has collected massive amounts of data and would want to continue to leverage that data.

Weaknesses: A modular and incremental approach to building the application will stretch the project timeline and increase risk.

Major hospitals are able to replace EHRs with COTS solutions with little to no patient care interruption. I don't see why NDCS can't. Any more COTS solutions are customizable to the environment they are being deployed in. By using an incremental approach and developing code in-house, what NDCS will save on COTS, they will pay for in time to complete the project. By developing a custom in-house solution, NDCS is also creating issues with long-term code supportability and future incompatibility, along with losing interoperability with local area hospitals for sharing and transferring of patient information as patients move in and out of local hospitals for care.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: I like the model NDCS uses in working with the OCIO staff.

Weaknesses: No funds or time is allocated for staff and end-user training on new software. This will significantly increase the risk of medical error due to untrained staff on new software being deployed.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 6/10

Strengths: Some risks were identified, however not complete.

Weaknesses: The downtime was a reason for not using a COTS solution, but what are the expected downtimes of in-house development? Not allocating any funds or time to staff training on new applications or modules deployed is a risk that should have been identified.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 13/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: This is going to take longer and cost more than NDCS thinks it will.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 10/15

Strengths: The goals of the project are clear within the context of the agency's service mission.

Weaknesses: The goals of the project within an IT context are vague. There are no project measurement and assessment methods defined.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 12/25

Strengths: The advantages of electronic record keeping are enumerated.

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



Weaknesses: It is unclear whether there is an existing system or if this is a migration from exclusively paper-based documentation. Regardless, in-house development of an EHR system is a considerable undertaking given the highly consequential nature of the data. Further, the information security considerations are paramount given the highly private nature of the data. The sole basis for the decision to build in-house is cost which leaves the reviewer to consider whether the true costs of in-house development have been adequately measured.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: Some consideration of the integration of the desired system with existing data sources is apparent.

Weaknesses: The technical elements of the existing environment and integration with a new system is not clear beyond the earnest desire to provide better service. The technical issues section is not completed. While the technical elements section does include some mention of issues, it does not enumerate technical issues with any degree of specificity.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: Closely working with the OCIO is a project strength.

Weaknesses: Key members of the project team are listed as TBD include subject matter experts. Only one section is completed.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths: Some general project risks are enumerated.

Weaknesses: There are no risk mitigation strategies defined.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 10/20

Strengths: The costs listed are distributed within the categories in credible overall proportions.

Weaknesses: The cost estimates are "high level" and it is not possible for the reviewer to make any meaningful assessment of the proposed budget. At the risk of putting too fine a point on this, the provided budget bears a striking resemblance to a tabular representation of "napkin math."

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 13/15

Strengths: Strong goal and sensible goals. Progress seems well in hand considering externalities over the prior biennium.

Weaknesses: Would prefer a richer description of measuring goal achievement as well as relationship to broader IT plan.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths: Reduction in paperwork requirements and improvement to patient outcomes through improved accuracy / clarity is clear and relative savings compare to commercial systems would seem to make sense.

Weaknesses: No discussion of relevant state or federal mandates.

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: In house development permits leveraging of existing investments. Incremental approach seems to promise reduced downtime and improved integration

Weaknesses: None Noted.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Agile approach is a smart choice for development with strong needs for SME feedback and assessment.

Weaknesses: The agile iteration time feels surprisingly long, over twice as long as I would usually expect, but this may be necessary for an agile approach to fit well into the overall culture of this environment?

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths: Realistic risk assessment and understanding of potential confounds.

Weaknesses: Would like to see more detail on identified risks/potential responses to external interface issues.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Electronic Health Records

NITC ID: 46-01



Does the project: (a) create efficiencies; and/or (b) reduce or eliminate risks? Yes

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project? No

Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget? No

Tier Recommendation: Tier 1

Comments: The Technical Panel strongly recommends that the agency reconsider the decision to build their own system rather than purchasing a commercially available system. The panel recognizes that this recommendation may require an increased budget amount over that in the current proposal.

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

See attachment (46-01 agency response.pdf) for agency response.



Pete Ricketts, Governor

November 10, 2022

Members of the NITC Committee:

Please accept my apology in not being able to attend your meeting today. It was my intention to appear so I might be able to address any questions you might have about the Electronic Health Records (EHR) project for the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS).

Below are written responses to the comments provided by the reviewers and the technical panel. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out.

Thank you,

Diane Sabatka-Rine
NDCS Interim Director

1. Weaknesses: I want to see clinical assessments happen quicker than 30 days of intake. For many people with severe medical conditions, a lot can happen in 30 days.

NDCS follows community standard of health care, as well as nationally recognized correctional health care standards for ensuring that individuals are assessed in the appropriate time frame.
2. Weaknesses: Developing the product in-house will significantly increase the project timeline and risk, as in-house developers get tasked with other duties and responsibilities.

NDCS has contracted two application developers who are committed to the EHR project full time. The only time they might be tasked with other duties would be when the workflow creates specified periods of down time.
3. Weaknesses: A modular and incremental approach to building the application will stretch the project timeline and increase risk. Major hospitals are able to replace EHRs with COTS solutions

Diane Sabatka-Rine, Interim Director
Department of Correctional Services

P.O. Box 94661 Lincoln, NE 68509-4661
Phone: 402-471-2654 Fax: 402-479-5623

corrections.nebraska.gov

with little to no patient care interruption. I don't see why NDCS can't. Any more COTS solutions are customizable to the environment they are being deployed in. By using an incremental approach and developing code in-house, what NDCS will save on COTS, they will pay for in time to complete the project. By developing a custom in-house solution, NDCS is also creating issues with long-term code supportability and future incompatibility, along with losing interoperability with local area hospitals for sharing and transferring of patient information as patients move in and out of local hospitals for care.

NDCS recognized that a modular and incremental approach to building the application could impact the project. That decision was based on being able to have basic system components in place and available for team members to use, rather than waiting until all components of the EHR were completed.

4. Weaknesses: No funds or time is allocated for staff and end-user training on new software. This will significantly increase the risk of medical error due to untrained staff on new software being deployed.

NDCS agrees this information should have been included in greater detail as part of the project description. Training has been provided to system users for components implemented so far, and that will continue throughout implementation.

5. Weaknesses: The downtime was a reason for not using a COTS solution, but what are the expected downtimes of in-house development? Not allocating any funds or time to staff training on new applications or modules deployed is a risk that should have been identified.

As with any IT development, there is the potential for downtime. NDCS has experienced such periods due to COVID and staffing. Going forward, we do not anticipate interruptions of that length. There should be no extended periods in which we cannot proceed with the project.

6. Weaknesses: This is going to take longer and cost more than NDCS thinks it will.

We recognize the impact that COVID and staffing shortages had on having steady progress with EHR. Additionally, we know that more components and features will be produced in the following biennium. Ongoing maintenance and the addition of new modules is likely to be necessary as the system is adapted to meet the needs of NDCS.

7. Weaknesses: The goals of the project within an IT context are vague. There are no project measurement and assessment methods defined.

NDCS agrees more information should be provided.

8. Weaknesses: It is unclear whether there is an existing system or if this is a migration from exclusively paper-based documentation. Regardless, in-house development of an EHR system is a considerable undertaking given the highly consequential nature of the data. Further, the information security considerations are paramount given the highly private nature of the data. The sole basis for the decision to build in-house is cost which leaves the reviewer to consider whether the true costs of in-house development have been adequately measured.

This is a migration from an almost exclusive paper-based system. Cost was not the sole basis of the decision to build in-house. Integration with the current inmate database was another chief consideration. As that system also includes highly personal and largely confidential information, the issue of data security is one that NDCS will continue to keep top of mind in the creation of an EHR.

9. Weaknesses: The technical elements of the existing environment and integration with a new system is not clear beyond the earnest desire to provide better service. The technical issues section is not completed. While the technical elements section does include some mention of issues, it does not enumerate technical issues with any degree of specificity.

We agree that the description in this area should have been more robust.

10. Weaknesses: Key members of the project team are listed as TBD include subject matter experts. Only one section is completed.

This was another area where greater explanation would have been of benefit. We are currently in the process of identifying those members of the health care team who will serve as subject matter experts. They will support the efforts of IT and our Medical Director in providing information that will aid in the development of the various modules, based on their specialties.

11. Weaknesses: There are no risk mitigation strategies defined.

NDCS agrees that risk mitigation strategies should be identified as the project moves ahead.

12. Weaknesses: The cost estimates are "high level" and it is not possible for the reviewer to make any meaningful assessment of the proposed budget. At the risk of putting too fine a point on this, the provided budget bears a striking resemblance to a tabular representation of "napkin math."

Moving forward, we will be taking closer notice of the expense tied to the project and projected costs.

13. Weaknesses: Would prefer a richer description of measuring goal achievement as well as relationship to broader IT plan.

We will work on developing measurable goals and benchmarks for EHR.

14. Weaknesses: No discussion of relevant state or federal mandates.

NDCS agrees that reference to relevant state and federal requirements should be noted.

15. Weaknesses: The agile iteration time feels surprisingly long, over twice as long as I would usually expect, but this may be necessary for an agile approach to fit well into the overall culture of this environment?

As noted, modules are being produced and launched in such a way that staff can start

utilizing them as they are built. In addition, the timeline was estimated to ensure that all necessary components for Health Services were included.

16. Weaknesses: Would like to see more detail on identified risks/potential responses to external interface issues.

Identifying those risks and responses would be helpful to the project.

17. Comments from the Technical Panel:

The Technical Panel strongly recommends that the agency reconsider the decision to build their own system rather than purchasing a commercially available system. The panel recognizes that this recommendation may require an increased budget amount over that in the current proposal.

When deciding to proceed with the in-house development of an EHR system, NDCS considered the benefits and deficits to that approach, versus a purchased system. Again, while we have wanted to be cost efficient, we recognize that there are trade-offs in launching an in-house project, some of which we have experienced, including the interruptions that occurred due to COVID and the staffing situation.

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Radio System Upgrade

NITC ID: 46-02



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Chad Cole

Agency: 46 - Department of Correctional Services

NITC Tier Alignment: Tier 1

Agency Priority:

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services has a need to update end-of-life radio equipment consisting of end-user radios, tower radios, and control radio consoles. This upgrade is vital to maintaining communications to keep inmates and staff safe while providing the ability to integrate with state/local first responders. Upgrading the radios and system infrastructure will allow standardized management and support that will provide long term upgradeability over the life of the equipment. This allows the department to align the radio communications strategy with the state radio system bringing the department up to the state standards of public safety radio communications.

The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services along with OCIO Public Safety Communications have worked together to integrate the new radio system with the state radio system giving centralized access for radios to work across the state at the respective facilities that can provide public safety radio access. The radio solution will be utilized by custody staff and maintenance staff who work within the facilities and are responsible for inmate transport outside of the facilities.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00

Comments:

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00
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:	\$3,324,469.00	\$2,576,523.00	\$5,900,992.00

Comments:

PROPOSAL SCORE

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Average
Average				
Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes (15)	15	9	13	12
Project Justification / Business Case (25)	25	25	23	24
Technical Impact (20)	20	15	18	18
Preliminary Plan for Implementation (10)	8	5	9	7
Risk Assessment (10)	8	10	10	9
Financial Analysis and Budget (20)	18	18	18	18
Total Score	94	82	91	89

REVIEWER COMMENTS

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Radio System Upgrade

NITC ID: 46-02



Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Aligning with, and connecting to, the Statewide Radio System using Project 25 digital standards provides clear and encrypted internal communications, and interoperability with first responders.

Communications are available across the state utilizing the Statewide Radio System. This is required when transporting inmates.

Leveraging the current system buildout reduces overall costs compared to building a completely new system. Additional capabilities of recording talkgroups using current State equipment ensures compliance with records retention laws.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Considering the age of the current system, a complete replacement of the equipment is necessary.

Adding encryption capable radios increases officer safety and security.

Utilizing the system logging recorder allows centralized management and distribution of information across facilities using the Statewide Radio System

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: The proposal leverages currently built-out and available repeaters and technology. It adds encryption and availability of multiple talk paths for increased security. The Statewide Radio System was built with sufficient capacity to provide the infrastructure necessary without detrimental impact to current users. The proposal includes state of the art standards based equipment.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Timelines are reasonable and achievable. Implementation of similar projects has been successful.

Weaknesses: Site preparation and remediation can be expensive and increase installation time. Equipment lead times could delay final implementation.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 8/10

Strengths: Current radio system is not supported by manufacturer.

Proposed system uses frequencies dedicated to Public Safety reducing the amount of interference. The higher frequency was chosen because of the increased ability to penetrate buildings.

Training has been included as a part of the implementation.

Cutover to the new system will utilize parallel operations between new and old increasing officer safety during that period and allowing a fall back position.

Weaknesses: Training should include a second session a few months after implementation.

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Pricing is based on current State Contract #14534 OC with Motorola

Weaknesses: Increases to prices due to inflation may cause budget constraints.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 9/15

Strengths: Goals are clear. Projected benefits are clear.

Weaknesses: Incomplete responses.

Measurement and assessment methods that will verify the project outcomes would be helpful.

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 15/20

Strengths: Benefits of the standardization is clearly stated.

Weaknesses: Incomplete responses.

Narratives of technical elements of the project and their impact would be helpful.

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 5/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Incomplete responses for training and staff development, ongoing support.

Include number of facilities that will be involved and timeframe for project completion aligning requested budget for each FY would be helpful.

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

46 - Department of Correctional Services

Proposal Name: Radio System Upgrade

NITC ID: 46-02



Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Unclear provided pricing (\$5,700,219), its relationship with the total funding request FY24 (\$3,324,469) and FY(2,576,523). An explanation would be helpful.

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 13/15

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 23/25

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths: Aligns with statewide radio system

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 9/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Importance of a modern system that has parts/replacements available is important compared to current legacy solution.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Does the project: (a) create efficiencies; and/or (b) reduce or eliminate risks? Yes

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project? Yes

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

Tier Recommendation: Tier 1

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)

See attachment (46-02 agency response.pdf) for agency response.

NEBRASKA

Good Life. Great Mission.


DEPT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES



Pete Ricketts, Governor

DATE: November 2, 2022

TO: Nebraska Information Technology Commission

FROM: Robin Spindler, Deputy Director 

RE: NDCS Review Response

NDCS has received and reviewed the comments and recommendations submitted by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) concerning information services projects submitted as part of the 2023 – 2025 Biennium Budget Request. This includes the proposal for an electronic health records system.

NDCS plans to attend the Commission meeting on November 10 to provide any additional information or clarification. If there is a particular time you would like us to schedule that appearance, please let us know.

C: Diane Sabatka-Rine, Interim Director

Diane Sabatka-Rine, Interim Director
Department of Correctional Services

P.O. Box 94661 Lincoln, NE 68509-4661
Phone: 402-471-2654 Fax: 402-479-5623

corrections.nebraska.gov

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: New Budget Management and Request System
NITC ID: 65-01



PROJECT DETAILS

Project Contact: Lee Will
Agency: 65 - Administrative Services
NITC Tier Alignment: Tier 2

Agency Priority: 1

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The State of Nebraska has used the Nebraska Budget Request and Reporting System (NBRRS) for the past 15 years. The State Budget Division seeks to take advantage of improvements in software and methodologies in budget management and request submission process of agencies, boards, and commissions of the state.

After reviewing seven different products, we have chosen Anaplan as the best product for a new budget management and request system. Additionally, the division has chosen Allitix as the company to implement the needed configuration of Anaplan.

The Division believes this new system will allow for the management of the state's budget from beginning to end.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Expenditures

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
Contractual Services:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Telecommunications:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Training:	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00
Project Costs:	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Capital Expenditures:	\$202,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$374,538.00
Total Estimated Costs:	\$210,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$382,538.00

Comments: \$654,650 from FY22 Appr/Reappr

Funding

	Fiscal Year 2024	Fiscal Year 2025	Total
General Fund:	\$210,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$382,538.00
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:	\$210,230.00	\$172,308.00	\$382,538.00

Comments: \$654,650 from FY22 Appr/Reappr

PROPOSAL SCORE

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	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)	18	20	20	19
Total Score	98	100	100	99

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: Modern system eliminates manual work and reduces errors
 Enhanced customer experience

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: New Budget Management and Request System

NITC ID: 65-01



Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: Eliminates manual process that is subject to human error.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: Minimal technical impact and risk.

Eliminates legacy systems

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Realistic timelines and steps

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: Low risk. Current system will remain in place until new system has been fully tested.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 18/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses: Actual costs to be determined

Goals, Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Review Score = 15/15

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed and comprehensible.

Weaknesses:

Project Justification / Business Case

Review Score = 25/25

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed with convincing Justifications.

Weaknesses:

Technical Impact

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed including features come with the cloud based solution.

Weaknesses:

Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed. A well thought out preliminary implementation plan.

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths: All points are clearly addressed.

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths: The proposal indicated no additional appropriation would be required.

Weaknesses:

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:

65 - Administrative Services

Proposal Name: New Budget Management and Request System

NITC ID: 65-01



Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment

Review Score = 10/10

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Financial Analysis and Budget

Review Score = 20/20

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Does the project: (a) create efficiencies; and/or (b) reduce or eliminate risks? Yes

Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project? Yes

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

Tier Recommendation: Tier 2

Comments:

NITC COMMENTS

AGENCY RESPONSE (OPTIONAL)