

MEETING AGENDA

Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Tuesday, August 12, 2008
9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents: Click the links in the agenda
or [click here](#) for all documents. (xx pages)

1. Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes* - [June 10, 2008](#)
4. Project Reviews
 - Ongoing Reviews (as needed)
 - Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown
 - Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS - James Ohmberger
 - Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska - Student Information System
5. Standards and Guidelines
 - Requests for Waivers*
 - [Department of Correctional Services](#). Multiple requests for waiver from [NITC 8-301](#) (Password Standard)
 - Confirm 30-Day Comment Period*
 - [NITC 5-202](#): Blocking Email Attachments (Revised)
 - Discussion
 - [Questions](#) regarding [NITC 7-403](#) (Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing)
 - Project Status Reporting - [Example](#)
 - Enterprise Projects - [Statutes](#)
6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)
 - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group - Horn
 - Learning Management System Standards Work Group - Langer
 - Security Architecture Work Group - Hartman
7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting Date - September 9, 2008

9. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Item

(The Technical Panel will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda, but reserves the right to adjust the order of items if necessary and may elect to take action on any of the items listed.)

NITC and Technical Panel websites: <http://nitc.ne.gov/>

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on July 2, 2008.

The agenda was posted to the NITC website on August 10, 2008.

TECHNICAL PANEL
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Tuesday, June 10, 2008, 9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brenda Decker, CIO, State of Nebraska
Rick Golden, University of Nebraska
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Mike Winkle, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications

MEMBERS ABSENT: Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Ms. Decker called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. There were four members present at the time of roll call. A quorum was present. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#) on May 12, 2008. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on June 6, 2008. A copy of the Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall of the meeting room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MAY 13, 2008 MINUTES

Mr. Winkle moved to approve the [May 13, 2008](#) minutes as present. Mr. Golden seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Golden-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS - ONGOING REVIEWS (AS NEEDED)

Retirement Systems - Jerry Brown and Robin Goracke

The assigned developers from the Office of the CIO continue to evaluate the maintainability of the Phase I code. At this point in the review, they indicated that it is maintainable and uses appropriate JAVA coding techniques.

The Phase II functional areas have been parsed from 15 to 22, which provided a more manageable size and complexity for each function. Phase II final approval is completed on 9 of the 22 functional areas. Phase II Design/Development continues. Most of this is accomplished off-shore.

Phase III (Batch) Requirements Validation with the users began the week of June 2, 2008.

The OCIO Project Office is currently putting the Project Plan on the Clarity project management software. It was decided to use SharePoint for the document repository. The QA team is working with the OCIO PMO to gain access to the repository. The Quality Assurance team is close to selecting a replacement for Paul Hackencamp.

The NPRIS project team met with the OCIO Security team on May 28, 2008.

- o NPRIS internal application will continue to use NPERS domain (Active Directory) for user registry.
- o NPRIS Self-service application should use NDS (Nebraska Directory Services)
- o Saber will test NPRIS for security vulnerability using IBM AppScan
- o The project team is still discussing the password expiry and userid naming policies, which would impact current self-service users. Currently, the password never expires and the userid is established by the user, as long as it is not already used.

Saber is currently reviewing the feasibility of replacing COGNOS reports with SQL Reporting Services. COGNOS currently costs approximately \$25,000 annually.

Mr. Goracke distributed the OCIO PMO Project Status format that is now being used for the NPRIS project. The status report included the following areas:

- o Planned value – where you should be
- o Earned value – estimate of costs and time when phases will be done, Office of the CIO can estimate needs and if project is on time.
- o Actual Cost – Actual costs spent on the project, so far it is right on target, could be used to see how and where resources are being spent to adjust where needed.

Ryan Christensen, of the Office of the CIO, was acknowledged and thanked for his assistance with the project management software.

Health and Human Services - MMIS and LIMS

LIMS – Four bids were received. The vendor selected was Kenware for the \$365,500 project. The RFP is in the intent to award phase. A question was raised regarding the resignation of a key resource staff person as a risk to project. The project will hire the staff member as a consultant/contractor. The role is more business related than technical.

MMIS – The project has completed the RFP phase. The system selected is similar to the system used by the State of Oklahoma. Forethought was awarded the bid and the contract was signed on June 1. The project will be housed in the Gold's building downtown. Staff will be moving in on June 16. This project is a 3-year effort with a projected go-live date of July 1, 2011. For future updates, the project will have more detailed reports including project management charts.

Nebraska State College System and the University of Nebraska - Student Information System

The vendor selection is done and the project is now in the negotiation phase. Work continues on project organization, hiring a project director, and looking for office space to house the project. There is a high level of collaboration among all entities involved. Dr. Kraus, chair of the Steering Committee, has volunteered to make a presentation to the NITC.

PROJECT REVIEWS - NEW

DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL TECHNOLOGY PURCHASE ([Neb. Rev. Stat. § 79-1335](#))
[National Repository of Online Courses \(NROC\) Agency License - Purchase](#)

A technical committee has reviewed the proposal and have submitted questions for clarification. Ron Cone and Gordon Roethemeyer were available via a phone conference to answer questions.

Mr. Roethemeyer provided an overview of the request. Omaha Public Schools has been a fully chartered member of NROC and were involved in a pilot project with other school districts. NROC provides courses via a template that can be modified per teacher's needs. The Distance Education Council voted on and approved the NROC purchase. The \$20,000 "Other Funds" line item budget would be a split among the ESU's at an approximate cost of \$3,000 each. There is a commitment from some of the Educational Service Units to share the costs of the statewide licensing.

Technical Panel members presented questions and concerns regarding the following:

- o Hardware, support and hosting costs
- o Number of proposed servers
- o Standard for servers and operating systems
- o Distribution method for a statewide license and access to all K-12 institutions
- o Confirmed commitment from all Educational Service Units

Ms. Decker suggested that since the panel members agree that the NROC content is valid but there is not enough information on the technical aspect that this request be tabled until the next meeting. This will give the Distance Education Council an opportunity to address the questions presented by the Technical

Panel members and the technical review committee. Ms. Decker also stated that there should be a documented commitment from the other ESUs for fees, contributions of hardware, plus support.

PROJECT REVIEWS - NEW

COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY FUND GRANT APPLICATION - [EHEALTH PROPOSALS](#)

Anne Byers, Community I.T. Manager

The Community Technology Fund has approximately \$270,000 available through June 30, 2009. The Community Council is submitting one project for technical review. The eHealth council is submitting 7 proposals for technical review.

PROJECT #1, EHEALTH PROJECT NEBRASKA HEALTH INFORMATION INITIATIVE—UNO & NEHII

Mr. Winkle moved to provide the following comments on the Project Nebraska Health Information Initiative project:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application, finds that:

- 1) The project is technically feasible.
- 2) The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.
- 3) The accomplishment of the project within the proposed timeframe is questionable without the commitment of the remainder of funds required.

Mr. Golden seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Golden-Yes, Langer-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

PROJECT #2, EHEALTH MEDICAID ELECTRONIC BILLING FOR LONG-TERM CARE PROJECT

Mr. Langer moved to provide the following comments on the Medicaid Electronic Billing for Long-Term Care project:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application, finds that:

- 1) The project is technically feasible.
- 2) The panel can not determine if the technology is appropriate because not enough information about how the project relates to the MMIS project has been supplied in the proposal.
- 3) The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.

Mr. Winkle seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Golden-Yes, Langer-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

PROJECTS #3-#7

PROJECT #3, WESTERN NEBRASKA HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE IMPLEMENTATION—PANHANDLE PUBLIC HEALTH DISTRICT; PROJECT #4, PUBLIC INPUT ON SHARING ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS—UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA BOARD OF REGENTS ON BEHALF OF THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC POLICY CENTER; PROJECT #5, BEHAVIORAL HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE NETWORK DEVELOPMENT—REGION V SERVICES; PROJECT #6, HEALTH INFORMATION SECURITY AND PRIVACY CONSUMER EDUCATION—NITC EHEALTH COUNCIL HEALTH /OFFICE OF THE CIO; AND PROJECT #7, HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY AND SECURITY WEBSITE—EHEALTH COUNCIL-HISPC

Mr. Golden moved to provide the following comments for each project:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application, finds that:

- 1) The project is technically feasible.
- 2) The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.
- 3) The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.

Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Golden-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

PROJECT REVIEW - [WEB SITE DEVELOPMENT FOR PEOPLE ATTRACTION](#) - UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. Langer moved to provide the following comments on the Web Site Development for People Attraction:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application, finds that:

- 1) The project is technically feasible.**
- 2) The proposed technology for the project is unknown.**
- 3) The project can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.**

Mr. Winkle seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Golden-Yes, Langer-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - NITC 1-201: AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PLAN - RECOMMENDATION TO THE NITC

[Comments Received](#) (1)

The document has been posted for the 30-day public comment period. One comment was received.

Mr. Winkle moved to recommend approval of [NITC 1-201](#): Agency Information Technology Plan as revised by the comment received. Mr. Golden seconded. Roll call vote: Langer-Yes, Golden-Yes, Winkle-Yes, and Decker-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES - NITC 1-202: PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS - RECOMMENDATION TO THE NITC

Comments Received (None)

The document has been posted for the 30-day public comment period. No comments were received.

Mr. Winkle moved to recommend approval of [NITC 1-202](#): Project Review Process. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Golden-Yes, Langer-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-4, No-0. Motion carried.

REGULAR INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Due to time constraints, the work group updates were passed over.

TECHNICAL PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Ms. Horn would like to recommend Jeremy J. Sydik as her alternate, to replace Lance Perez.

Mr. Langer moved to approve [Jeremy J. Sydik](#) to serve as Christy Horn's alternate on the Technical Panel. Ms. Decker seconded. Roll call vote: Decker-Yes, Langer-Yes, Golden-Abstain, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-3, No-0, Abstain-1. Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held on July 8, 2008, 9:00 a.m. in Varner Hall.

Mr. Winkle moved to adjourn. Mr. Golden seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO.

Becker, Rick

From: Hartman, Steven
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2008 4:12 PM
To: Becker, Rick
Subject: FW: Request for Non-expiring Password Waivers

Steven W. Hartman, CISSP, CISM
State Information Security Officer
State of Nebraska, Office of the CIO
(office) 402.471.7031
(fax) 402.471.4864
(cell) 402.416.3668

NEW EMAIL ADDRESS steve.hartman@nebraska.gov

From: Wells, George
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2008 3:49 PM
To: Hartman, Steven
Subject: FW: Request for Non-expiring Password Waivers

Steve,
Can you please give me an update on this request?

George M. Wells
IT Manager, NDCS
402-479-5658 Office
402-610-3498 Cellular
402-479-5958 Fax

From: Wells, George
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2008 5:24 PM
To: Hartman, Steven
Cc: Songster, Steve; VonSeggern, TJ
Subject: Request for Non-expiring Password Waivers

NDCS requests a waiver to use non-expiring passwords for the following video equipment on our Data network:

Bosch Digital Video Recorder (Bosch Control Center Software) at the Work Ethic Center in McCook, the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women at York, and the Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility in Omaha. This equipment is limited to one (1) Administrator account and five (5) User accounts with up to a twelve (12) character password.

Panasonic Remote Access (web access via a dedicated video PC) at the Community Corrections Center in Lincoln, the Nebraska State Penitentiary in Lincoln, the Lincoln Correctional Center, and the Diagnostic and Evaluation Center in Lincoln. The Panasonic video software is limited to one (1) Administrator account and fifteen (15) user accounts (only eight can be signed on at a time) with up to a twelve (12) character password.

Pelco PC Client Software (on a dedicated video PC) at the Omaha Correctional Center. This application is limited to one (1) Administrator account and twenty (20) user accounts (maximum of five users at a time) with up to a ten (10) character password.

All three video environments are connected via Extreme Networks layer 3 switches employing a separate

video VLAN. Access is limited to designated state employees via state owned networked PCs. The DCS Director is the last user on each of these systems. Access to these systems is not available via a remote connection from outside the NDCS Network.

A non-expiring password waiver is also requested for the following Environmental Control Systems:

Tridium Environmental Controls (Web Access) and Echelon Environmental Controls (Web Access) at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women in York. The security software for both systems allow for one (1) Administrator and an unlimited number of user accounts with up to a twelve (12) character password.

Web Supervisor Environmental Controls (Web Access) at the Nebraska State Penitentiary in Lincoln. This system allows for one (1) Administrator and an unlimited number of User accounts with up to a twelve (12) character password.

Andover Continuum Environmental Controls (Web Access) at the Omaha Correctional Center and the Tecumseh State Correctional Institution in Tecumseh. This system allows for one (1) Administrator and one (1) user account with up to a twelve (12) character password.

All four environmental control systems require vendors access using a VPN account to install software upgrades and patches to retain optimum performance. Additionally, designated maintenance staff at the associated facility as well as designated central office engineering staff have access from home via a VPN to make after hours adjustments to the system versus traveling to the facility. This reduces the impact of system failure or partial failure. These systems are connected to the NDCS Network via Extreme Networks Layer 3 switches using a separate VLAN.

If you need any additional information, please contact either TJ VonSeggern at 479-5923 or me. Thank you for considering both of these requests.

George M. Wells
IT Manager, NDCS
402-479-5658 Office
402-610-3498 Cellular
402-479-5958 Fax

Becker, Rick

From: Hartman, Steven
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2008 4:12 PM
To: Becker, Rick
Subject: FW: Waiver Request

Steven W. Hartman, CISSP, CISM
State Information Security Officer
State of Nebraska, Office of the CIO
(office) 402.471.7031
(fax) 402.471.4864
(cell) 402.416.3668

NEW EMAIL ADDRESS steve.hartman@nebraska.gov

From: Wells, George
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2008 3:48 PM
To: Hartman, Steven
Subject: Waiver Request

Steve,

We have a substantial number of staff in NDCS that do not routinely work with a computer. We have installed 1-2 PCs in the institutions' admin areas for staff to use during Open Enrollment and to look up their pay stub, leave balance, or other self service function. We have a high turnover rate for these staff and creating them each a separate network log-on account would be a significant amount of work for limited use. What we are requesting is the following:

1. Create generic network accounts with non-expiring passwords that would let these staff get to the NIS logon web page, where they would use their NIS log-on account to complete their activity.
2. Lock down the accounts in the ISA proxy system so they can only go to NIS via the browser.

Please forward this request for approval at the earliest opportunity. Thank you.

George M. Wells
IT Manager, NDCS
402-479-5658 Office
402-610-3498 Cellular
402-479-5958 Fax



Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Password Standard

Category	Security Architecture
Title	Password Standard
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies <input type="checkbox"/> All..... Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excluding higher education institutions Standard <input type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: All Public Entities Guideline Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval (see Section 3.2) Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.
---------------	---

Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Date: Date Adopted by NITC: September 18, 2007 Other:

Prepared by: Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission
 Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/>

1.0 Standard

Passwords are a primary means to control access to systems; therefore all users must select, use, and manage passwords to protect against unauthorized discovery or usage.

1.1 Password Construction

The following are the minimum password requirements for State of Nebraska passwords:

- Must contain at least eight (8) characters
 - Must not repeat any character sequentially more than two (2) times
- Must contain at least three (3) of the following four (4):
 - At least one (1) uppercase character
 - At least one (1) lowercase character
 - At least one (1) numeric character
 - At least one (1) symbol
- Must change at least every 90 days
- Can not repeat any of the passwords used during the previous 365 days.

1.2 Non-Expiring Passwords

Agencies may use non-expiring passwords for automated system accounts (e.g. backups and batch jobs) after submitting the form found in Appendix A. All non-expiring passwords should exceed the character requirements listed in Section 1.1.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

Passwords are used to authenticate a unique User ID to a variety of State of Nebraska resources. Some of the more common uses include: user accounts, web accounts, email accounts.

3.0 Applicability

3.1 State Government Agencies

All State agencies, boards, and commissions are required to comply with the standard listed in Section 1.0.

3.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC Technical Panel upon request by an agency.

3.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a "Request for Exemption" to the NITC Technical Panel. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; system limitation, or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the NITC via e-mail or letter (Office of the NITC, 501 S 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68509). The NITC Technical Panel will consider the request and grant or deny the exemption. A denial of an exemption by the NITC Technical Panel may be appealed to the NITC.

4.0 Responsibility

4.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6))

4.2 State Agencies

Each state agency will be responsible for ensuring that any application or system requiring the use of a password adheres to this standard.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 NITC Information Security Policy (<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html>)

5.2 Non-expiring Password Agreement (Appendix A)

Appendix A

Non-Expiring Password Agreement

This agreement describes the agreed upon policy exception and/or level of security provided by the Office of the CIO for the application known as:

To the limits dictated by the State of Nebraska and Federal laws, agency data and system owners are responsible for determining how critical and sensitive information is for their applications to insure integrity, availability, and confidentiality.

Security Classification Levels

The NITC Data Security Standard recognizes four basic levels of security classifications that are associated with varying degrees of known risks. (See NITC Security Officer Handbook for more details). They can be summarized as follows:

HIGHLY RESTRICTED is for the most sensitive information intended strictly for use within your organization and controlled by special rules to specific personnel. It is highly critical and demands the highest possible security.

CONFIDENTIAL is for less sensitive information intended for use within your organization, yet still requires a high level of security. It may be regulated for privacy considerations. (e.g. HIPAA)

INTERNAL USE ONLY is for non-sensitive information intended for use within your organization. The security is controlled, but not highly protected.

UNCLASSIFIED/ PUBLIC is for information that requires minimal security and can be handled in the public domain.

Agency Justification

The undersigned agency representative has been authorized to request a **non-expiring password** for the application and data named above with a **security classification level** of _____ and includes the following criteria as supporting justification:

* * * * *

Office of the CIO Justification

The Office of the CIO recommends **no policy exceptions** with the following justification:

Agency Representative

Date

Office of the CIO Representative

Date

NITC 5-202 DRAFT

State of Nebraska Nebraska Information Technology Commission Standards and Guidelines

NITC 5-202 (Draft)

Title	Blocking Email Attachments
Category	Groupware Architecture
Applicability	Applies to all state government agencies, excluding higher education

1. Purpose

It is important to take steps to protect the state's computing environment against the threat of viruses. Email attachments with certain extensions are often used in virus attacks because of their execution access and the amount of damage they can cause. Therefore, the State of Nebraska prohibits certain attachments from being transmitted through email.

2. Standard

2.1 Removing Prohibited Attachments Before Delivery

The SMTP gateway will remove any prohibited attachments before allowing the email to be delivered. If any of the blocked extensions are detected, the attachment will be deleted and a message stating that the attachment was blocked will be included in the email message.

2.2 List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

Attachment A, entitled "List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked," contains the current listing of attachments which will be blocked by the State of Nebraska.

2.3 Alternative Methods for Sending or Receiving Files

If an individual needs to send or receive a file with one of the blocked extensions, other alternatives for transmitting files should be considered, such as: Secure file transfers (sFTP / FTPS) or Web-based document retrieval.

[Attachment A](#): List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

VERSION DATE: DRAFT - August 6, 2008

HISTORY: Original version adopted on November 13, 2003.

PDF FORMAT: (to be added)

List of Extensions - Attachments which will be blocked

Extension - Description	Internal ¹	Inbound
ade – Access Project extension (Microsoft)	X	
adp – Access Project (Microsoft)	X	
app – Executable Application	X	
asp – Active Server Page	X	
bas – Basic	X	X
bat – Batch	X	X
cer – Internet Security Certificate File	X	
chm – Compiled HTML Help	X	
cmd – Command	X	X
com – Command, executable	X	X
cpl – Control panel applet	X	X
crt – Certificate File	X	
csh – csh Script	X	
exe – Executable program	X	X
fxp – FoxPro Compiled Source (Microsoft)	X	
gadget – Windows Vista gadget	X	
hlp – Windows Help File	X	
hta – HTML application	X	X
inf – set up	X	X
ins – Internet communications settings	X	X
isp – Internet communications settings	X	X
its – Internet Document Set, Internet Translation	X	
js – JScript	X	X
jse – JScript encoded file	X	X
ksh – UNIX Shell Script	X	
Ink – Shortcut	X	X
mad – Access Module Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maf – Access (Microsoft)	X	
mag – Access Diagram Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mam – Access Macro Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maq – Access Query Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mar – Access Report Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mas – Access Stored Procedure (Microsoft)	X	
mat – Access Table Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
mau – Executable Media file	X	
mav – Access View Shortcut (Microsoft)	X	
maw – Access Data Access Page (Microsoft)	X	
mda – Access Add-in, MDA Access 2 Workgroup (Microsoft)	X	
mdb – Access Application, MBD Access Database (Microsoft)	X	
mde – Access MDE Database File (Microsoft)	X	
mdt – Access Add-in Data (Microsoft)	X	
mdw – Access Workgroup Information (Microsoft)	X	
mdz – Access Wizard Template (Microsoft)	X	
msc – Microsoft common console document	X	X
msi – Install Control file	X	X
msp – Windows installer patch	X	X

mst – Windows installer transform	X	X
ops – Office Profile Settings File	X	
pcd – Visual test (Microsoft)	X	
pif – Windows program information file	X	X
prf – Windows System File	X	
prg – Program file	X	
pst – MS Exchange Access Book File (Microsoft)	X	
reg – Microsoft registry	X	X
scf – Windows Explorer Command	X	
scr – Screensaver	X	X
sct – Windows script component	X	X
shb – Document short cut	X	X
shs – Shell Script object	X	X
test – Test files		X
tmp – Temporary File / Folder	X	
url – Internet shortcut	X	X
vb – VBScript	X	X
vbe – VBScript encoded file	X	X
vbs – Visual Basic	X	X
vsmacros – Visual Studio .NET Binary-based Macro Project	X	
vss – Visio Stencil (Microsoft)	X	
vst – Visio Template (Microsoft)	X	
vsw – Visio Workspace File (Microsoft)	X	
ws – Windows Script File (Microsoft)	X	
wsc – Windows Script component	X	X
Wsf – Windows Script File	X	
wsh – Windows Scripting host settings	X	X
wma – Windows Media Audio		X
wmf – Windows Media File		X

Note:

1 – Microsoft Outlook strips these attachments when sending to another Exchange user within the State of Nebraska.

Becker, Rick

From: Rolfes, Tom
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 8:31 AM
To: Becker, Rick
Subject: FW: Policy questions

From: Gordon Roethemeyer [mailto:groethem@esu10.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2008 7:15 PM
To: Rolfes, Tom
Subject: Re: Policy questions

Tom:

Please insert a discussion item into NITC Technical Panel meeting agenda for August 12th concerning these questions and any questions that the panel has for our policies subcommittee.

Polycom's PVX software use for distance learning?

Could a student use a laptop with PVX to receive a class? If so, would the school qualify for incentive payment for that class? What about Renovo licensing and control in an instant such as this?

If an ESU purchases a bridge does the bridge have to be licensed and controlled by Renovo?

Will all codec devices owned by libraries, hospitals, colleges and the State have to be licensed and controlled by Renovo?

Are all members of Network Nebraska required to have their codec devices licensed and controlled by Renovo?

--

Gordon Roethemeyer
Executive Director
Distance Education Council
Educational Service Unit #10
PO BOX 850
Kearney, NE 68845

Email: groethem@nebdec.org
Phone: 308-237-5927 ext. 294
Cell: 308-440-0706
Website: <http://www.nebdec.org>



Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing

Category	Video Architecture
Title	Scheduling Standard for Synchronous Distance Learning and Videoconferencing
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Standard <input type="checkbox"/> Excluding Not Applicable
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... Standard
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Entities using state-owned or state-leased communication networks for synchronous video.....Standard
	Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval (see Section 3.1). Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Version Date: April 17, 2006 Date Adopted by NITC: May 1, 2006 Other: Contact information updated in § 3.1.1 on February 28, 2008.

1.0 Standard

This document consists of a list of features that ought to be available in any system that is developed for use in scheduling of synchronous events using videoconferencing technology.

It is the intent that any and all such scheduling systems defined by the specifications below be accessible either through the Internet or within a defined intranet as decided upon by the system administrators.

The following sections attempt to describe the various levels and types of scheduling or coordination that might be considered.

1.1 Hardware control component

When attempting to link two or more sites electronically, some system must coordinate the connectivity between/among the sites. This includes controlling the network and endpoint hardware and bandwidth necessary to cause a successful connection.

1.1.1 Standards for hardware control system

A system should be able to control all hardware in a network and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to enable the following:

- 1.1.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.1.1.2 Locate devices by IP address (both static and DHCP)
- 1.1.1.3 Locate devices by MAC address
- 1.1.1.4 Facilitate far-end control in endpoint devices with the capability
- 1.1.1.5 Display a call list that is understood by non-techs using plain English site description
- 1.1.1.6 Have a defined quality of service
- 1.1.1.7 Hardware and software systems must work such that the scheduling system is available for use at least 99.9% of the time
- 1.1.1.8 The system should not require reset/reboot more often than once per week
- 1.1.1.9 Have a minimum of a one-year warranty
- 1.1.1.10 Annual maintenance fees after the warranty has run out should not exceed 10% of original purchase price
- 1.1.1.11 Keep automated log data that may be defined by and searched in ways to be defined by the system administrator(s) with multiple possible search definitions
- 1.1.1.12 Maintain security in ways that can be defined by system administrators including:
 - 1.1.1.12.1 Keeping log information secure
 - 1.1.1.12.2 Limiting access to an event
 - 1.1.1.12.3 Turning encryption on/off in endpoint devices with the capability

- 1.1.1.12.4 Identifying security capability to system administrators and event coordinators by site
- 1.1.1.12.5 Provide an identity management system that allows for multiple levels of user access as defined by system administrators
- 1.1.1.13 Facilitate ad hoc events by users with permission from system administrators
- 1.1.1.14 Facilitate scheduled events by users with permission from system administrators
- 1.1.1.15 Be capable of controlling all specific equipment used in the network (CODECs, routers, switchers, MCUs, firewall systems, etc.)
- 1.1.1.16 Facilitate various types of events
 - 1.1.1.16.1 Broadcast to all
 - 1.1.1.16.2 Broadcast to some
 - 1.1.1.16.3 2-way point-to-point
 - 1.1.1.16.4 2-way multipoint
 - 1.1.1.16.5 A combination of broadcast and 2-way

1.2 Event logging component

If a system coordinator has a requirement to track information about events some mechanism would have to be in place. This may include knowing the number of people at a site, the minutes an event runs at any given site, or the number of events a specific organization schedules.

1.2.1 Standards for event logging system

A system should be able to automatically store data and permit reports and be capable of linking into the all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.2.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.2.1.2 Store data in an ODBC compliant relational database
- 1.2.1.3 Provide fields for logging various pieces of information
 - 1.2.1.3.1 minutes a site is available/not available
 - 1.2.1.3.2 minutes a site is used
 - 1.2.1.3.3 number of event attendees
 - 1.2.1.3.4 type of event as defined by system administrators
 - 1.2.1.3.5 number of sites per event
- 1.2.1.4 Permit system administrator defined fields (no fewer than 64)
 - 1.2.1.4.1 Definable by site, groups of sites, and groups of groups
- 1.2.1.5 Related GUI entry for call setup as defined by system administrators
 - 1.2.1.5.1 Physical site location

- 1.2.1.5.2 Local contact and facility arrangement info
 - 1.2.1.5.2.1 Costs, availability, site rules
 - 1.2.1.5.2.2 ADA options available
- 1.2.1.5.3 Searchable criteria for describing or accessing spaces
- 1.2.1.5.4 Must have a GUI that is understandable in plain English
- 1.2.1.6 Facilitate search to know what facilities are in conflict or are often in conflict
 - 1.2.1.6.1 number of conflicts for a given site over a specific amount of time
- 1.2.1.7 Accommodate a facility “wait” list / availability queue
 - 1.2.1.7.1 If a facility is already confirmed for an event, it should log who has requested the same facility then auto notify the requester(s) if the event causing the conflict is cancelled
- 1.2.1.8 Account for billing charges per event/location and total bill generation after the event

1.3 Facilities coordination component

If an event will include locations for which more than one person/organization has responsibility, then some mechanism must exist for coordinating use of facilities. There may be technical or administrative limits as to the number or types of sites that can participate in any given event. This could be as simple as users coordinating times over the telephone or through e-mail, but for some applications there may be a greater need for pre-scheduling and coordination among multiple administrators.

1.3.1 Standards for facilities coordination system

A system should enable access to facilities based on defined permissions, resolve conflicts based on pre-determined policies and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.3.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.3.1.2 System editable user access
 - 1.3.1.2.1 Activate a facility such that it is known to the system and to system users
 - 1.3.1.2.2 Building level admin such that the facilities at a specific location can set policies for that site and permit use by others
 - 1.3.1.2.3 Regional admin (organization / geo-political) such that a group of facilities can set policies for all related sites and permit use by others

- 1.3.1.2.4 Sys admin (configuration) such that technical system setup, operation and maintenance may be conducted
- 1.3.1.2.5 Sector admin such that groups of groups of facilities can set policies for all related sites and permit use by others
- 1.3.1.2.6 Room request such that any designated site user or administrator may request access to a facility they do not already have rights to schedule
- 1.3.1.2.7 Participant access defaults
 - 1.3.1.2.7.1 All denied unless specifically permitted
 - 1.3.1.2.7.2 All permitted unless specifically denied
- 1.3.1.2.8 User account directory service with definable permissions for each account
- 1.3.1.3 Types of coordination
 - 1.3.1.3.1 Event posting to inform others of possible access
 - 1.3.1.3.2 Site joining to allow other to access
 - 1.3.1.3.3 Ad hoc to allow immediate activation of unscheduled events
 - 1.3.1.3.4 Pre-planned events that may occur once or cyclically
 - 1.3.1.3.5 Inter network coordination to permit interaction of sites both within and outside a controlled network
 - 1.3.1.3.6 Intra network coordination to permit interaction of sites within a controlled network
 - 1.3.1.3.7 Administrator defined bandwidth prioritization to minimize network bottlenecks
 - 1.3.1.3.8 Administrator defined asset prioritization to minimize system conflicts
 - 1.3.1.3.9 Site-requested bandwidth speed
- 1.3.1.4 Facilities information to be posted
 - 1.3.1.4.1 Identify technology available by site
 - 1.3.1.4.2 Physical site location
 - 1.3.1.4.3 Local contact and facility arrangement info
 - 1.3.1.4.3.1 Costs, availability, site rules
 - 1.3.1.4.3.2 ADA options available
- 1.3.1.5 Event information to be posted
 - 1.3.1.5.1 Definable credit type
 - 1.3.1.5.2 Definable student type
 - 1.3.1.5.3 Event/course prerequisites
 - 1.3.1.5.4 Event/course descriptions
 - 1.3.1.5.5 Teacher / event leader / presenter
 - 1.3.1.5.6 Materials needed
 - 1.3.1.5.7 Event coordinator info
 - 1.3.1.5.8 Target audience
 - 1.3.1.5.9 Mapquest-like link

1.4 People coordination component

If a specific location is to be used this implies that operational people may need to be dedicated to cause successful events. Since there will be a variety of site designs and operations, then there will be a variety of the demand of staff time. Likewise each facility will have limits on how many people can attend at any one location. Finally, there may be limitations as to the total number of event participants allowed.

1.4.1 Standards for people coordination system

A system should enable interaction of people based on policies set by system administrators and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.4.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.4.1.2 Allow for multiple permission levels
 - 1.4.1.2.1 View schedules
 - 1.4.1.2.2 Request systems/facilities
 - 1.4.1.2.3 Approve systems/facilities use
- 1.4.1.3 Provide information about instructor/facilitator and their availability
- 1.4.1.4 Allow for predetermined maximum number of attendees
- 1.4.1.5 Track and display count of committed attendees
- 1.4.1.6 Track and display remaining permitted attendees
- 1.4.1.7 Allow for predetermined maximum number of sites
- 1.4.1.8 Track and display count of committed sites
- 1.4.1.9 Track and display remaining permitted sites

1.5 Event clearinghouse component

As system users see a need for pre-scheduled events coordinated among a large number of facilities and administrators, the concept of a virtual location for brokering of events becomes attractive. Such a clearinghouse could serve as a way that event coordinators might let others know the specifics of events they are planning (a certain class with a specific sort of content will be offered on a certain schedule for a certain period of time or a specific event will happen one time on a specific day at a specific time).

Such a clearinghouse could also serve as a way for interested parties to find events that meet their specific needs (a school administrator has a certain number of students who need a specific class that is not offered locally). Availability might also include information about participant or site number limitations (the total seats/sites in the class/event, the number requested/registered so far and the number remaining of the total).

1.5.1 Standards for an event clearing house system

A system should enable online interaction for publishing of event information and be capable of linking into all the other systems listed in this standard to include the following:

- 1.5.1.1 Browser-based access
- 1.5.1.2 Posting of one-time single events
- 1.5.1.3 Posting of sequenced or cyclical events
- 1.5.1.4 Posting of costs to participate in an event
- 1.5.1.5 Permit system administrator defined fields (no less than 256)
- 1.5.1.6 Provide for automated multiple time zone accommodation
- 1.5.1.7 Posting of multiple standard bell schedules related to formal educational events
- 1.5.1.8 Permitting or excluding view of encrypted/secured events such that those with permission may see that the events are available and those without permission won't even be able to know that these events are taking place
- 1.5.1.9 Posting of all, part or none of the information defined in the standards in this document as defined by system administrators
- 1.5.1.10 Use an ODBC compliant relational database
- 1.5.1.11 System administrator defined search/reporting capability
- 1.5.1.12 Posting of facility group affiliation
- 1.5.1.13 Provide for automated email notification of site requests/confirmations
 - 1.5.1.13.1 Events offered
 - 1.5.1.13.2 Events needed
 - 1.5.1.13.3 Event outages
 - 1.5.1.13.4 Event conflicts
- 1.5.1.14 Provide for automated site schedule generation to include
 - 1.5.1.14.1 Events offered
 - 1.5.1.14.2 Events needed
 - 1.5.1.14.3 Event outages
 - 1.5.1.14.4 Event conflicts
- 1.5.1.15 Provide for event cancellation "drop dead" date policies for events to include automated email notifications
 - 1.5.1.15.1 Minimums not met
 - 1.5.1.15.2 Facilities conflict not resolved
 - 1.5.1.15.3 Email notification
- 1.5.1.16 Provide for links to asynchronous event-related material (eLearning)
- 1.5.1.17 Provide for automated billing
- 1.5.1.18 Provide for post event evaluations as defined by system administrators

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this standard is to establish and define the needs for scheduling to be addressed when purchasing and maintaining scheduling coordination systems.

2.1 Background

The State of Nebraska is about to exceed 300 IP-based videoconferencing facilities within the sectors of K-12 education, higher education, informal education, telehealth, and state agencies. In order for any particular entity to be able to connect to any other particular entity (within or outside their subsector), some software system is required to complete the connection, maintain the connection, and to list the directory of participating entities.

The standards expressed herein is a product of a meeting that took place on February 3, 2006, with input from over 20 representatives from the NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group, coming from institutions all across the State. It is this unselfish dedication to achieving a common good that makes such a software system possible.

When describing scheduling of teleconferencing events there is a variety of descriptive language expressed by those who use the technology. Depending on how "scheduling" is defined, the need may be described on a continuum from "not needed" to "locally coordinated" to "centrally coordinated".

2.2 Objective

The objective of this standard is to enable all existing and future synchronous distance learning and videoconferencing facilities in Nebraska to achieve interoperability and maintain an acceptable quality of service through scheduled and ad hoc event coordination.

3.0 Applicability

These standards apply to synchronous distance learning and videoconferencing facilities as follows:

- If utilizing state-owned or state-leased communications networks:
 - Any synchronous distance learning facility or videoconferencing application which utilizes state-owned or state-leased communications networks must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5; or
 - The entity must provide, or arrange for, coordination on their behalf through some other entity with the stated capability.

- If using state funding:
 - All **new** facilities or applications receiving state funding must comply with the scheduling standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5.
 - All **existing** facilities or applications receiving state funding for ongoing operations must convert to the standards listed in Sections 1.1 through 1.5 as soon as fiscally prudent or upon renewal of any existing scheduling system service contract, whichever comes first.

- These standards **do not apply** to the following entities:
 - University of Nebraska (relating to the university’s academic research mission)
 - Any entity which applies for, and receives, an exemption.

General Statement on Applicability

The Governing board or chief administrative officer of each organization is responsible for compliance with these standards. The NITC will consider adherence to technical standards as part of its evaluation and prioritization of funding requests

3.1 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC Technical Panel upon request by an agency or other entity.

3.1.1 Exemption Process

Any agency or other entity may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a “Request for Exemption” to the NITC Technical Panel. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the NITC via e-mail (ocio.nitc@nebraska.gov) or letter (Office of the NITC, 501 S. 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68509). The NITC Technical Panel will consider the request and grant or deny the exemption. A denial of an exemption by the NITC Technical Panel may be appealed to the NITC.

4.0 Responsibility

An effective program for scheduling standards compliance involves cooperation of many different entities. Major participants and their responsibilities include:

1. Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The NITC provides strategic direction for state agencies and educational institutions in the area of information technology. The NITC also has statutory responsibility to adopt minimum technical standards and guidelines for acceptable and cost-effective use of information technology. Implicit in these requirements is the responsibility to promote adequate quality of service and uniformity for information systems through adoption of policies, standards, and guidelines.
2. Technical Panel Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group. The NITC Technical Panel, with advice from the Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group, has responsibility for recommending scheduling standard policies and guidelines and making available best practices to operational entities.
3. Agency and Institutional Heads. The highest authority within an agency or institution is responsible for interoperability of information resources that are consistent with this policy. The authority may delegate this responsibility but delegation does not remove the accountability.
4. Information Technology Staff. Technical staff must be aware of the opportunities and responsibility to meet the goals of interoperability of information systems.

5.0 Related Documents

5.1 Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group Charter:

<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/video/charter.pdf>

5.2 Glossary of Technical Terms

<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/itc/citizens/glossary.htm>

Project Status Form

General Information			
Project Name			Date
Sponsoring Agency			
Contact	Phone	Email	Employer
Project Manager	Phone	Email	Employer
Key Questions			Explanation (if Yes)
1. Has the project scope of work changed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
2. Will upcoming target dates be missed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. Does the project team have resource constraints? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
4. Are there problems or concerns that require stakeholder or top management attention? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

Project Metrics		
Measure	Numbers	Percent Complete
Tasks Complete	[13 of 54]	[24%]
Tasks in Progress	[26 of 54]	[48%]
Tasks not Started	[28 of 54]	[52%]
Time spent	[18 of 86 weeks]	[21%]
Time remaining	[68 of 86 weeks]	[79%]
[Project Specific Measure]		

Summary Project Status

Based on the color legend below, indicate green, yellow, or red for the reporting periods of each item. Any item classified as red or yellow requires an explanation in the comment boxes that follow this section. Additional priority items can be added to the list for status reporting.

Select one color in each of the Reporting Period columns to indicate your best assessment of:	Last Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY]			This Reporting Period [MM/DD/YYYY]		
1. Overall Project Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
2. Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
3. Budget (capital, overall project hours)	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
4. Scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
5. Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green
	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green	<input type="checkbox"/> Red	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow	<input type="checkbox"/> Green

Color Legend

	Red	Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement. “Probable that item will NOT meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope”.
	Yellow	Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning. “Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed”.
	Green	Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables. “Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality”.

Product and/or Service Performance

Performance Standard	Meets	Exceeds	Below	Explanation

Milestones Planned and Accomplished			
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date	Actual Date

Milestones Planned and Not Accomplished			
For each item listed, provide a corresponding explanation of the effect of this missed item on other target dates and provide the plan to recover from this missed item.			
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date	Effect on Other Dates/Plan

Milestones Planned for Next Period		
Milestone	Original Date	Revised Date

Decision Points			
For each item listed, provide a corresponding explanation of the effect of this item on other target dates, scope or cost and provide the responsible parties name. The responsible party will ensure the decision is made and carried out.			
Decision Point	Decision Due Date	Deciders Name or Names	Decisions Effect on Project

Project Issues				
Description	Impact on Project - (H,M,L)	Date Resolution is Needed	Issue Resolution Assigned to	Date Resolved

Footnote: High, Medium, Low Impact.

High- "project killer" major impact on project time, scope, cost. Issue must be resolved! - **Medium**- impact will moderately effect project time, scope, cost. - **Low**- Issue will not impact project delivery

Comparison of Budgeted to Actual Expenditures				
Use a chart like the following to show actual expenditures compared to planned levels. Break the costs into other categories as appropriate.				
Fiscal Year [YYYY]				
Budget Item	Actual Costs to Date	Estimate to Complete	Total Estimated Costs	Total Planned Budget
Salaries				
Contract Services				
Hardware				
Software				
Training				
Other Expenditures*				
Total Costs				
Other Expenditures include supplies, materials, etc.				

Risks Management			
Major Risk Events	High Medium Low	Risk Mitigation	Mitigation Responsible Party

Additional Comments / Concerns

Enterprise Project Statutes

86-506 Enterprise project, defined.

Enterprise project means an endeavor undertaken over a fixed period of time using information technology, which would have a significant effect on a core business function or affects multiple government programs, agencies, or institutions. Enterprise project includes all aspects of planning, design, implementation, project management, and training relating to the endeavor.

Source Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 276; Laws 2008, LB823, § 2. July 18, 2008

.....

86-525 Enterprise project; legislative findings.

In addition to the findings in section 86-513, the Legislature also finds that:

- (1) The effective, efficient, and cost-effective operation of state government requires that information be considered and managed as a strategic resource;
- (2) Information technologies present numerous opportunities to more effectively manage the information necessary for state government operations;
- (3) Information technologies are changing and advancing at a very rapid rate, increasing the computing power available to individual users;
- (4) The commission should have the responsibility to establish goals, guidelines, and priorities for information technology infrastructure; and
- (5) Periodic investments in the information technology infrastructure are required to develop and maintain the foundation for the effective use of information technologies throughout state government.

Source Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 3; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 5; R.S.Supp., 2000, § 81-1192; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 295.

86-526 Enterprise project; designation.

The commission shall determine which proposed information technology projects are enterprise projects. The commission shall create policies and procedures for the designation of such projects. The commission shall evaluate designated enterprise project plans as authorized in section 86-528.

Source Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 5; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 6; R.S.Supp., 2000, § 81-1194; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 296; Laws 2008, LB823, § 7. July 18, 2008

86-527 Information Technology Infrastructure Fund; created; use; investment.

The Information Technology Infrastructure Fund is hereby created. The fund shall contain revenue from the special privilege tax as provided in section 77-2602, gifts, grants, and such other money as is appropriated or transferred by the Legislature. The fund shall be used to attain the goals and priorities identified in the statewide technology plan. The fund shall be administered by the office of Chief Information Officer. Expenditures shall be made from the fund to finance the operations of the Information Technology Infrastructure Act in accordance with the appropriations made by the Legislature. Transfers from the fund to the General Fund may be made at the direction of the Legislature. Any money in the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund available for investment shall be invested by the state investment officer pursuant to the Nebraska Capital Expansion Act and the Nebraska State Funds Investment Act.

Source Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 6; Laws 1998, LB 924, § 42; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 7; R.S.Supp., 2000, § 81-1195; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 297; Laws 2002, Second Spec. Sess., LB 1, § 10; Laws 2003, LB 408, § 7; Laws 2006, LB 921, § 19; Laws 2008, LB823, § 8. July 18, 2008

86-528 Enterprise project; funding.

(1) The Legislature may allocate money from the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund for enterprise projects. The Legislature may recognize multiple-year commitments for large projects, subject to available appropriations, including remaining obligations for the century date change project managed by the department.

(2) No contract or expenditure for the implementation of an enterprise project may be initiated unless the commission has approved a project plan. The project plan shall include, but not be limited to, the objectives, scope, and justification of the project; detailed specifications and analyses that guide the project from beginning to conclusion; technical requirements; and project management. The commission may request clarification, require changes, or provide conditional approval of a project plan. In its review, the commission shall determine whether the objectives, scope, timeframe, and budget of the project are consistent with the proposal authorized by the Legislature in its allocation from the fund.

(3) The commission may also evaluate whether the project plan is consistent with the statewide technology plan and the commission's technical standards and guidelines.

Source Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 8; R.S.Supp.,2000, § 81-1196.01; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 298; Laws 2008, LB823, § 9.July 18, 2008

86-529 Enterprise project; commission; duties.

To implement enterprise projects pursuant to sections 86-525 to 86-530, the commission shall:

(1) Develop procedures and issue guidelines regarding the review, approval, and monitoring of enterprise projects; and

(2) Coordinate with the Chief Information Officer to monitor the status of enterprise projects, including a complete accounting of all project costs by fund source.

Source Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 10; Laws 1998, LB 924, § 43; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 9; R.S.Supp.,2000, § 81-1199; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 299; Laws 2008, LB823, § 10.July 18, 2008

86-530 Enterprise project; report.

The Chief Information Officer shall report annually to the Governor and the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature on the status of enterprise projects.

Source Laws 1996, LB 1190, § 13; Laws 2000, LB 1349, § 10; R.S.Supp.,2000, § 81-11,102; Laws 2002, LB 1105, § 300; Laws 2008, LB823, § 11.July 18, 2008