NEBRASKA STATE RECORDS BOARD
MEETING: July 8, 2003

Nebraska State Capitol
Room 1507
Lincoln, NE
July 8, 2003
1:30 P.M.

NEBRASKA STATE RECORDS BOARD
AGENDA
Room 1507 State Capitol
July 8, 2003 - 1:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order, Roll Call

2. Notice of Hearing (6/27/03 Lincoln Journal Star)

3. Approval of Minutes from March 28, 2003 meeting

4. Records Management Cash Fund Balance

5. Public Hearing
   a. Health an Human Services--Electronic Access to Practitioner Lists

6. Grant Status Report

7. Grant Applications
   a. University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension Office—Access E-government $25,000
   b. Board of Public Accountancy-Online Review of Annual Registration/Online Submission of Forms-- $25,000

8. Nebrask@ Online General Manager's Report
   a. Project Priority List--Review and Approve
   b. New State Portal Demo

Motion to go into closed session

9. Review and Approve Network Manager Services RFP Evaluation Criteria .

End Closed Session

10. Establish Network Manager RFP Evaluation Subcommittee and Selection Procedures

11. Consideration of Extension of the Deadline for submission of RFP

12. Miscellaneous Matters
   a. Consideration of Using Public Notice Calendar for Public Notice of State Records Board Meetings

13. Adjournment

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given of a public meeting of the Nebraska State Records Board on Tuesday, July 8, 2003, at 1:30 PM in Room 1507 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska. The meeting will include review of grant applications for the State Records Board Grant program, and a public hearing on setting fees for electronic access to public records of the Health and Human Services system. The agenda for the meeting is available at the office of Secretary of State for public inspection during regular business hours. # 2358033-11-June 27

NEBRASKA STATE RECORDS BOARD

MINUTES

Meeting of March 28, 2003

The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Gale at 9:32 A.M. on March 28, 2003, in Room 1507 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The following Board members were present:
John Gale, Chairman;
William Bidrowski;
Lorelee Byrd;
Jerry Catlett;
Lauren Hill, representing the Governor;
Laureen Riedesel;
Steve Schafer, representing the Director of Administrative Services;
Kate Witek.

Not present were:
Jon Bruning;
David Buelt;
Diane Vicars.

Chairman Gale announced that notice of the meeting had been published in the Lincoln Journal Star on March 20, 2003.

The minutes of the meeting of December 9, 2002, were considered. Mr. Catlett moved that the minutes be approved as circulated; motion seconded by Mr. Bidrowski.

Voting For:	Bidrowski	Byrd	Catlett	Gale
	Hill	Riedesel	Schafer	Witek
Voting Against:	None			
Absent:	Bruning	Buelt	Vicars	

The motion carried.

Greg Lemon, Chief Deputy Secretary of State, reported on the Records Management Cash Fund -State Records Board balance.

Greg Lemon commented on the Grant Project Status Report. Steve Schafer indicated that he would update the expected completion dates for grants to the Chief Information Officer.

Chairman Gale opened discussion of a grant application for $25,000.00, from the University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension Office for a program entitled Access e-Government. Phyllis Schoenholz, Extension Educator, testified in favor of this application. Dennis Kahl, Seward County Extension Educator, also appeared in support of this application. After discussion, this application was tabled until 10:30 A.M.

Greg Lemon introduced the Network Manager Contract Request for Proposals (RFP) and reported that this RFP had been approved by the subcommittee appointed to work on it. After discussion, Mr. Schafer moved to approve draft RFP; motion seconded by Ms. Byrd.

Voting For:	Bidrowski	Byrd	Catlett	Gale
	Hill	Riedesel	Schafer	Witek
Voting Against:	None			
Absent:	Bruning	Buelt	Vicars	

The motion carried.

Ms. Witek departed from the meeting

Chairman Gale reopened the discussion of the Cooperative Extension Office grant application. After discussion, Mr. Schafer moved to approve this application with the conditions that the Cooperative Extension Office demonstrate cooperation with Nebrask@ Online, prepare a work plan and timelines, and prepare reports to the Board of training results; motion seconded by Mr. Bidrowski. Chairman Gale requested that the motion be amended to add the further condition that Cooperative Extension not show preference to Nebrask@ Online over private vendors. The maker of the motion and the second both accepted this amendment. As a result of this amendment, Chairman Gale indicated that sentence two, paragraph four, page four, which reads:

Access e-Government will promote the technical services of Nebraska Online when the local governments are ready to develop or upgrade their website.

be deleted. The maker of the motion and the second both accepted this amendment.

Chairman Gale called for a vote on the motion as twice amended.

Voting For:	Bidrowski	Byrd	Catlett	Gale
	Schafer			
Voting Against:	Hill	Riedesel		
Absent:	Bruning	Buelt	Vicars	Witek

The motion failed.

Chairman Gale opened discussion of a grant application for $25,000.00, from the Chief Information Officer for Interactive Licensing Phase III. Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer, testified in favor of this application.

Ms. Byrd departed from the meeting.

Ms. Hill asked the CIO to provide more detail on what Phase III will do, including timelines. After discussion, Ms Hill moved to table this application until the next Board meeting; motion seconded by Mr. Bidrowski.

Voting For:	Bidrowski	Catlett	Gale	Hill
	Riedesel	Schafer		
Voting Against:	None			
Absent:	Bruning	Buelt	Byrd	Vicars
	Witek			

The motion carried.

Rod Armstrong, Nebrask@ Online General Manager, presented the General Manager's Report. After reviewing the Project Priority List, Mr. Schafer moved that the priority list be approved; motion seconded by Mr. Bidrowski.

Voting For:	Bidrowski	Catlett	Gale	Hill
	Riedesel	Schafer		
Voting Against:	None			
Absent:	Bruning	Buelt	Byrd	Vicars
	Witek			

The motion carried.

Rod Armstrong discussed the Nebrask@ Online Business Plan with the Board.

Chairman Gale departed from the meeting. Mr. Bidrowski presided.

Greg Lemon discussed legislation of interest to the Board and the RFP evaluation process.

No other business appearing before the Board, Mr. Schafer moved to adjourn; motion seconded by Ms. Hill.

Voting For:	Bidrowski	Catlett	Hill	Riedesel
	Schafer			
Voting Against:	None			
Absent:	Bruning	Buelt	Byrd	Gale
	Vicars	Witek		

The motion carried.

Acting Chairman Bidrowski declared the meeting adjourned at 11:22 A.M.

John A. Gale
Chairman
State Records Board

STATE RECORDS BOARD
RECEIPTS & EXPENDITURES FY2003

	JUL Actual	AUG Actual	SEP Actual	OCT Actual (corrected)	NOV Actual	DEC Actual	JAN Actual	FEB Actual	MAR Actual	APR Actual	MAY Actual	JUN Actual
Receipts-NOL	$275,064	($373,544)	$433,639	$111,107	$105,173	$251,139	($40,017)	$109,914	$0	$763,244	$352,262	$329,584
Receipts-DMV/DR (7194)	$8,306	$4,528	$5,143	$5,641	$3,275	$5,128	$5,258	$5,813	$0			
Receipts-UCC (7411)	$264	$220	$171	$199	$376	$127	$153	$374	$0			
Receipts-Interest	$2,982	$2,656	$2,604	$2,314	$2,772	$2,689	$3,060	$2,226	$0	$4,593	$2,818	$1,922
Transfer from UCC	$49,400											
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$336,016	($366,139)	$441,558	$119,261	$111,596	$259,082	($31,546)	$118,327	$0	$767,837	$355,080	$331,506
Expend-Operations	$0	($235)	($60)	($233)	($1,445)	($351)	($2,303)	($2,071)	$0	($4,166)		($5,275)
Expend-NOL	($109,287)	($109,455)	$0	($199,112)	($108,499)	($95,913)	($99,995)	($115,717)	$0	($558,859)	($453,368)	($336,586)
Expend-Grants & UCC Funds	$0	($7,107)	$0	($15,829)	($30,124)	($25,142)	($34,084)	($25,191)	$0			
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	($109,287)	($116,796)	($60)	($215,175)	($140,068)	($121,407)	($136,382)	($142,979)	$0	($563,025)	($453,368)	($341,861)
PROFIT(LOSS)	$226,728	($482,935)	$441,498	($95,914)	($28,472)	$137,676	($167,927)	($24,652)	$0	$204,812	($98,289)	($10,354)
FUND BALANCE	$937,529	$454,594	$896,092	$800,178	$771,706	$909,382	$741,455	$716,803	$716,803	$921,614	$823,326	$812,971
GRANT ENCUMBRANCES	($240,692)	($240,692)	($240,692)	($240,692)	($209,336)	($205,306)	($180,171)	($164,698)	($164,698)			
UCC FUNDS ENCUMBRANCE	($47,183)	($40,076)	($40,076)	($25,379)	($26,612)	($16,808)	($16,808)	($7,091)	($7,091)			
UNENCUMBERED FUNDS	$649,654	$173,826	$615,324	$534,107	$535,759	$687,268	$544,475	$545,014	$545,014			

Addendum Two to the
Interagency Agreement Between
Department of Health and Human Services Finance and Support
and
Nebraska State Records Board

This Addendum Two to the Interagency Agreement between Health and Human Services System and the Nebraska State Records Board sets forth certain services provided by Nebrask@ Online (operated under the auspices and authority of the Nebraska State Records Board), the prices to be charged for such Nebrask@ Online services, and revenue to Nebrask@ Online.

Project: Online search, production and sale of professional practioners lists, which includes all individuals who hold an active Nebraska license, certificate, or registration to practice health professions and occupations, health facilities, and child care providers maintained by the Credentialing Division of the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure.

Fee for electronic access and sale:

List Size:	Fee:	NOL :
0 – 10 names	$ 0.00	$ 0.00
10 – 500 names	$15.00	$15.00
500 – 1,000 names	$20.00	$20.00
1,000 & over names	$25.00	$25.00

By: _____   Date:_____

Authorized Officer
Health & Human Services Finance and Support

By: _____   Date:_____

Authorized Officer
Health & Human Services Regulation and Licensure

By: _____   Date:_____

Authorized Officer
Nebraska State Records Board

Request for Approval to Establish Fees for Nebraska Health and Human Services System Regulation and Licensure Practioners List Online Search and Sales

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 84-1205.03 and the *Nebraska State Records Board Guidelines for Submission of Requests for Fee-Based Electronic Access*, the following information is submitted regarding the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure's request to the Board for fees related to the online search and sale of professional practioners lists. Such lists are currently sold by the Department in hardcopy, e-mail, diskettes (3 ½ "), and labels of all individuals who hold an active Nebraska license, certificate, or registration to practice the health professions and occupations, health facilities, and child care providers as listed in #2 below.

1.   **A copy of the contract under consideration.**

        A copy of the proposed addendum to the existing interagency agreement between the Board and the Department of Health and Human Services Finance and Support, dated August 27, 1998 is attached.

2.   **A description of the Public Records which are the subjects of the proposed electronic access fee and the proposed fees and splits.**

        State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-102) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license persons engaged in the practice of medicine and surgery, athletic training, respiratory care, osteopathic medicine, chiropractic, dentistry, dental hygiene, pharmacy, podiatry, optometry, massage therapy, physical therapy, audiology, speech-language pathology, embalming, funeral directing, psychology, veterinary medicine and surgery, medical nutrition therapy, and mental health practice.

        State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-385 and Sec. 71-385.01) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license persons engaged in cosmetology and electrology.

        State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-6310) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to certify persons eligible to work on asbestos projects.

        State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-5181) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to certify emergency medical services and personnel.

        State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-6322 and Sec. 71-6326) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license businesses and certify individuals engaged in lead abatement projects.

        State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-1,132.13) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license individuals engaged in the profession of nursing.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-6061) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license nursing home administrators.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-6102) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license persons engaged in occupational therapy.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-35070 requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license persons engaged in radiography.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 46-1202) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license persons engaged in water well contracting and pump installation.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-5306) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to certify water operators.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-401) requires the Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure to license health care facilities and services.

State statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. Sec. 71-1908) requires the Department of Health and Human Regulation and Licensure to license child care providers.

The electronic search and payment application for practioner lists has been developed and is ready for implementation by Nebrask@ Online. The Department and NOL have agreed on a per-transaction fee (listed below) for each list downloaded, payable by the user.

3.   **The anticipated timeline for implementation.**

The application is 90% completed and should be available on or about July 31, 2003.

4.   **Security provisions.**

The application information resides on a secure server, and filing transmissions are encrypted through Secure Socket Layer (SSL) technology.

5.   **The fee and distribution of the fee for electronic access.**

List Size:	Total Charge:	NOL :
0 – 10 names	$ 0.00	$ 0.00
10 – 500 names	$15.00	$15.00
500 – 1,000 names	$20.00	$20.00
1,000 & over names	$25.00	$25.00

6. **Explanation/Justification of the need for electronic access.**

The Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure Credentialing Division receives numerous requests to purchase practioners lists. Department personnel spend considerably amounts of time fulfilling these requests, especially when the request is for labels. Estimate of one week's requests are as follows:

Lists (hardcopy)	3
E-mail	33
Diskettes	13
Labels	6

Providing lists online would enhance Department efficiency by freeing up personnel time currently spent on filling these requests as considerable time is spent making copies, labels, and diskettes. The Department would also realize cost savings of material supplies (paper, diskettes, labels), and postage. Service to the public would be enhanced by allowing users to download lists in a format suitable to individual printers or directly to electronic format at their convenience, streamlining the process and providing faster turn-around.

7. **How fees and splits were determined.**

The fee was determined by size of the list and considering the resources required by Nebrask@ Online to develop, maintain, and update the search and payment application and potential transaction volumes.

8. **Any pertinent statutory provisions.**

See #2. In addition, no statutory changes are required.

9. **The cost of providing electronic access (search and download) and how that cost is computed.**

Nebrask@ Online has provided the infrastructure support to this application, and has already completed the majority of the necessary development work to bring the application online. Given the nature of the services offered by the network (most of which are provided to agencies and the public free of charge); it is difficult to allocate exact ongoing operating expenses to this application since it is a part of the overall cost of operating the network.

The fee was arrived at by agreement between the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services Regulation and Licensure and Nebrask@ Online. The rationale is based in large part on direct cost saving, personnel efficiency to be realized by the Department, and enhanced customer service. The fees proposed coincide with the current fees for hardcopies provided by the Department.

10.   **Projected volume of activity and revenue.**

Based on the weekly usage noted in #6 and an estimated initial adoption rate of 10%, it is projected that NOL will receive approximately $5,000 for the first year following implementation.

Grant Project Status Report
Third Quarter 2003

Agency Name(date awarded)	Project Description	Original Grant Amount	Amount Spent To Date	Completion Date
Secretary of State (5/20/02)	Online Rules & Regulations completed Tracking Phase nearly finished	$25,000	$24,977.05	April 2003
Library Commission (2/15/02)	Wireless Training Module	$25,000	$24,236.59	Spring 2003
Chief Information Officer (2/15/02)	Business Portal Phase II	$25,000	$6,632.00	October 2002
Chief Information Officer (5/20/02)	Interactive License Renewal Initiative	$25,000	$15,000	January 2003
Chief Information Officer (5/20/02)	Citizen's Portal (Phase II approved 6/24/03)	$25,000	$5,000	December 2003
Chief Information Officer (5/20/02)	Education Portal	$25,000	$5,000	January 2003
Chief Information Officer (5/20/02)	Online Payment Portal	$25,000	$12,500	January 2003

Nebraska State Records Board Grant Application

Agencies desiring grants from the Nebraska State Records Board for projects to improve access to state government information should complete this application and follow any procedures outlined in this application and any accompanying materials.

1. Name of agency applying for grant.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Center for Applied Rural Innovation, conNEcting Nebraska technology team.

2. Title or brief description of the project. Access eGovernment

3. Grant request amount: $25,000
See attachment for budget breakdown.

4. Will there be a fee for accessing records associated with this project? No

5. If yes, provide any statutory reference or authorization for the fee. N/A

6. Please describe the project in detail.

Summary
The Council for Excellence in Government released results of its third annual survey in April 2003. According to the report, 68 percent of Americans have Internet access at home, school, or work and go on-line at least once a day. Further, the survey found that 75 percent of all Internet users have used a government – federal, state or local – Web site to get information. Rural Nebraskan's Internet usage also increased according to the 2002 Nebraska Rural Poll. The poll conducted annually by the UNL Center for Applied Rural Innovation first looked at technology in 1997. The poll showed that the use of telecommunications technologies by rural Nebraskans increased over the past five years. For example, in 1997 only 13 percent of the respondents regularly used e-mail. In 2002, 42 percent regularly used e-mail. Similarly, when asked about the "World Wide Web" in 1997, only eight percent said they used it regularly. However, in 2002, 43 percent say they regularly use "Internet access." This survey information shows that Nebraskan's will access government information if is available.

Nebraska has made significant progress in improving access to state government information through Nebrask@ Online. Having access to this information is beneficial to the local governments; however, there are many counties that do not have the skills or the expertise to utilize the State of Nebraska information. In addition, state legislation has been adopted to help local governments create their Web presence; but, many rural counties have not taken advantage of this opportunity.

In 2002, conNEcting Nebraska partnered with the University of Minnesota to bring Access eGovernment to Nebraska. Access eGovernment is an educational opportunity for county and city elected officials, county commissioners/supervisors, department heads, IT staff, and community citizens who are interested in developing and/or updating local governmental websites.

The initial plan was to implement the Access eGovernment in the counties without providing additional training. However, after meetings with county officials and staff, it was clear that an assessment of the skill levels needed to be conducted. The "Governmental Official Computer Skills Assessment" assesses the technology skill level in a county. Elected officials and staff from five rural counties completed the Assessment (see attachment) which indicates that governmental employees understand and use essential applications for their own governmental department. However, the survey results point out that governmental officials/staff do not understand the concepts nor have the skills for eGovernment beyond their own office. An understanding of the skills identified in the assessment, will help employees more fully utilize their computers and operate their offices in a more efficient and professional manner. The following table shares the results associated with e-government concepts.

E-Government Concepts	not familiar	somewhat familiar	familiar	total responses
I am familiar with the concepts of E-Government	81.16%	11.03%	7.81%	111
I am familiar with Nebraska county web pages	63.55%	24.88%	11.57%	109
I am familiar with my own county web site	71.37%	16.88%	11.75%	107
I am familiar with the benefits of local counties/entities having their own web site	60.95%	26.85%	12.20%	107
I know how other counties are using the Internet to conduct business	79.85%	11.65%	8.50%	108

The conNEcting Nebraska team will assist county officials/staff in 20 counties become more capable in Windows file management, e-mail applications and Internet searching of state and federal governmental resources. The Access eGovernment curriculum shows local governments how to plan information-rich websites, and how to communicate with their citizens and transact business. Grant funds would be used to cover the cost of the annual agreement with the University of Minnesota and expenses related to the training.

conNEcting Nebraska Background and Experience
The conNEcting Nebraska team is made up of eight University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension educators assigned to coordinate and teach information technology education and programs in Nebraska. Team members are located in rural Nebraska and have the expertise to help local officials learn about website development, content, maintenance, and upgrading through the new Access eGovernment curriculum.

The conNEcting Nebraska curriculums include:
> Master Navigator: Over 1,500 Nebraska citizens learned basic file management skills, e-

mail and how to use the Internet through this course developed by conNEcting Nebraska.
➤ Nebraska Electronic Main Street: Nearly 400 small business owners or employees learned how to use the World Wide Web for business expansion. The course teaches an understanding of e-commerce and introduces participants to the many business uses of the Internet.

During 2002 and 2003, librarians, teachers and postmasters received specialized training. These trainings are described below: (See attachments)
➤ Technology Training for Lincoln area librarians: In-depth training on mail applications, Internet searching and computer skills for librarians.
➤ Master Navigator for Educators: Technology training for teachers in the Norfolk Public School system. The coNEcting Nebraska team adapted and customized the Master Navigator curriculum specifically for educators and school systems.
➤ Nebraska Postmasters: Basic computer skills, e-mail applications and Internet searching during Nebraska League of Postmasters Conference workshops

To reach more Nebraskans, the team utilizes a train-the-trainer model. The team has trained the Nelson Fellows in southwest Nebraska, Rural Enterprise Assistance Program (REAP) staff, volunteers and others to train the Master Navigator and Nebraska Electronic Main Street curriculum. Trainers from the REAP Nebraska Electronic Main Street classes report their successes at http://www.cfra.org/newsletter/2002_08.htm#Feature .

Team members have assisted rural communities and counties to study information technology and broadband access needs. Communities include Alliance, Crawford, Harrison, Edgar, West Point and York. Counties include Brown, Cheyenne, Custer, Fillmore, Keya Paha, and Rock. The communities are at different stages of their development. For example, the community of West Point is in the process of developing a plan to fulfill its technology needs. conNEcting Nebraska team members led Edgar through a technology assessment. It was determined to develop a community-wide survey under the direction of University of Nebraska-Kearney This report can be found at: http://www.unk.edu/acad/crrd/pdf_files/Edgar2rpt2003.pdf. The slide show is available at http://www.unk.edu/acad/crrd/pdf_files/Edgar4.pdf .

conNEcting Nebraska team members have experience in working with city and county governments in determining a Web presence. After completing the Master Navigator course, a Seward County commissioner understood the need for his county to have a Web presence. Graduates of the Master Navigator course then created the Seward county website. Those sites can be viewed at (http://connectseward.org/es/ and http://connectseward.org/cgov/). The conNEcting Nebraska team members understand their locale and have connections and working relationships with local community and government officials.

Methods to Accomplish Project
At present, twenty counties have been identified for Access eGovernment training. Those counties are Antelope, Boone, Burt, Butler, Cedar, Colfax, Cuming, Dodge, Gosper, Keith, Kimball, Madison, Nance, Nuckolls, Perkins, Phelps, Platte, Seward, Stanton, Thayer.

Anticipated training will include:

1. Evaluation of computer skills of county officials/staff by using the Government Official Computer Skills Assessment (see attachment).

2. Facilitation of a one-hour Quick Tour of Access eGovernment to alert officials about the importance, potential of and the "real world" of e-government.

3. The conducting of up to four hands-on workshops per county will be offered to raise computer and/or Internet skills for local officials and employees.

4. Facilitation the full curriculum of Access eGovernment in four sessions. The four-session curriculum includes topics on:
   - What Governments are Doing – An exploration of governmental sites in the country to discover both poorly designed sites/content and good sites.
   - What People Want – Discovery of content, forms and services, what different audiences want, and look at ways to engage citizens.
   - Security and Privacy Issues – Participants will see the impacts of breaches of security and privacy on government sites.
   - Website Design and Hosting: Outsourcing Web Applications – helps participants discuss design, navigation, accessibility etc. and whether or not they want to design and host the site, or to use template-based vendors.

Access eGovernment is designed for smaller county and city governments. It is targeted toward those who are working to create a website or to update and re-design their website. This curriculum provides a basic understanding of how to create good government websites and helps local officials understand what topics/information they should consider, and what questions to ask before developing a web presence. The training includes examples of government websites, tools for evaluating websites, suggestions for website content, links to service providers, suggestions for disseminating public information, suggestions for website design and discussions about disability issues. In addition to the electronic resources, the Access eGovernment curriculum includes presentation materials to help introduce the program to local groups.

The program incorporates an online guide with a local education program complete with printed resources. The online guide can be used for personal learning and background information. In addition, extension faculty offer to lead a county team of employees and citizens through hands-on learning workshops. The workshops will give people an opportunity to see what others around the state and country are doing, discuss security and privacy concerns, and learn about some very useful tools.

This program does not build web sites for local officials. (Access eGovernment will promote the technical services of Nebrask@ Online, volunteers, and local web designers when the local governments are ready to develop or upgrade their websites.)

7. **Please describe whom the beneficiary or recipient of this service will be and projected activity for access or use of the proposed service.**

Beneficiaries of this service will be the:
- ➤ Elected officials and county employees will more fully utilize their computers and operate their offices in a more efficient and professional manner.
- ➤ Counties that complete the training will be able to determine their web presence and take steps to develop user-friendly Web sites.
- ➤ State of Nebraska staff will find local governments more knowledgeable about on-line access to state's resources.

The long-term objectives will be that:
- ➤ Nebraska citizens and businesses will utilize convenient and user-friendly websites to access information and transact business with their local government.
- ➤ Citizens and businesses based outside the state will also be able to access governmental information or execute transactions with Nebraska governmental entities.
- ➤ Agencies and governmental departments will become more efficient by accessing information from various governmental sites and participate in inter-departmental/agency communication.
- ➤ Local governments will improve customer service and enhance operational efficiency.

8. **Timeline for implementation (specific completion date must be provided, grant funds lapse if not expended prior to completion date)**

Summer 2003	Schedule training and conduct Government Official Computer Skills Assessment survey for the twenty counties identified to receive assistance in 2003. The twenty counties identified are Antelope, Boone, Burt, Butler, Cedar, Colfax, Cuming, Dodge, Gosper, Keith, Kimball, Madison, Nance, Nuckolls, Perkins, Phelps, Platte, Seward, Stanton, Thayer.
Fall 2003	Provide hands-on workshops to raise computer and/or Internet skills for local officials and employees before holding Access eGovernment training.
Winter 2004	Facilitation of Access eGovernment
Spring 2004	Conduct Post Evaluation

9. **Agency contribution to project (labor, equipment etc.)**

The conNEcting Nebraska team will contribute professional expertise and time to plan, facilitate, monitor and evaluate this project. Center for Applied Rural Innovation staff will provide administrative and financial management support to the project. Technological equipment and bandwidth for training will be provided by UNL Cooperative Extension or secured in

cooperation with other agencies and organizations.

Educators that have committed to be instructors are: Connie Hancock, Leslie Crandall, Phyllis Schoenholz, Dewey Teel (along with Sandy Preston), Alan Vyhnalek, Larry Peterson, Dennis Kahl, and Carroll Welte.

10 a. Has this project ever been submitted as a budget request (explain.) No.

10 b. Does the project require additional statutory authority (explain)? No.

10 c. Why is the grant money needed for the project, and, if applicable, how will the service be sustained once the grant money is expended?

The University of Nebraska is committed to work with county governments on this proposal. Extension Educators have earmarked time; however, their operating budgets do not allow them to reach the counties. In turn, county budgets are not prepared to cover these expenses. This funding will help local governments become better educated to use and develop full-service Web sites. It is anticipated that local governments will continue networking with local web developers, volunteers and/or with Nebrask@ Online to access software that will allow citizens to transact business on local governmental pages.

Once local governmental officials are trained, there will not be a need for continued monetary support. Local governments may seek additional resources through grants or their community to develop their own Web sites.

11. Please describe how this project will enhance the delivery of state agency services or access to those services.

Employees and county officials will become more proficient at accessing the State of Nebraska information that is on-line. These same employees and officials will be able to direct local people to the information available.

Access eGovernment will help local government officials design Web pages for their own counties as they will realize what criteria needs to be considered when developing and accessing state and federal e-governmental capacities.

12. Please describe how this project will
1.) Improve the efficiency of agency operations;
2.) Facilitate collaboration among state agencies;
3.) Facilitate collaboration among state agencies and other public institutions; and or Support public/private partnerships in the delivery of public services.

12.1
This project will improve the integration of information and services across organizational, geographic and political boundaries without having to incur the cost of organizational changes.

A post evaluation will be conducted to determine if county officials and employees Internet and computer skills have increased from the start of this process using the pre-evaluation survey as a

benchmark.

We will evaluate the number of counties facilitated, number of hits on developed eGovernment sites and the number of transactions completed on each site.

12. 2 and 12.3

This project will facilitate collaboration among state agencies by delivering information and services without constraints due to time, place or availability of staff. Easier and faster access to information avoids potentially important consequences stemming from the lack of timely data.

Citizens will be able to access more public services, delivered online, anytime, anywhere as governmental entities work toward integration and seamless service through the use of technology. Collaborators on this project are:

> University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension
> University of Nebraska Center for Applied Rural Innovation
> Nebrask@ Online
> Nebraska Secretary of State Office
> Nebraska Information Technology Commission
> Technologies Across Nebraska
> University of Minnesota
> Nebraska Association of County Officials.

13. Contact person for any questions regarding this application.

Phyllis Schoenholz, Extension Educator   pschoenholz1@unl.edu
University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension
225 North 4th, Hebron, NE 68370

Phone - 402-225-2381
Fax - 402-768-7213

Send grant notification to University of Nebraska, Sponsored Programs, ____

Signed this _____ day of _____, _____

_____
                              CARI Director

Access eGovernment Budget

Line Item	Year 1
Personnel	
Student intern to prepare and mail notebooks to participants. Estimate 100 hours per year @ $8.00 an hour.	800
Subtotal Personnel	**800**
Supplies	
Materials - Estimated cost per participant of $27 includes duplication of notebook, postage and supplies. 15 participants per site.	8,227
Subtotal Supplies	**8,227**
Operating	
Subtotal Operating	**-**
Travel	
Travel - estimate eight round trips for each community to teach basic computer and internet skills. Estimate of 150 mile trips at 36 cents a mile for 20 distinct locations.	8,640
Subtotal Travel	**8,640**
Contractual	
Evaluation - on-going. Government Assessment survey will be conducted as a pre survey. A post survey six months after training. An overall evaluation of the program will be conducted to determine if this approach was successful.	2,560
Minnesota Curriculum -yearly curriculum contract fee. Allows for regular curriculum updatees and immediate on-line acceess to data.	2,500
Subtotal Contractual	**5,060**
Total Direct Costs	**22,727**
Indirect Costs @ 10%	2,273
Total Costs	**25,000**

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Review

Type of Review: State Records Board Grant Application

Project Title: Access eGovernment

Agency: University of Nebraska

Resolution passed by the Technical Panel on February 12, 2003:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application entitled "Access eGovernment," finds that:

- There are no technical elements of this project to review.

Nebraska State
Records Board
State Capitol, Suite 2300
Lincoln, NE 68509

John Gale
Chairman
(402) 471-8606
http://www.nol.org

APPLICATION FOR STATE RECORDS BOARD GRANT
TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO PUBLIC INFORMATION

Agencies desiring grants from the Nebraska State Records Board for projects to improve access to state government information should complete this application and follow any procedures outlined in this application and any accompanying materials.

1. **Name of agency applying for grant** *Nebraska State Board of Public Accountancy*

2. **Title or brief description of project** */On-Line review of Annual Register and submission of Applications and Forms*

3. **Grant request amount $** *25,000*

4. **Will there be a fee for accessing records associated with this project?** *No (with the exception of payment of the application or license fee)*

5. **If yes, provide any statutory reference or authorization for the fee** *The Annual Register is referenced in Section 1-109 and Licensing fees are referenced in Section 1-136 of the Statutes.*

6. **Please describe the project in detail (you may attach this description)**

Please see attached description of scope and purpose of project.

7. Please describe whom the beneficiary or recipient of this service will be and projected activity for access or use of the proposed service.

Users of the Annual Register include the public, vendors, and licensed CPA's.

Users of the On-Line Applications and Forms will be CPAs and CPA Firms (Licensees) that wish to renew their public accountancy license on-line or complete other necessary regulatory paperwork. There is the potential for approximately 2,300 licenses to be renewed via the Internet annually, as well as a number of forms that are required to be completed and submitted annually. Implementation of this project will bring e-commerce and government services to Nebraska citizens by being available to over 4,100 individuals and businesses.

8. Estimated timeline for implementation ___*April 1, 2005*_____

9. Agency contribution to project (labor, equipment etc.)
Agency personnel are committed to making the project a success through training and marketing/promoting the services to all licensees.

10a. Has this project ever been submitted as a budget request (explain)?
Yes, for the current biennium budget. The Appropriations Committee did not fund the request due to a projected shortfall in the Board's cash fund at the end of FY03. The Board has reached the maximum amount that it can charge in all fees, so it has basically "maxed" out the amount of its revenue. A legislative bill to increase the statutory maximums and allow an increase in fees was introduced at the Board's request in the 2003 regular legislative session.

10b. Does the project require additional statutory authority (explain)? _*Yes (register) No (on line licensing).*_____

10c. Why is the grant money needed for the project, and, if applicable, how will the service be sustained once the grant money is expended?

The Board does not have the current revenue or budget to purchase the hardware and programming necessary to implement this project. The grant will be used for all start-up costs and at least the first two years of implementation. After that the maintenance costs will be relatively small and the savings in postage, paper, copying/printing and staff time should offset this amount.

11. Please describe how this project will enhance the delivery of state agency services or access to those services (you may attach a separate sheet if needed)

The Annual Register requires that each licensee be sent via mail a copy of the Register. The project includes printing & proofing, staff time, and mailing costs.

In our current licensing and regulatory environment, each licensee is sent a paper copy of a license renewal or other application form. These sometimes get lost -sometimes in the mail, and sometimes on a desk. The on-line license and application process will be accessible 24 hours a day/seven days a week to the licensee. Not only will access be convenient, but a completed on-line application will be processed quickly and decrease the application or form process turn-around time for the licensee. The project allows for more efficient delivery by the agency as well, by utilizing existing data and databases and eliminating a certain amount of staff time in handling paperwork.

12. Please describe how this project will 1) Improve the efficiency of agency operations; 2) Facilitate collaboration among state agencies; 3) Facilitate collaboration between state agencies and other public institutions; Support public/private partnerships in the delivery of public services (you may respond to any or all of these criteria in your answer, attach additional pages if needed)

<u>*Benefits of Implementing Project*</u>

<u>*To Public:*</u>

The public and licensees will be able to access the Annual Register on the Internet at their convenience. They will also be able to print off the complete Register.

<u>*To Licensees:*</u>

The firms and individuals needing to submit forms and applications will have easier access to the forms (24/7 service), and will receive their licenses or service quicker than in the past. Completing the form on-line will consist of verifying existing information and checking boxes in most cases, resulting in less completion time. Users of government services, in this case, will have ready access to their licensing information and perform the required duty of licensing or completing an application relatively quickly.

<u>*To NBPA:*</u>

The NBPA will no longer have to prepare 1800 Annual Registers for distribution. The current database utilized by the NBPA is aged and needs review & repair. In 2002, the NBPA experienced some failures with the database causing a long delay in release of the Registers.

Additionally, the NBPA will no longer need to have applications and renewal license forms printed in mass quantity, provide the time and postage to send out the forms, nor enter the majority of data into the database. Data entry error will be virtually non-existent, and will result in a more productive and efficient use of staff time and agency resources.

Grant Application
Page 4

13. Contact person for any questions regarding this application D*an Sweetwood*

phone #___*471-3595*_____   E-mail ___*nbpa01@nol.org*_____

Signed this __30th_____ day of September, 2003.

_____

                                                            Agency Director

Please Return to:

State Records Board
Suite 2300, State Capitol
P.O. Box 94608
Lincoln, NE 68509-4608

I. Description and Scope of Project

This project will enable licensees (both individuals and firms) of the Nebraska Board of Public Accountancy (NBPA) to review the Annual Register via the internet instead of the annual submission to over 1800 licensed Certified Public Accountants (CPA) by the NBPA. Projected savings could be well over $5000 each year. Future legislation would enable the NBPA to eliminate the need to print and mail the Register each year as it would be available for review electronically over the Internet.

Additionally, in the future licensees (both individuals and firms) could renew their public accountancy licenses either annually or biennially via the Internet with a credit card payment. Upon receipt of a unique, identifying Personal Identification Number (PIN), each qualified firm or individual will be able to access the current database information attached to their license, update that information and submit the request for a license along with credit card payment information to NBPA. A valid license will then be mailed from the NBPA office to the licensee.

Currently, NBPA annually issues approximately 1800 individual licenses and approximately 500 firm licenses. Of the 1800 individual licenses, about 900 renew at $200 each and about 900 renew at $80 each. The 500 firm licenses renew at $100 each.

Licensees will also be able to complete required forms and applications on-line, as well. They will be able to complete most of the required regulatory forms on-line and transmit the information directly to the Board.

II. Purpose of Project

The purpose of the project is to provide quick, easy and convenient review of the Annual Register for licensees and the public and will save costs to the NBPA.

Eventually, the goal of the NBPA would be the availability to licensees of on-line form submission & license renewal 24 hours a day, seven days a week in the privacy of his or her own home or office. It is also to decrease administrative time in the form and renewal process by allowing direct submission of information to the database; and to decrease information and data error. The fulfillment of this project will help NBPA to meet the Governor's goal of expanded service to citizens, and the support of e-commerce with Nebraska government.

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Review

Type of Review: State Records Board Grant Application

Project Title: On-Line Submission of Applications and Forms

Agency: Nebraska State Board of Public Accountancy

Resolution passed by the Technical Panel on October 9, 2002:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application entitled "On-Line Submission of Applications and Forms," finds that:

- The project is technically feasible.
- The application does not provide sufficient information to determine if the proposed technology is appropriate for the project. Any technical solution should conform with the on-line licensing approach being coordinated by the Office of the CIO.
- The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed time frame. There is insufficient information to determine if the budget is appropriate.

Nebrask@ Online Project List -- July 1, 2003									

Projects Completed

Agency	Project			Public Benefit	Time Sensit.	Complexity	Payment	Staff	Comments	Due
Attorney General	Site Redesign/Opinion/Complaint Search	W		Large	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	M. Lyons		5/1/2003
Auditor	Web Site Upgrade & Training	W		Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Fixed Cost	Warriner		10/1/2002
Chief Information Officer	State Employee Portal Design	W		Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Benes		3/1/2003
Chief Information Officer	Citizen Portal - Phase I	W		Extensive	Flexible	High	Grant	Warriner		3/1/2003
Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Online Calendar Submittal Form	A		Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Brown		4/7/2003
Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Online Request Information Forms	A		Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Brown		5/1/2003
Engineers & Architects	Web Site Redesign	W		Large	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Duffy		6/17/2003
Grain Sorghum Board	Site Conversion to Zope	W		Moderate	Low	Low	Non-Fee	Fitzgerald		6/30/2003
Health & Human Services	Pharmacy (facility) License Renewal	A		Extensive	Rigid	Very High	Grant	Lyons		3/31/2003
Historical Society	Collections database search	A		Large	Flexible	High	Non-Fee	Pfister		4/15/2003
Insurance	Mailing List for Medicare Coalition	A		Modest	Flexible	Low	Non-Fee	Lyons		6/4/2003
Motor Vehicles	License Plate Design Voting	A		Large	High	Low	Non-Fee	Pabian		5/1/2003
NACO	NIRMA Web Site Conversion	W		Large	High	Low	Non-Fee	Fitzgerald		6/30/2003
Prof Practices Commission	Web Site Conversion/Training	W		Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	M Lyons		5/1/2003
Secretary of State	Rules and Regulations Search	A		Extensive	Flexible	Extremely High	Grant	Bush		4/1/2003
Secretary of State	Rules & Regulations Tracking	A		Large	Flexible	High	Grant	Bush		4/1/2003
Sorghum Producers Assn.	Site Conversion to Zope	W		Moderate	Low	Low	Non-Fee	Fitzgerald		6/30/2003
Veterans Affairs	Web Site Redesign	W		Modest	Flexible	High	Non-Fee	Benes		6/2/2003
Wheat Board	Site Conversion to Zope/Design	W		Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Brown		5/15/2003
Women's Commission	Online Conf. Registration & Payment	A		Modest	High	High	Non-Fee	Brown/Lyons		3/30/2003
Women's Commission	Women's Health Survey	A		Moderate	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Brown		3/5/2003

Pending Approval

Agency	Project		Received	Benefit	Sensit.	Complexity	Payment	Staff	Complete	Due
Administrative Services	NIS Homepage design	W	05/15/03	Large	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Benes	99%	6/20/2003
Auditor	Agency Intranet	A	04/28/03	Large	High	Moderate	Fixed Cost	Duffy	99%	5/23/2003
Crime Commission	Crime Commission Database	A	01/15/01	Modest	Flexible	Very High	Non-fee	Pabian	99%	3/1/2002
Courts	JUSTICE	A	01/01/97	Extensive	Flexible	Extremely High	Unknown	Lyons	95%	10/1/2002
Health & Human Services	Medical Nutrition Therapist Lic. Ren.	A	11/01/02	Large	Rigid	High	Grant	Lyons	95%	7/15/2003
Motor Vehicles	CDL-Third Party Testing Web Site	A	12/17/02	Large	High	High	Fixed Cost	Bush	95%	6/23/2003
Secretary of State	UCC Filing/Search Upgrades	A	04/20/02	Large	Firm	Extremely High	Trans. Fee	Pfister	99%	12/31/2002
State Records Board	NOL Portal Redesign	W	03/01/03	Extensive	Firm	Very High	Non-Fee	Warriner	99%	7/8/2003

Projects Underway

Agency	Project		Received	Benefit	Sensit.	Complexity	Payment	Staff	Complete	Due
Account. & Disclosure	Database Conversion & Search	A	06/23/03	Extensive	High	Extremely High	Fixed Cost	Pfister/Bush	5%	11/1/2003
Account. & Disclosure	Web Site redesign	W	06/23/03	Extensive	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Fitzgerald	0%	11/1/2003
Administrative Services	Vehicle Checkout Enhancements	A	07/15/02	Modest	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Pfister	30%	2/1/2003
Agriculture	Web Site Redesign/Password section	W	02/11/03	High	High	High	Fixed Cost	Fitzgerald	25%	8/15/2003
Arts Council	Web Site Redesign/Hosting/Training	W	02/07/03	Large	Rigid	High	Fixed Cost	Benes	80%	6/27/2003
Banking	Bank Financial Info Section/UN& PW	A	05/07/03	Large	High	Moderate	Non-fee	Lyons	10%	10/1/2003
Chief Information Officer	Forms Automation	A	03/15/01	Extensive	Flexible	Very High	Grant	All	15%	Ongoing
Counties	County Project Phase I	W	07/01/00	Extensive	Flexible	Very High	Approp.	Brown	80%	Ongoing
Counties	County Project Phase II	A	07/01/01	Extensive	Flexible	Extremely High	Approp.	Brown	10%	Ongoing
Counties	Marriage License Application	A	01/01/03	High	High	High	Non-Fee	Bush	95%	8/1/2003
Electrical Board	Web Site Upgrade & Training	W	03/01/03	Large	High	Moderate	Non-Fee	Duffy	90%	6/30/2003
Nebr. Emergency Mgmt.	Web Site Redesign/Password Section	W	11/12/02	Large	Flexible	Very High	Fixed Cost	M. Lyons	50%	7/15/2003
Fire Marshal	Web Site Hosting & Redesign	W	05/19/03	Large	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Fitzgerald	50%	7/30/2003
Grain Sorghum Board	Web Site Redesign/Conversion	W	06/16/03	Large	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Duffy	25%	7/30/2003
Health & Human Services	Practioner Lists	A	03/12/03	Large	High	Moderate	Trans. Fee	Pfister	90%	6/1/2003
Health & Human Services	Physical Therapist License Renewal	A	11/01/02	Large	Rigid	High	Grant	Lyons	50%	7/31/2003
Racing Commission	Web Site Redesign/Conversion	W	06/24/03	Large	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Gibbs	10%	9/1/2003
Retail Federation	Website Redesign/Conversion	W	06/06/03	Large	Flexible	Low	Non-Fee	Fitzgerald	25%	8/15/2003
Revenue	Income Tax 1040N (Long Form)	A	01/01/02	Extensive	Flexible	Extremely High	Trans. Fee	Pablan	65%	1/1/2004
Tax Equalization (TERC)	Web Site Redesign/Training	W	03/06/03	Moderate	Flexible	Low	Non-Fee	Duffy	80%	7/1/2003

Projects Requested

Agency	Project		Received	Benefit	Sensit.	Complexity	Payment	Staff	Complete	Due
Administrative Services	NIS site search	A	03/24/03	Moderate	High	High	Non-Fee	Bush	0%	7/1/2003
Bankers Assn	User Management System	A	06/16/03	Moderate	Flexible	Moderate	Non-fee	Pfister	0%	7/15/2003
Nebraska Diplomats	Web Site Hosting /Conf. Registration	W	03/10/03	Moderate	Flexible	Moderate	Non-Fee	Gibbs/Brown	0%	5/1/2003
Electrical Board	Form Automation	A	05/01/03	Large	Rigid	Moderate	Grant	Brown	0%	6/30/2003
Health & Human Services	LPN License Renewal	A	05/01/03	Large	Rigid	High	Grant	Lyons	0%	7/23/2003
Health & Human Services	EMS/EMT License Renewal	A	05/01/03	Large	Rigid	High	Grant	Lyons	0%	9/2/2003
Health & Human Services	Well Drillers License Renewal	A	05/01/03	Large	Rigid	High	Grant	Lyons	0%	9/2/2003
Health & Human Services	Water Operators License Renewal	A	05/01/03	Large	Rigid	High	Grant	Lyons	0%	9/2/2003
Historical Society	Photo Image database	A	01/15/03	Large	Flexible	High	Non-Fee	Pfister	0%	6/1/2003
Insurance	Company & Agent databases search	A	02/11/03	Large	High	High	Non-Fee	Bush	0%	6/30/2003
Library Commission	Databases Access/Portals	W	02/04/03	Extensive	High	Moderate	Non-Fee	Gibbs/Warriner	0%	8/30/2003
Library Commission	Drawdown Accounts/ACH Transfers	A	06/03/03	Large	Flexible	High	Proc. Fee	Unassigned	0%	12/15/2003
Motor Vehicles	Commercial Vehicle Search	A	04/01/02	Extensive	Flexible	High	Unknown	Pfister	0%	1/1/2003
Motor Vehicles	Message Plate Ordering	A	02/02/02	Large	Flexible	High	Unknown	Unassigned	0%	6/1/2003
Revenue	Web Site Redesign	W	07/01/03	Extensive	High	High	Non-Fee	Unassigned	0%	12/30/2003
Secretary of State	EFS Filing	A	02/02/02	Large	Firm	High	Trans. Fee	Pfister	0%	4/1/2003
Secretary of State	UCC Amendment Filing	A	02/02/02	Large	Firm	High	Trans. Fee	Pfister	0%	4/1/2003

Projects On Hold

Agency	Project		Received	Benefit	Sensit.	Complexity	Payment	Staff	Complete	Due
Administrative Services	State Employment App. Upgrade	A	04/08/03	Extensive	Firm	Extremely High	Grant/Fee	Lyons	50%	5/19/2003
Crime Commission	Searchable Database #2	A	02/01/02	Large	Flexible	High	Non-Fee	Pabian	0%	6/1/2003
Crime Commission	Searchable Database #3	A	02/01/02	Large	Flexible	High	Non-Fee	Pabian	0%	9/1/2003
Energy Office	Energy Loan Program Automation	A	05/15/00	Modest	Flexible	Very High	Grant	Bush	85%	4/1/2003
Motor Vehicles	Drivers License Reinstatement	A	02/01/02	Modest	Flexible	High	Unknown	Pfister	10%	4/1/2003

Possible Projects

Agency	Project		Received	Benefit	Sensit.	Complexity	Payment	Staff	Complete	Due
Accountability & Disclosure	Campaign Statement Filings	A		Large	High	High	Fixed Cost	Pfister		
Arts Council	E-Granting	A		Large	High	High	Fixed Cost	Gibbs		
Historical Society	Suite of E-Government Services	A		Large	Flexible	High	Trans. Fee	Gibbs		
Patrol	Criminal History Searches	A		Extensive	Flexible	Extremely High		Gibbs/Lyons		
Insurance	E-Government Suite	A		Extensive	Flexible	Extremely High		Bush		
Revenue/SOS	State Tax Lien Filings	A		Extensive		High		Armstrong		
Secretary of State/IRS	Federal Tax Lien Filings	A		Extensive		High		Armstrong		
Neb. Trans. Providers	Web Site Design & Training	W		Moderate	Flexible	Moderate	Non-fee	Brown		
Volunteer Service Comm.	Community Service Website/Portal	W		Moderate	Flexible	High	Fee/Grant	Gibbs		

Nebraska State Record's Board

**Evaluation and Scoring Manual in Response
to Request for Proposal (RFP)
SCA-0261**

Nebrask@Online Manager

July 3, 2003

1   OVERVIEW

1.1   Introduction

This manual defines the evaluation process and procedures to be applied to proposals received in response to the Nebrask@Online Manager Request for Proposal (RFP) issued by the Materiel Division on behalf of the Nebraska State Record's Board (NSRB). The Materiel Division's reference number for this procurement is SCA-0261. This manual does not cover the items that will be addressed by Purchasing, such as receipt of the proposal on time and the compliance with the mandatory requirements.

Proposals must conform to the specifications described in the Nebrask@Online Manager Request for Proposal (RFP). All proposals will be evaluated and scored using the criteria laid out in this evaluation manual. If contractor presentations are requested, the presentations will also be reviewed and the score for the presentation component may be added to the initial proposal score.

Selection committee members should use the forms and scoring sheets provided with this manual. Other guidance to selection committee members is available in *the Procedure for the Procurement of Contractual Services* published by the Department of Administrative Services Materiel Division.

Each proposal will be evaluated for format compliance and technical content. There is no separate cost component for evaluation in SCA-0261; rather cost and expense data is included in, and evaluated with, the technical proposal. The primary desire of the State for this procurement is to:

> *Ensure an award will be made based on the highest quality of service that best matches the State's requirements, at the most economical cost.*

1.2   Selection Committee

The Nebraska State Records Board (NSRB) will establish the selection committee for this procurement. The selection committee will be responsible for: 1) evaluating the technical proposals, 2) attending and evaluating vendor presentations, 3) resolving compliance issues, and 4) preparing a final report that will recommend one or more qualified contractors to the NSRB for final selection.

1.3   Evaluation Process

Each contractor proposal received on or before the submission deadline goes through the following evaluation process, which may consist of up to the six (6) steps listed below:

Step 1 —Screening for Mandatory Requirements:

The Materiel division will review each proposal to judge its compliance with the items listed in Section II.M and Sections V.A of the RFP. These items address the structure of the proposal rather than the specific content and can be measured with a yes/no response. A representative from the Materiel division will complete the *Screening For Mandatory Requirements Form* contained in Attachment 1. This initial screening will take place after the proposal opening on July 17, 2003, but before any proposals are distributed to evaluation team members for their preliminary evaluation.

Step 2 —Proposal Evaluations:

The evaluation team will score each proposal that passes the Screening For Mandatory Requirements. Please see section 1.4 for additional guidelines on scoring. Evaluators score each proposal in three (3) scoring categories. Each category will have a maximum point total, as will certain subcategories within each category. All team member evaluations will be combined and divided by the total number of evaluators. The best score possible is 100 points.

The point distribution for Contractor proposal evaluation, by major evaluation category, is:

- Executive Summary (Maximum 10 Points)
- Corporate Overview (Maximum 30 Points)
- Technical Approach (Maximum 60 Points)

Evaluators will use the *Proposal Evaluation Individual Score Sheet* to score the proposal evaluation. Parts 1–3 of the *Proposal Evaluation Individual Score Sheet* are provided in Attachment 2.

Step 3 —Ranking Based on Proposal Evaluation Scores:

The selection of the contractors to make onsite presentations, if applicable, is based on the highest point total during the Proposal Evaluation. Contractors will be ranked based on their proposal evaluation score and no more than 5 contractors will be selected to make onsite presentations.

The totals from each evaluator in step 2 above will be summed, divided by the number of evaluators, and a final proposal score determined for each contractor. A *Proposal Evaluation Summary Score Sheet* is provided in Attachment 3. If applicable, this score will be used to select the top 5 contractors to invite onsite to make presentations and answer questions about their proposals. Each contractor will be ranked based on total score from highest to lowest. In the event

of a ranking tie in the top 5, both contractors will be included. If the tie results in the selection of more than 5 contractors, the NSRB may choose to override the 5-contractor limit or request the evaluation team to re-evaluate the tied contractors.

Step 4 — Proposal Presentations and Staff Interviews (Optional):

At the Evaluation Committee's discretion, selected contractors may be asked to deliver onsite presentations in support of their proposals. These presentations will provide additional information, and will help the evaluation team members make their final scoring decisions. Contractors will be the given the opportunity to deliver a brief summary of their proposal. Time may also be set aside to interview "key" personnel.

Step 5 — Presentation Evaluations (Optional):

If Contractor presentations are conducted, an evaluation of the contractor presentations may also take place. The criteria for evaluation of presentations will be established after bid opening, but prior to any presentations taking place.

Step 6 — Final Ranking:

The final award is based on the highest point total from the proposal evaluation and, if applicable, presentation evaluation. The selection committee documents their recommendation, which is then delivered to the NSRB. Upon final determination, a letter of intent will be drafted and posted on the State's website.

1.4   Scoring Guidelines

The evaluator should use the following scoring general criteria when evaluating each of the separate categories:

Zero (0) Points:

Should be awarded for any criteria category about which no relevant information is provided.

Between Zero (0) and Half (50%) Points:

If partial information relevant to the category is provided, but it does not fully meet the requirements of the RFP, points below 50%, but above zero (0) should be assigned. In addition, if sufficient information is provided, but does not meet the expectations and goals set forth in the RFP, between zero (0) and 50% of points should be assigned.

50% of Points – Midrange Points:

50%, or half, of points available for the category should be assigned if the requested information is

adequately provided and it appears, from the information provided, that minimum levels of service/quality of product/efficiency/innovation/vision/experience (as appropriate for the particular category) can be met.

Midrange (50%) – Maximum Points:

Over 50% of available points, up to the maximum for the category, can be assigned if all relevant/required information is supplied and it appears, from the information provided, that levels of service/quality of product/efficiency/innovation/vision/experience (as appropriate for the particular category) proposed not only meet, but exceed, the States expectations and goals as set forth in the RFP. The maximum should be reserved for situations that clearly go far beyond what was requested and would be extremely beneficial to the State.

Example:

If a particular evaluation criterion were assigned 10 available points, and a contractor's proposal provided some of the required relevant information, but not all, that particular item might get a 3.

If in another category, all required information is provided, and part (but not all) of the proposed solution exceeds minimum requirements, that particular category might receive an 8.

2 Attachment 1 — Screening For Mandatory Requirements Form

2.1 Instructions

Review each proposal and provide a Yes or No answer to each of the following questions. In some cases a N/A (not applicable) is acceptable. Make as many copies of this attachment as you need to screen all proposals.

Date Of Evaluation:

Contractor Name:

Questions	Yes	No
1. Is there a SIGNED "Request for Proposal for Contractual Services" form?		
2. Does the proposal include an Executive Summary?		
3. Does the proposal include a Corporate Overview?		
4. Does the proposal include a Technical Approach section?		

3   Attachment 2 — Proposal Evaluation Individual Score Sheet & Instructions

3.1   Instructions

This evaluation form provided is divided into 4 parts. This form is to be used by members of the evaluation committee to record and summarize their scores for the *Proposal Evaluation*. Parts 1 through 3 are to be used for individual category scoring and Part 4 is used to summarize the scores for each contractor. The form contains references to the RFP that describe the basis of evaluation in each subcategory. The referenced RFP section is the definitive statement of what each contractor's proposal is to be assessed against. It is the responsibility of the selection committee member to be familiar with the RFP.

Nebrask@Online Manager

Proposal Evaluation – Individual Scoring Sheet

Contractor Name:	
Evaluation Team Member #:	
Date of Evaluation:	

Category:	RFP	Max Points	Points Based on Submitted Proposal
Part 1 — Executive Summary		**Points**	
• Understanding Of The Nebrask@ Online Network And The Scope Of The NOL Manager's Responsibilities and overview of the vendor's proposal and qualifications.	V.A. 2	10	
•			
Total Executive Summary Points		**10**	

Part 2 — Corporate Overview		**Points**	
• Corporate Overview, Financial Statements (and contract performance)	V.A.3.a-g	*ϸν*	
• Contractor's Corporate Experience	V.A.3. h	15 *ιν*	
• Summary of Contractor's Proposed Management Organization / Resumes/Qualifications For Individuals To Be Assigned To This Project.	V.A.3.i	10	
•			
Total Corporate Overview Points		**30**	

Part 3 — Technical Approach		**Points**	
• Contractor's Vision for Network Manager Contract. This includes Contractor's understanding of the need for revenue, non-revenue, maintenance and innovation activities and their detailed plans to accomplish these activities.	V.A.4.a	25	
• Contractor's Proposed Business Services 3 Year Plan. This includes Contractor's proposed mix of service delivery and support, new services definition and technical innovation.	V.A.4.b	25	
• General Administration and Operation 3 year plan. This includes Contractor's ability to balance operational efficiency and cost minimization while providing high levels of service.	V.A.4.c	10	
Total Technical Approach Points		**60**	

Part 4 — Total Points		**100**	

4   Attachment 3 — Proposal Evaluation Summary Score Sheet

4.1   Instructions

Selection committee members should enter their individual point total from Part 4 of the *Proposal Evaluation Individual Score Sheet* into the *Proposal Evaluation Summary Score Sheet.* The individual totals should then be added and entered into the point total column. This number should then be divided by the number of selection committee members. The result is the Averaged Point Total for each contractor.   The *Proposal Evaluation Summary Score Sheet* follows:

Proposal Evaluation Summary Score Sheet

Contractor Name	Evaluators Scores							Total Points[1]	Average Points[2]
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
5.									
6.									
7.									
8.									
9.									
10.									
11.									
12.									
13.									
14.									
15.									
16.									
17.									
18.									
19.									
20.									

[1] Total Points = Sum of each individual evaluator's scores.

[2] Average Points = Total Points / # of Evaluators