



# Summary of Quarterly IT Project Reports

<http://da.ks.gov/kito/>

**APRIL/MAY/JUNE 2011**

Prepared by the  
Enterprise Project Management Office  
Published: August 2011

**Quarterly Executive Summary Report**

**Active Projects (Project Cost = \$188,615,113)**

- 10 Projects in Good Standing
- 7 Projects in Good Standing/Infrastructure
- 1 Project Caution Status
- 10 Project Alert Status
- 1 Project Recast
- 0 Reporting Insufficient
- 29 Total Number of Projects**

**Funding Source for Project Cost – (Does not include operational cost)**

- 41% Federal Funds
- 59% Other Funds (Include State General Funds and all other Funding Sources)

**27 Projects are managed by a Kansas Certified Project Manager**

- 23 Executive Branch Projects
- 4 Regents Projects
- 0 Judicial Projects
- 2 Legislative Branch Projects
- 29 Total Projects by Branches and Regents**

**Planned Projects – For This Reporting Period**

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)**

Kansas DUI Tracking System (KsDTrak) – Estimated Total Project Costs: **\$2,706,250**

**Approved Projects – For This Reporting Period (Est. Project Cost = \$3,519,509)**

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)**

KsORT Integration Project – Estimated Project Costs: **\$538,152**

**Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR)**

Kansas Motor Fuel Modernization – Estimated Project Costs: **\$2,981,357**

**Completed Projects – For This Reporting Period (Project Cost = \$2,418,913)**

**Administration, Kansas Department of (DofA)** (Total Project Cost may not be Final Cost)

KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade III – Total Project Cost: **\$0**

**Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR)**

Drivers License Photo First Model Office – Total Project Cost: **\$1,403,280**

**Emporia State University (ESU)**

Campus Wide Network Wiring Project II – Total Project Cost: **\$28,826**

**Kansas, University of (KU)**

KU Exchange 2010 Upgrade Project – Total Project Cost: **\$986,807**

**Introduction**

This report is a summary of information with regard to major information technology projects. Information technology projects are defined as a major computer, telecommunications, or other information technology improvement with an estimated cost of \$250,000 or more from any source of funding, over all fiscal years. The listed reports have approval of the respective branch Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO). The current CITO approved project plan on file with the Kansas Information Technology Office (KITO) is the benchmark for status monitoring.

In accordance with Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC) Policy 2500-Project Status Reporting including the reference to Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) Review of Active Projects Policy 2 - <http://www.da.ks.gov/kito/itec/ITPoliciesMain.htm>, these projects are monitored on a quarterly basis. The JCIT Policy 2 has established the following specific measures as their basis to evaluate project status.

The measures below are addressed individually however when a project experiences difficult problems the impact is reflected in more than one measure. JCIT has determined 30% to be the threshold when a project should be stopped. When a project deviates from its schedule or cost by 30% or more it shall be recast.

JCIT Policy 2 Reference	JCIT Policy 2 Measurement	Documentation used for Analysis	JCIT Policy 2 Condition
<b>5.1 – Critical Path</b>	10% to 20% behind schedule.	WBS	The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status.
	20% or more behind schedule.	WBS	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
<b>5.2 – Task Completion Rate</b>	Completion Rate of 80%-90%.	WBS	The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status.
	Completion Rate of 80% or less.	WBS	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
<b>5.3 – Deliverable Completion Rate</b>	Completion Rate of 80%-90%.	WPI	The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status.
	Completion Rate of 80% or less.	WPI	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
<b>5.4 – Issues</b>		Change Mgmt Forms	Unresolved issues that have a negative impact on the project schedule, budget, or objectives should be concisely documented noting when the issue was presented to the sponsor and what actions have been initiated to achieve resolution.
<b>5.5 Cost – Deviation from Financial Plan</b>	10%-20% deviation from plan.	DA518	The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status.
	20%-30% deviation from plan.	DA518	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
	30% or more deviation from plan.	DA518	When a project deviates from its CITO-approved project plan by 30% or more it shall be recast. It may go on hold for a time and the project should be recast upon startup. JCIT policy #2 has determined 30% to be the threshold when a project should be stopped.
<b>5.6 – Actual v Planned Resources</b>	Deficiency gap of 15%-20%.	EAC and WBS	The project manager should be acting with the project sponsor to correct this condition.
	Deficiency gap of 20%-25%.	EAC and WBS	There should be a plan to show a compensatory change in resources or a plan to reduce the scope, costs and objectives for the project with approval of the agency head.
	Deficiency gap of 25% or more.	EAC and WBS	Third party review should be considered if the impact is reflected in other measures. The project should not be permitted to drift awaiting a compensatory resources plan or a new reduced project scope plan.
<b>5.7 – Risk</b>		Risk Report	The impact may be reflected in more than one measure. The risk report should be evaluated as to whether it reasonably reflects the sum of measures and where present, the progress being achieved with mitigation plans.

Established procedures for changes to project plans should be followed. Changes in a project of more than 10% are not approved in this quarterly reporting process. Any change in planned expenditures for an information technology project that would result in the total authorized cost of the project being increased above the currently authorized cost of such project by more than either \$1,000,000 or 10% of such currently authorized cost of such project, whichever is lower or any change in the scope of an information technology project should be presented and reviewed by the chief information technology officer to whom the project was submitted pursuant to KSA 79-7209.

# PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW

April-May-June 2011

**ACTIVE PROJECTS TOTAL                    \$188,615,113    \$32,037,647**

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
<b>EXECUTIVE BRANCH</b>						
<b>ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
ACTIVE-NEW	<a href="#">AVPN Replacement of Legacy Wide Area Network - Infrastructure</a>	\$4,801,643	\$531,000	IT Fund IT Reserve Fund	40% 60%	13
Active	<a href="#">SHARP PeopleSoft 9.1 HR/Payroll System Upgrade</a>	\$5,132,000	\$1,476,444	IT Fund IT Reserve Fund HR Information Services Fund Accounting Recovery Services Fund	39% 37% 11% 13%	15
ACTIVE-NEW	<a href="#">Unified Communications VoIP Project - Infrastructure</a>	\$8,884,207	\$782,919	IT Fund IT Reserve Fund	39% 61%	17
Completed-New	<a href="#">KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade III- Infrastructure</a>	\$0	\$1,860,495	State Rate Base	100%	89
Completed	<a href="#">Statewide Financial Management System Pre-Implementation Planning/Activities</a>	\$1,656,818	\$0	SGF	100%	86
Completed	<a href="#">Statewide Financial Management System</a>	\$44,777,322	\$11,606,902	SGF Financial. Mgmt – Off Budget (Fee Collections) Equip Lease Financial Mgmt – On Budget (KDOT \$ Transfer)	4% 83% 1% 12%	86
<b>ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE</b>						
Completed	<a href="#">Case Management System II</a>	\$237,400	\$90,000	Grant Funding – Bureau of Justice Keeping Kansas Safe Medicaid Revolving Fee Fund Court Costs	28% 54% 18%	89
<b>COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
ACTIVE-ALERT	<a href="#">Statewide Broadband Project</a>	\$1,931,727	\$325,000	Federal Funds State In-Kind INK & Kansas Farm Bureau	85% 5% 10%	19

# PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW

April-May-June 2011

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>	<b>Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost</b>	<b>Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End</b>	<b>Page</b>
Planned	<a href="#">Kansas Career Pipeline (KCP) – Subscription and Integration</a>	\$350,000	To Be Determined	Federal Grant Funding, Kansas Board of Regents, Kansas State Board of Education Kansas Dept. of Corrections	To Be Determined	104
<b>CORPORATION COMMISSION, KANSAS</b>						
ACTIVE-ALERT	<a href="#">KCC Project 2010 BPI – Business Process Innovation and Improvement</a>	\$891,996	\$164,778	Public Serv Reg Fee Fund Conservation Fee Fund Transportation Fee Fund	65% 15% 20%	22
<b>CORRECTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>	<b>Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost</b>	<b>Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End</b>	<b>Page</b>
Planned	<a href="#">TOADS/OMIS Replacement</a>	\$12,000,000 - \$15,000,000	\$3,000,000	SGF Grant Funding	To Be Determined	106
<b>EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
Active	<a href="#">Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation</a>	\$1,774,798	\$1,426,410	National Institute of Education Science SGF	98% 2%	24
<b>HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
Approved-New	<a href="#">Kansas Women Infants and Children (KWIC) System Upgrade</a>	\$7,974,651	\$3,342,206	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) WIC Program	79% 21%	94
Approved	<a href="#">Laboratory Information Management System</a>	\$2,362,270	\$1,050,000	SGF Public Health Preparedness Master Lease Special Projects Funds	3% 20% 73% 4%	95
Active	<a href="#">Child Care Licensing and Registration Information System (CLARIS) Inspection Module</a>	\$918,958	\$105,000	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)	100%	26

**PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW**

*April-May-June 2011*

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
<b>HEALTH CARE STABILIZATION FUND</b>						
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned	<a href="#">HCSF Technology Improvement Project</a>	\$871,533	\$406,700	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	108
<b>HEALTH POLICY AUTHORITY</b>						
Approved-New	<a href="#">Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination (K-MED) Project</a>	\$62,000,000	\$3,600,000	SGF Health Resources & Services Admin Ctr for Consumer Information & Insurance Oversight.	5% 9% 50% 36%	96
ACTIVE-ALERT	<a href="#">Data Analytic Interface III</a>	\$844,112	\$3,471,507	SGF Federal Financial Participation	13% 87%	28
ACTIVE-NEW-ALERT-NEW	<a href="#">State Medicaid Health Information Technology (HIT) Plan (SMHP)</a>	\$619,899	\$0	SGF Federal Financial Participation	10% 90%	31
Completed	<a href="#">KHPA Document Imaging Project</a>	\$419,378	\$235,773	SGF Federal Financial Participation	50% 50%	87
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned	<a href="#">Health Information Exchange</a>	\$250,000 - \$500,000	\$300,000	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	110
<b>HIGHWAY PATROL, KANSAS</b>						
ACTIVE-ALERT	<a href="#">Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)/Records Management System (RMS) Project</a>	\$927,183	\$292,277	SGF Federal Forfeiture KCC – Kansas Civil Assessment Fund	5% 93% 2%	33
<b>HISTORICAL SOCIETY, KANSAS STATE</b>						
ACTIVE-RECAST-NEW	<a href="#">Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) III</a>	\$8,207,329	\$225,000	SGF INK Grant National Digital Information and Preservation Program – Library of Congress KEEP Fees Unfunded Security Audit	5% 2% 1% 91% 1%	35

**PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW**

April-May-June 2011

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
<b>INSURANCE DEPARTMENT, KANSAS</b>						
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned	<a href="#">Kansas Health Benefits Exchange</a>	\$1,800,000 - \$3,250,000	\$8,500,000 - \$10,500,000	Federal Grants, Carrier Fees and Premiums	2/11 – 3/14	111
<b>INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF</b>						
Approved-New	<a href="#">KCJIS Master Entity Index (MEI)</a>	\$314,850	\$0	Traffic Records Coordinating Council KBI Fee Fund	96% 4%	98
Approved-New	<a href="#">KsORT Integration Project</a>	\$538,152	\$0	SMART Grant Record Check Fee Fund Anticipated Funds	55% 5% 40%	99
ACTIVE-CAUTION-NEW	<a href="#">Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project</a>	\$605,200	\$247,556	SGF Justice Assistance Grant U.S. Homeland Security Grant	17% 67% 16%	38
ACTIVE-ALERT-NEW	<a href="#">KCJIS-KDOR Data Integration</a>	\$901,000	\$0	SGF Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Grant Justice Assistance Grant	4% 11% 85%	40
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned-New	<a href="#">Kansas DUI Tracking System (KsDTrak)</a>	\$2,706,250	\$735,000	Kansas Department of Transportation	6/11 – 7/14	112
Planned	<a href="#">Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement</a>	\$625,000	\$225,000	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	114
<b>JUVENILE JUSTICE AUTHORITY</b>						
Active	<a href="#">Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite</a>	\$2,134,340	\$242,468	SGF Juvenile Accountability Block Grant	45% 55%	42
<b>KANSAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM</b>						
ACTIVE-ALERT-NEW	<a href="#">Kansas eCitation Project</a>	\$1,931,522	\$112,161	State Traffic Records Funds National Highway Transportation Safety Administration Section 408 Grant	26% 74%	45

# PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW

April-May-June 2011

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
<b>LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
ACTIVE-ALERT	<a href="#">UIM Build and Deploy</a>	\$18,957,746	\$2,670,000	Federal Bonds Reed Act	16% 84%	48
Canceled	<a href="#">Unemployment Insurance Modernization III</a>	\$27,754,871	\$2,670,000	Federal Bonds Reed Act	38% 62%	90
<b>LOTTERY, KANSAS</b>						
Completed	<a href="#">Expanded Gaming Central System</a>	\$23,595	\$0	Lottery Revenue	100%	90
<b>RETIREMENT SYSTEM, KANSAS PUBLIC EMPLOYEES</b>						
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned	<a href="#">Active Workflow</a>	\$775,000	\$30,000	KPERS Fund	To Be Determined	115
Planned	<a href="#">Sharp Interface</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	KPERS Fund	To Be Determined	116
<b>REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
Approved-New	<a href="#">Kansas Motor Fuel Modernization</a>	\$2,981,357	\$692,841	KDOR Budget Actions	100%	100
Active	<a href="#">DMV Modernization</a>	\$40,326,159	\$1,999,832	Division of Vehicle Modernization Fund Vehicle Operating Fund INK Grant	98% 1% 1%	52
Active	<a href="#">PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement III</a>	\$456,392	\$1,262,386	SGF VIPPS CAMA	19% 81%	54
Completed-New	<a href="#">Drivers License Photo First Model Office</a>	\$1,403,280	\$346,048	Vehicle Operating Fund Dept of Homeland Security Grant	5% 95%	91
<b>SECRETARY OF STATE, KANSAS</b>						
ACTIVE-NEW	<a href="#">Statewide Voter Registration and Election Management System (ELVIS) Primary and Secondary Datacenter Hardware Replacement Project - Infrastructure</a>	\$522,449	\$38,742	Help America Vote Act (HAVA) Federal Fund	100%	56

**PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW**

April-May-June 2011

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
<b>SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES</b>						
Approved	<a href="#">Learning and Performance Management System</a>	\$428,334	\$78,000	SGF Federal Funds	76% 24%	101
ACTIVE-ALERT	<a href="#">Customer and Provider Portal (CAPP)</a>	\$7,328,782	\$825,000	SGF Federal Funds	1% 99%	58
ACTIVE-ALERT-NEW	<a href="#">Community Supports and Services (CSS) Automation</a>	\$395,700	\$98,400	SGF Federal System Transformation Grant	37% 63%	61
Active	<a href="#">Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Quality Control (QC) Enterprise Customer/Control Management (ECCM)</a>	\$990,472	\$75,000	SGF Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Dept. of Defense Appropriations Act 2010	19% 81%	63
Completed	<a href="#">Human Services Management (HSM) Roadmap II</a>	\$191,024	\$0	SGF	100%	91
	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>	<b>Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost</b>	<b>Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End</b>	<b>Page</b>
Planned	<a href="#">Addiction and Prevention Services Replacement</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	117
Planned	<a href="#">Avenues</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	8/11 – 12/15	119
Planned	<a href="#">Hospitals Electronic Medical Record</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	121
<b>TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF</b>						
Approved	<a href="#">Kansas Truck Routing and Intelligent Permitting System (K-TRIPS)</a>	\$2,663,590	812,159	Permit Fee KDOT CVISN KDOR CVISN	50% 25% 25%	102
Active	<a href="#">Communication System Inter-operability Program - Infrastructure</a>	\$51,920,334	\$12,000,000	SHF SGF Safety ODP PSIC, AR&R & Other	23% 1% 38% 11% 27%	65
Completed	<a href="#">Brocade Switch Upgrade - Infrastructure</a>	\$319,585	\$51,000	SGF SHF	6% 94%	87
Completed	<a href="#">Workflow Conversion Project III</a>	\$428,946	\$750,000	SHF	100%	92

# PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW

April-May-June 2011

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>	<b>Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost</b>	<b>Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End</b>	<b>Page</b>
Planned	<a href="#">Capital Inventory Management System</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	7/12 - 6/13	122
Planned	<a href="#">Consumable Inventory Management System</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	7/12- 6/13	123
Planned	<a href="#">Document Management System Replacement</a>	\$750,000 - \$1,000,000	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	1/12 – 1/14	124
<b>REGENTS</b>						
<b>EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY</b>						
Completed-New	<a href="#">Campus Wide Network Wiring Project II - Infrastructure</a>	\$28,826	\$0	SGF American Recovery & Reinvestment	8% 92%	92
<b>KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS</b>						
ACTIVE-NEW	<a href="#">Kansas Statewide Postsecondary Electronic Transcript System</a>	\$602,306	\$26,500	SGF Student Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)/ARRA	3% 97%	70
<b>KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF</b>						
Active	<a href="#">KU HR/PAY PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject I</a>	\$3,510,000	\$735,000	KU General Use Fund KMC Student Fees KMC Research Overhead	37% 11% 52%	73
Completed-New	<a href="#">KU Exchange 2010 Upgrade Project - Infrastructure</a>	\$986,807	\$605,323	General Use Fund	100%	88
	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>	<b>Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost</b>	<b>Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End</b>	<b>Page</b>
Planned	<a href="#">KU Enterprise Storage Consolidation</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	125
<b>KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF</b>						
ACTIVE-NEW	<a href="#">KUMC HR/PAY PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject II</a>	\$6,041,596	\$315,0000	KU General Use Fund KMC Student Fees KMC Research Overhead	37% 11% 52%	75
Active	<a href="#">Clinical Research Center (CRC) - Infrastructure</a>	\$1,903,907	\$24,000	Johnson County Educational Triangle Research Fund	100%	77

# PROJECT REPORT OVERVIEW

April-May-June 2011

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Funding Source for Project Cost	Percentage	Page
<b>PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY</b>						
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned	<a href="#">Library Management System</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	126
<b>WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY</b>						
Completed	<a href="#">Banner Enrollment Management Suite Implementation Project</a>	\$495,050	\$145,409	SGF-Internal Salaries SGF-Capital SGF-Consulting	12% 45% 43%	88
<b>LEGISLATIVE BRANCH</b>						
Active	<a href="#">K-LISS Architecture – Infrastructure</a>	\$13,512,683	\$1,650,000	SGF	100%	79
Active	<a href="#">Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III - Infrastructure</a>	\$1,640,673	\$915,267	Capital Restoration Funds SGF	80% 20%	82
<b>JUDICIAL BRANCH</b>						
	Project Name	Project Cost	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost	Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost	Estimated Planning Start/Close Out End	Page
Planned	<a href="#">E-Filing Project</a>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	127

All new Approved, Recast, Completed and Planned projects for this reporting period are in **BOLD**.

New Active projects for the quarter and projects that result in a Caution, Alert or Recast status for the quarter will be noted in **BOLD** and **ALL CAPS**.

**Project Cost:** Planning, execution and closeout dollars of a project.

**Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:** Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.


All new Approved, Active, Recast, Completed, Planned projects occurring after the reporting period are *italicized and noted with an asterisk* \*.

**ACTIVE PROJECTS SECTION**


Projects in this section have received CITO approval and are in the Execution Phase. Agencies submit quarterly project status reports in accordance with ITEC Policy 2500 r1 – Project Status Reporting and JCIT Policy #2 until the end of the Execution Phase. Projects that exceed established thresholds are required to fulfill appropriate remedies outlined in JCIT Policy #2 before the project can move forward.

**TERMS**

- CITO Council - A management group consisting of the three (3) Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO) representing the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of Kansas state government.
- Execution Start - This is the start date on the current CITO approved detailed plan that “triggers” the beginning of the execution phase. The trigger date is an event (ie. hardware/software purchase or installation, code development, etc.) identified by the agency. Execution start is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements.
- Execution End - This is the end date on the current CITO approved detailed plan. The execution end date is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements.
- Project Cost - Planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.
- Estimated 3 Future Years of Operational Cost - Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.
- Execution Project Cost - Project dollars associated with the internal and external costs of the execution phase.
- Execution Cost to Date- Project dollars expended through the reporting end date for the execution phase.
- Internal Cost - Includes direct costs, not overhead, of state government staff associated with the execution phase.
- External Cost - Project dollars associated with an agency’s contracted costs and overhead for the execution phase.
- Adjusted – Agency modified schedule and or cost by less than 10%.
- Funding Source for Project Cost - This item calls for identification of financing by percentage of funding source.
- Infrastructure - These are hardware initiatives and not system development projects. They are the underlying foundation or basic framework of a system or resources.
- On Hold Until - A significant event and or change has occurred resulting in the agency head requesting the project be placed in a temporary hold status approved by the CITO.
- Subproject - A portion or sub-set of the full project, CITO approvals may be given at the sub-project level as the project progresses.
- Vendor - Contractor for the project. If there is more than one contractor the primary responsibilities are identified.

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Project Report Assessments  
EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Administration, Department of (DofA)



AVPN Replacement of Legacy Wide Area Network

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	5/27/11		
Project Cost:	\$4,801,643	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$531,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$4,645,643	Execution Cost to Date:	\$2,600,476
Internal Cost:	\$717,560	Internal Cost to Date:	\$143,000
External Cost:	\$3,928,083	External Cost to Date:	\$2,457,476
Execution Start:	6/1/11	Execution End:	8/31/12
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
Information Technology Fund (DISC)	40%	AT&T – AVPN Circuits	
Information Technology Reserve Fund (DISC)	60%		

The state legacy frame relay Inverse Multiplexing Asynchronous Transfer Mode (IMA ATM) for broadband switching and transmission technology network is nearing the end of its usefulness and will be replaced by AT&T Virtual Private Network (AVPN) technology next generation network. AVPN eliminates the dependence on a particular DLL (Data Link Layer) technology of the frame relay network by transmitting variable-length data packets more efficiently. AVPN offers greater design/operation flexibility of our Internet Protocol (IP) network and provides postalized (flat) T1 rates regardless of the local exchange company. In addition AVPN promotes superior traffic engineering and management providing a network that is more scalable, less complex to manage, more efficient in the transport of data, and has higher reliability and increased performance. AVPN opens the path to Unified Communications (UC) and Collaboration thus future-proofing our network. AVPN is a network service that uses Internet protocol multi-protocol label switching to create a private network inside the AT&T network or the "AT&T cloud". AVPN is an essential piece of our UC roadmap. As our customers migrate to this environment, AVPN provides Class of Service (CoS) and Quality of Service (QoS) that are not available in the current frame relay network. The division will also upgrade site routers to the Cisco 2911 models needed to accommodate the increased bandwidth required in the APVN environment.

For the reporting period:

- **Network Planning and Engineering** is complete and on schedule.
- **Installation** of telco demarc to LAN extensions are 80% complete and on schedule.
- **Procurement** of Core and Edge Routers complete and in stock for first phase deployment.
- **Proof of Concept** lab trail is complete and on schedule.
- **Network Management System (NMS)** complete and operational.
- **Pilot** conversion of four (4) sites is in progress as scheduled. The customer response at our first AVPN cutover, Jackson County Sheriff’s Office, Holton, KS, “Wow! This network is fast!”

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.	<b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Project Stopped/Canceled.	<b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project completed and waiting for PIER.	Project on hold.
<b>I</b> Infrastructure Project	Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
<b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received	Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**AVPN Replacement of Legacy Wide Area Network (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$156,000		
Internal Cost:	\$156,000		
Estimated Start:	1/11	Estimated End:	8/11

**Implementation**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/27/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$4,645,643</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,600,476</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$717,560</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$143,000</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,928,083</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,457,476</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>6/1/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/31/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	9/12	Estimated End:	10/12

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Administration, Department of (DofA) (Continued)**



**SHARP PeopleSoft 9.1 HR/Payroll System Upgrade**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 6/17/10  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 12/16/10  
 Project Cost: \$5,132,000 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$1,476,444

Execution Project Cost:	\$5,132,000	Execution Cost to Date:	\$580,270
Internal Cost:	\$2,187,500	Internal Cost to Date:	\$239,660
External Cost:	\$2,944,500	External Cost to Date:	\$340,610
Execution Start:	1/18/11	Execution End:	2/4/13

Funding Source for Project Cost

Information Technology Fund 39%  
 Information Technology Reserve Fund 37%  
 Human Resource Information Services Fund 11%  
 Accounting Recovery Services Fund 13%

Vendor

Cedar Crestone - PeopleSoft

The Oracle/PeopleSoft Human Resource Management System (HRMS) rel. 8.9 SP1 software supporting the Statewide Human Resource and Payroll System (SHARP) will become unsupported by the vendor on 12/31/12. Going unsupported significantly increases the risk of a system failure in this mission critical application that provides payroll and human resource-related functions for 52,000+ state employees. Unsupported software means that the vendor is not obligated to fix broken code or provide software updates when the Federal Government passes changes to tax laws, the Fair Labor Standards Act or Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Reporting requirements. It also means that certain help desk troubleshooting functions would no longer be available for the retired release. PeopleSoft code runs on third party system level software such as Sun Solaris and Oracle. When these third parties upgrade and change their software, it affects the stability of the PeopleSoft software. Also, the tools used to maintain and enhance the software will no longer be supported or patched, so existing problems with their operation may not be remedied, leaving them prone to errors. Postponing this upgrade will introduce several risks. Depending on the length of the delay, there is the possibility that a direct upgrade path and the skill set needed may not be available. Therefore, multiple upgrades would be necessary to reach the current version. Additionally, performing the upgrade within the proposed timeframe allows the work to be done when there is not an upgrade scheduled for the Statewide Management Accounting and Reporting Tool (SMART) system. Delaying the upgrade increases the potential for both the SHARP and SMART systems to require upgrades simultaneously. We do not have the bandwidth or budget to achieve this. As software is utilized longer than the lifespan from the original environment for which it was designed, the complexity of keeping it current with a changing regulatory, business, and technical environment is increased. Taken together, these factors all increase risk of system failure if the system is not upgraded. Upgrading to Oracle/PeopleSoft Enterprise Human Capital Management (HCM) 9.1 will mitigate these risks because the system will again be supported by the vendor, maintenance/development tools will use current technology and be supported.

**For the reporting period:** Hardware was installed. Environments for the Statewide Management Accounting and Reporting Tool (SMART) system, the Statewide Human Resource and Payroll System (SHARP) and the Data Warehouse were built in order to have vanilla environments and to perform fit/gap analysis. Fit/gap analysis was completed. Analysis phase ended. Design Phase has begun.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Meeting targeted goals.                      | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.                    | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER.      | Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project              | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**SHARP PeopleSoft 9.1 HR/Payroll System Upgrade (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	3/10	Estimated End:	1/11

**Subproject I – Design and Develop**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>12/16/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,904,250</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$580,270</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,542,500</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$239,660</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,361,750</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$340,610</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>1/18/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>1/31/12</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>2/15/12</b>

**Subproject II – Testing and Deploy**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,227,750</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$645,000</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$582,750</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/1/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>2/4/13</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	2/13	Estimated End:	3/13

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology   |

**Administration, Department of (DofA) (Continued)**

**Unified Communications VoIP Project**



CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 5/27/11  
 Project Cost: \$8,884,207 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$782,919

Execution Project Cost:	\$8,646,307	Execution Cost to Date:	\$336,783
Internal Cost:	\$1,468,047	Internal Cost to Date:	\$174,503
External Cost:	\$7,178,260	External Cost to Date:	\$162,280
Execution Start:	6/1/11	Execution End:	8/31/13

Funding Source for Project Cost

Information Technology Fund (DISC)	39%
Information Technology Reserve Fund (DISC)	61%

Vendor

AT&T – AVPN Circuits

Effective state government requires high quality communications systems. These systems include telecommunications products and services. Demands from Kansas citizens for up-to-date data delivered to them at their personal computer (PC) or hand-held device will continue to increase. The Division of Information Systems and Communication’s (DISC) telecommunication networks and systems must accommodate these demands for data, voice and video for total e-government/e-democracy access. Additionally, the demands on internal communications (including voice, data and video) between and among Kansas state agencies and local units of government will increase as cloud computing and virtual methodologies are employed. Because of these requirements it is imperative that DISC, as the central provider of telecommunications systems for the enterprise, be ready and able to provide the services and products needed. The legacy Plexar system is nearing contract termination in the Topeka and Wichita campuses. DISC will replace the existing Plexar base of 12,575 phones with Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) phones as part of the UC strategic roadmap. The deployment will be in defined phases before full scale deployment is offered statewide.

**For the reporting period:**

- **Planning and Engineering** completed as scheduled.
- **Procurement** of Call Manager and IP phones completed and in stock for first phase deployment.
- **Proof of Concept Phase** Osawatomie State Hospital (OSH) completed on schedule (268 IP phones).
- **Pilot Phase** DISC conversion completed as scheduled (183 IP phones).
- **Installation and Test** of OSH Attendant Console successfully completed.
- **Ready for production** conversion; next group is Judicial (200 IP phones)

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Meeting targeted goals.                 | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.               | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | Project on hold.   |
| Infrastructure Project                  | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| Project completed and PIER received     | Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Unified Communications VoIP Project (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$237,900		
Internal Cost:	\$237,900		
Estimated Start:	2/11	Estimated End:	10/13

**Implementation**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/27/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$8,646,307</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$336,783</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,468,047</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$174,503</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$7,178,260</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$162,280</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>6/1/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/31/13</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	9/13	Estimated End:	10/13

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.







**Commerce, Department of  
Statewide Broadband Project**

**A**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	6/24/10		
Project Cost:	\$1,931,727	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$325,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,913,313	Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,391,331
Internal Cost:	\$64,308	Internal Cost to Date:	\$375,270
External Cost:	\$1,849,005	External Cost to Date:	\$1,016,061
Execution Start:	7/1/09	Execution End:	12/31/10
		**Execution End:	12/3/10
		Adjusted Execution End:	Unknown
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
Federal Funds	85%	Connected Nation, LLC – Data Collection &	
***State In-Kind Match	5%	Mapping	
***Information Network of Kansas and			
Kansas Farm Bureau Grant	10%		

The federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) legislation passed in 2/09 included grant funding for the collection of broadband-related data as well for planning programs at the state level. States were not mandated to participate, but all 50 states have applied for and received this funding in some form. This specific grant program, the State Broadband Data and Development (SBDD) Grant Program, is administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), U.S. Department of Commerce and is intended to collect comprehensive and accurate state-level broadband mapping data, develop state-level broadband maps depicting residential and “anchor institution” (school, libraries, public safety organizations, etc.) broadband connectivity, aid in the development and maintenance of a national broadband map, and fund statewide initiatives directed at broadband planning and increased adoption. The program requires a 20% match which may be funded through either cash or "in-kind" state contributions. The program also allows for a non-profit entity to be designated by the state to receive the grant and conduct the mapping on its behalf. After a competitive bid process, the state designated the non-profit Connected Nation to receive funds for the state's broadband mapping and planning project. The state's SBDD grant application was awarded by NTIA on 11/30/09. The award is for the period of two (2) years, from 11/1/09 through 10/30/11 for broadband mapping activities (including semiannual data/map updates), and 11/1/09 through 10/30/14 for planning activities. However, the state plans to complete the initial data collection and mapping project addressed in this document by mid 4/10, with routine data/map updates occurring through 10/30/11. The primary broadband planning efforts related to this project will be completed by 12/31/11 with funding for a broadband-related support position continuing into the next year, along with other ongoing operational post-implementation governance and support activities and expenses. Total federal funding over the grant period (includes significant ongoing post-implementation activities) is \$1,974,083.00, with a state match, predominantly "in-kind" of \$493,521.00. (Total: \$2,467,604.00). The state project includes data collection, mapping, and the following planning and coordination activities: hiring of a state broadband coordinator for the duration of the grant; performing cost modeling for underserved areas; surveying; development of a state broadband plan; and conducting a statewide broadband summit meeting of broadband stakeholders. This project supports the State Strategic Information Plan goals of managing enterprise information and improving collaborative partnerships by collecting data about connectivity from community anchor institutions at multiple levels of government, governing the effort collaboratively, and sharing the resulting information via maps.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Statewide Broadband Project (Continued)**







The planning, cost modeling and surveying represent activities that will support the enterprise as a whole in delivering electronic services/eGovernment in the short and long term. \*\*Execution end was incorrectly stated when the project was originally entered into the quarterly report. \*\*\*The 20% matching contribution is tied to the overall federal grant total. The federal grant includes ongoing maintenance and program expenses as well as internal and external costs related to the implementation portion of the mapping and planning project. \*\*\*\* On 4/8/11 the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) Council met to review a request submitted by the Kansas Department of Commerce. The agency sought approval to close out the Statewide Broadband Project and make a determination that future activities under the SBDD Supplemental Grant would not constitute a reportable project under K.S.A. 75-7201 et seq. The CITO Council did not approve the closure of the Statewide Broadband Project. The Council noted that significant work and deliverables remain unfulfilled in the project. Specifically, one of the primary deliverables for the project, the broadband map, also known as the Connect Kansas BroadbandStat mapping application, still had unresolved accessibility conformance issues. The Council also found that this work constitutes an Information Technology Project pursuant to K.S.A 75-7201. The Council found that the contemplated activities may very well fall within the definition of an Information Technology Project in K.S.A. 75-7201.

**For the reporting period:**

1. The state has initiated a transition process to reclaim the formal grant designated entity status from Connected Nation. This will provide the state with greater control and direction of broadband planning efforts and amplify the focus of future efforts on direct economic impact to Kansans.
2. Connected Nation agreed to relinquish designated status to the state and the change is planned to be effective 6/30/11. The change is subject to final approval by NTIA. The Commerce department has worked closely with NTIA to ensure the process is carried out in accordance with the grant terms. The agency expects to have the designation change officially implemented by 9/30/11.
3. The interactive map, Broadband Stat, has been launched but is in beta status due to accessibility compliance concerns identified by the state American with Disabilities (ADA) team.
4. Resolution of the accessibility compliance issues have been acknowledged by Connected Nation, however they have not yet committed to a satisfactory remedy which holds the state free of incurring incremental costs for its implementation. Through update and coordination with the Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO), the Commerce Department is preparing a High Level Plan, which will provide a more efficient means of tracking progress of the outstanding task to be completed given the unpredictable timing nature of vendor negotiations.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to an increase in the critical path from 12/3/10 to “unknown” based on the 6/24/10 approved plan. As of 6/30/11 the critical path has been extended by 33% based on the 10/18/10 approved project plan. The project is also in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 79%, with three (3) deliverables outstanding at quarter end based on the 6/24/10 approved plan. Issues outlined in the January/February/March 2011 quarterly report placed this project in Alert Status. At that time the agency indicated that it was not possible to return the project back to the approved plan. This required the project to be Recast with adjusted information and submitted for Executive Chief Information Technology Officer approval. On 5/25/11, the EPMO met with Commerce to discuss the status of the recast plan. Additional information provided at that time indicated that Commerce was still negotiating with the Connected Nations (vendor) to determine if they could make the Broadband Map compliant with state accessibility requirements. Commerce cannot proceed with the Recast plan until the contractual issues are resolved. It was requested that Commerce submit a Revised High Level Plan until the issue can be resolved. As of 8/22/11 our records indicate that we have not yet received the Revised High Level Plan. Without a current, effective project plan in place, project success will be difficult. The agency will continue to submit biweekly reports to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive CITO.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

**Statewide Broadband Project (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$15,004		
Internal Cost:	\$15,004		
Estimated Start:	3/09	Estimated End:	6/09

**Prior Work - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>6/24/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$375,270</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$375,270</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$26,323</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$26,323</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$348,947</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$348,947</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>7/1/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>3/31/10</b>

**New Work**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>6/24/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,538,043</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,016,061</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$37,985</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$154,301</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,500,058</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$861,760</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>4/1/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/31/10</b>
		<b>**Execution End:</b>	<b>12/3/10</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>Unknown</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$3,410		
Internal Cost:	\$3,410		
Estimated Start:	12/10	Estimated End:	12/10
Adjusted Estimated Start:	Unknown	Adjusted Estimated End:	Unknown

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  **▽** Project on hold.
-  **⊕** Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  **⊘** Reporting insufficient.
-  **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Corporation Commission, Kansas (KCC)**

**KCC Project 2010 BPI – Business Innovation and Improvement**

<b>A</b>	CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	9/4/08	
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/6/09	
<b>+</b>	Project Cost:	\$891,996	(Planning, execution and close-out)
	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$164,778	

Execution Project Cost:	\$839,184	Execution Cost to Date:	\$795,964
Internal Cost:	\$154,489	Internal Cost to Date:	\$220,168
External Cost:	\$684,695	External Cost to Date:	\$575,796
Execution Start:	8/11/09	Execution End:	12/21/10
		Adjusted Execution End:	10/31/11

Funding Source for Project Cost

Public Service Regulation Fee Fund	65%
Conservation Fee Fund	15%
Transportation Fee Fund	20%







Vendor

ACO Information Services Ltd.

The Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) is embarking on a major project to improve the organization's business processes and technology. The goal is to position the Kansas Corporation Commission to be able to more efficiently serve the public, regulated entities and other interests of the State of Kansas. A number of our legacy technologies will be replaced or refreshed through this initiative, which will be accomplished through a firm/fixed price contract resulting from state issued Request for Proposal (RFP). Most significantly, Oracle Forms technology is being sunsetted by the Oracle Corporation, and will no longer be supported in the coming years. Through this project, we intend to replace the Oracle Forms-based technologies, with a more robust and flexible set of technologies which will be well supported into the coming decade. The Kansas Corporation Commission will implement a Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) solution which has been successfully implemented by other state government Public Utility Service Regulatory Commissions. The Kansas Corporation Commission embraces an atmosphere of continual Business Process Innovation and Improvement (BPI), and has identified a number of inter-related business initiatives, aligned with the Kansas Strategic Information Management (SIM) Plan for 2008-2013 and to be delivered in a carefully orchestrated series of inter-related initiatives, by year-end 2010. When realized, these initiatives will significantly improve efficiency, streamline operations, reduce costs, retain valuable institutional knowledge, and improve customer service. Project 2010 BPI is included in the Kansas Corporation Commission's Three Year Information Technology Management and Budget Plan.

**For the reporting period:** The project is in alert status after the first quarter of 2011. The KCC is working to recast the unfinished portion of the project. A new Chairman and Executive Director were appointed in early 6/11 and are coming up to speed with the project details. The project is therefore currently on hold while KCC leadership evaluates the next steps in proceeding with this project.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 63%, with three (3) deliverables outstanding at quarter end based on the 8/6/09 approved plan. The project is also in Alert status due to an increase in the critical path from 12/21/10 to 10/31/11 resulting in a 59% extension to the project schedule based on the 8/6/09 approved plan. Issues outlined in the January/February/March 2011 quarterly report placed this project in Alert Status. At that time it was indicated that it was not possible to return the project back to the approved plan. This required the project to be Recast with adjusted information and submitted for Executive Chief Information

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KCC Project 2010 BPI – Business Process Innovation and Improvement (Continued)**

**Project Status: (Continued)** Technology Officer approval. On 7/20/11, new KCC management disclosed that they could not file a Recast plan because the vendor had failed to complete approximately twenty (20) critical items on the project for it to be considered acceptable for the agency to use. The KCC is currently in discussions with ACO to reach an agreement on the remaining work and problems. Once complete, the project can move forward to file a recast plan and work toward completing the project. The project will also continue to submit biweekly reports to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive CITO.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$45,516		
Internal Cost:	\$33,516		
External Cost:	\$12,000		
Estimated Start:	8/08	Estimated End:	8/09

**Subproject I - Project Kickoff, Requirements Elaboration and Gap Analysis - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>8/6/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$261,226</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$180,891</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$22,420</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$21,185</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$238,806</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$159,706</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>8/11/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>11/10/09</b>

**Subproject II – Data Conversion, Production Rollout and Final Acceptance**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>10/29/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$577,958</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$615,073</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$132,069</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$198,983</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$445,889</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$416,090</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/11/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/21/10</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>10/31/11</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$7,296		
Internal Cost:	\$7,296		
Estimated Start:	12/10	Estimated End:	1/11
Adjusted Estimated Start:	11/11	Adjusted Estimated End:	12/11

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Education, Department of (KSDE)**



**Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 9/17/09  
 Project Cost: \$1,774,798 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$1,426,410

Execution Project Cost:	\$1,766,793	Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,153,137
Internal Cost:	\$33,960	Internal Cost to Date:	\$24,423
External Cost:	\$1,732,833	External Cost to Date:	\$1,128,714
Execution Start:	9/30/09	Execution End:	9/14/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

National Institute of Education Science	98%
State General Fund	2%

Vendor

Docufide, Inc.

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) will implement electronic transcripts for all K-12 districts in the state. This will include electronic exchange of student records as students move between K-12 districts, electronic transfer of transcripts from K-12 districts to postsecondary institutions, and an annual upload of high school transcript data to the Kansas State Department of Education. The Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation initiative will provide the ability to efficiently, reliably, and securely capture and deliver electronic student academic records. This can reduce the burden related to admission and guidance activities, eliminate the security risks associated with manual and paper processes, increase the accuracy and effectiveness of the data, and ensure that students receive the services they need in a timely manner. In addition the annual feed of student course data will contribute to efficient and reliable interoperability between district data systems and the Kansas State Department of Education for reporting high school course completion data. Over the past two years the Kansas State Department of Education has collaborated with Missouri and Nebraska State Departments of Education in evaluating e-Transcript solutions. In addition, the Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) conducted the request for proposal process for member states, and so an additional request for proposal was not needed to begin work with the vendor. Midwest Higher Education Compact member states include Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

**For the reporting period:** The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) and Docufide are continuing the statewide rollout for schools to register and implement student record exchange (SRE) and electronic transcripts (eTranscript). Over 135 high schools are sending electronic transcripts to postsecondary institutions, and over 300 K-12 schools are sending student records electronically. KSDE and Docufide continue to work with the Student Information System (SIS) vendors to include the required fields for the schools electronic transcript report. KSDE and Docufide continue to update the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) online training materials, and are conducting training webinars for the schools statewide.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Meeting targeted goals.                      | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.                    | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER.      | Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project              | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$944		
Internal Cost:	\$944		
Estimated Start:	5/09	Estimated End:	9/09

**Subproject I - Establish eTranscript - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>9/17/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$540,766</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$540,591</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$8,488</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$9,595</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$532,278</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$530,996</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/30/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>6/30/10</b>

**Subproject II - Rollout Year 1**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/20/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$611,511</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$612,546</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$11,600</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$14,828</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$599,911</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$597,718</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>7/1/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>6/30/11</b>

**Subproject III - Rollout Year 2**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>6/3/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$614,516</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$13,872</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$600,644</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>7/1/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>9/14/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$7,061		
Internal Cost:	\$7,061		
Estimated Start:	9/12	Estimated End:	3/13

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Health and Environment, Department of (KDHE)**

**Child Care Licensing and Registration Information System (CLARIS) Inspection Module**



CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	8/5/10		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/23/10		
Project Cost:	\$918,958	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$105,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$871,258	Execution Cost to Date:	\$520,905
Internal Cost:	\$44,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$10,320
External Cost:	\$827,258	External Cost to Date:	\$510,585
Execution Start:	8/25/10	Execution End:	1/10/12
Adjusted Execution Start:	9/21/10	Adjusted Execution End:	1/12/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) 100%

Vendor

LRS - Developers

The purpose of this project is to provide surveyors with an online tool to conduct surveys, and store data in the Kansas Department of Health and Environment’s (KDHE) existing Child Care Licensing and Registration Information System (CLARIS). CLARIS has been functional for ten (10) years. Even though the system is ten (10) years old, there is an advantage of leveraging this system to implement new functionality as it was built on mainstream technology that is still very much in use today. KDHE will make one (1) critical enhancement to provide better service to child care customers by adding an automated Inspection Module to CLARIS. The CLARIS Inspection Module will include an online survey to be used by all provider surveyors (County Health Departments, KDHE staff and child placing agencies) to conduct all surveys – initial, annual/recurring, complaint investigation and follow-up. It will provide a means to enter responses to each survey question, and store each of those responses in CLARIS. It will be a complete replacement for the current paper form based surveys and Notice of Survey Findings (NOSF) creation. It will provide all provider information and detailed survey history to the surveyor. In addition, it will provide a detailed database of survey responses that can be used for a wide variety of analyses. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds provide an opportunity to further promote the enhancement of quality in child care. Contractor duties under this agreement are funded by ARRA dollars, and contractor activities and costs are subject to all ARRA reporting requirements.

**For the reporting period:** The Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) finalized system development on 6/15/11. User testing began on 6/16/11 and concluded on 6/29/11. The current project deliverable completion ration is 91%.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- Infrastructure Project
- Project completed and PIER received
- Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Child Care Licensing and Registration Information System (CLARIS) Inspection Module  
(Continued)**

**Active**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$46,700		
External Cost:	\$46,700		
Estimated Start:	1/10	Estimated End:	8/10

**Design and Development of CLARIS Inspection Module**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>8/23/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$871,258</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$520,905</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$44,000</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$10,320</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$827,258</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$510,585</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>8/25/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>1/10/12</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/21/10</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>1/12/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,000		
Internal Cost:	\$1,000		
Estimated Start:	1/12	Estimated End:	9/12

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Health Policy Authority (KHPA)**

**Data Analytic Interface III**

**A**

**+**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	10/12/06		
CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval:	6/5/08		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	9/4/08		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	6/11/09		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	10/18/10		
Project Cost:	\$844,112	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$3,471,507		
Execution Project Cost:	\$802,000	Execution Cost to Date:	\$775,993
Internal Cost:	\$2,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$242,350
External Cost:	\$800,000	External Cost to Date:	\$533,643
Execution Start:	9/4/10	Execution End:	4/14/11
		Adjusted Execution End:	Unknown

Funding Source for Project Cost

State General Fund	13%
Federal Financial Participation	87%


Vendor

Thomson-Reuter

The statute creating the Kansas Health Policy Authority charges the Authority to provide data to a variety of stakeholders concerning utilization and cost of health care services purchased by the State and by other public and private entities. This data will enable stakeholders to participate with Kansas Health Policy Authority in developing a coordinated statewide health policy agenda. In addition, Kansas Health Policy Authority must make decisions about the management of health care benefits for Medicaid/State Children’s Health Insurance Program beneficiaries and for state employees, while balancing access, cost and quality. Therefore, Kansas Health Policy Authority is planning to develop a data warehouse called the Data Analytical Interface. The four (4) data groups that will be included are: Medicaid, State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), Kansas Health Insurance Information System (KHIIS), and the State Employees Health Benefit Program (SEHBP). The purposes for the recast are as follows:

- Critical problems were discovered during User Acceptance Testing (UAT) in 8/09. Kansas Health Insurance Information System (KHIIS) tasks were delayed to allow time for the vendor and KHPA to develop a contingency plan to address data gaps and other issues that were discovered. It also allowed us time to ensure the core product was sound.
- After the second UAT was completed it was decided to move forward with production implementation with the core product which included Medicaid, State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and State Employee Health Benefit Plan (SEHBP) data. KHIIS tasks continued to be behind schedule. More resources were added to the project to help ensure final project dates did not change.
- When the design of KHIIS began, it became apparent the vendor did not understand the full scope of the KHIIS needs. This caused further delays in the schedule and outstanding deliverables and the eventual request from the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) to recast the project to address project issues.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Data Analytic Interface III (Continued)**







<u>Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)</u>		<u>Actual expenditures (not cumulative)</u>	
Data Analytic Interface I	\$2,343,232	<u>\$1,238,924</u>	
Data Analytic Interface II	\$3,495,745	\$1,412,710	
Data Analytic Interface III	\$3,495,746	See above Execution Cost to Date	

**Project Gains**

Data Analytic Interface I – Requirements reviewed, data model finalized and data normalized.  
 Data Analytic Interface II – Completed user training, All KHPA staff who asked for training have been trained, User acceptance testing and acceptance of Kansas Health Insurance Information System (KHIIS).  
 Data Analytic Interface III – KHIIS Implementation and Transition to On Going Operations, formal acceptance of the entire system, project close-out.

**For the reporting period:** As reported previously, the only outstanding project issues are related to the implementation of Kansas Health Insurance Information System (KHIIS) data. The Medicaid and State Employee Health Insurance portions of the system have been operational for some time. There has been no change to the project plan task #1086 Formal acceptance as far as % complete. The project team is meeting bi-weekly to review and reconcile the agreed upon test reports. Thomson is reviewing reporting on their end to determine if they have any work arounds to resolve the record tagging issue reported in the January/February/March 2011 Quarterly Report. We have not received an update on what they have discovered. We are continuing to review the reports prepared by Thomson and have found some improvement but have not completely resolved the issues we encountered during the first review. We have determined, based on report review, that Thomson employs edit logic that changes diagnosis codes on paid claims data submitted by the insurance carriers. We are currently working with the Kansas Insurance Department to determine whether these changes are going to be acceptable since these changes are being made to claims that have already been paid/processed by the insurance carriers. During the past few weeks we have been able to determine the primary factors impacting the differences in the financial information Thomson is providing in the test reports. One of the logic elements that “bucket” claims into facility vs. professional vs. drug was implemented incorrectly which caused significant differences in two (2) of the three (3) groups, but the difference was not present in all insurance carriers because of their particular claims mix, making it very difficult to determine the source of the differences. We have been able to revise, and test internally, logic which we believe will correct the majority of the financial reporting differences leaving only the claim adjustments to be addressed as far as the differences in financial reporting. The new logic was provided to Thomson for their review 7/11/11. We anticipate having a response from Thomson regarding implementation of the revised logic within one (1) to two (2) weeks and actual implementation within the next two (2) monthly update cycles so that we may validate the financial reports. Thomson provided a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) document for our review 6/24/11. The CAP captured five (5) items (four (4) of which are general areas). (It is important to note that the logic mentioned in the previous paragraph may resolve three (3) of the issues presented in the CAP document.) Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), and Division of Health Care Finance (DHCF) staff have reviewed the CAP and are discussing this timeline with Thomson in relation to other work issues related to Medicaid and State Employee Health to ensure we do not create resource contention. Additionally, it is in everyone’s best interest to correct the outstanding KHIIS issues as soon as possible as we have nearly two (2) years of data to load once we implement. The items included in the CAP are:

- Accurately capturing the paid dates on the summary and detail lines of a claim;
- Records dropped due to line of business or Provider Type issues;
- Accurately handling adjustment claims to accurately capture financial data;
- Accurately “bucketing” claims into facility, professional, or drug categories

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

[Return to Index](#)

**Data Analytic Interface III (Continued)**

We are reviewing the impact of the tagging issue reported in recent bi-weekly reports to determine how best to handle the untagged data. Thomson staff indicates they have prepared documentation which will illustrate their code edits impact a relatively small population. Once we receive this documentation we will discuss it with the Insurance Department to determine their position/acceptance.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a task completion rate of 50% with one (1) task outstanding based on the 10/18/10 approved project plan. The project is also in Alert status due to an increase in the critical path from 4/14/11 to “unknown”. As of 7/18/11 the critical path has been extended by 37.5% based on the 10/18/10 approved project plan. Issues outlined in the January/February/March 2011 Quarterly Report indicated that the project would be unable to return to the original schedule. At that time, no recovery plan was requested because the project reported it would finish by 4/25/11 after it closed eleven (11) open issues with the Thomson – Reuters (vendor) prior to accepting final approval of the system. On 4/25/11 the agency reported that it did not complete as expected and it could not define when they might complete the project. Information reported in the April/May/June 2011 Quarterly Report indicated that the project is continuing to review the reports prepared by the vendor but has not accepted the deliverables because of the prior issues. The project will now need to be recast. This will require the Detailed Project Plan to be revised with adjusted information and submitted for Executive Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) approval. Without a current, effective project plan in place, project success will be difficult. Team members will have limited understanding of expectations, activities may not be properly defined and response requirements may not be understood. The agency will also continue to submit biweekly reports to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive CITO.

**Phase Three**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>10/18/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$802,000</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$775,993</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$242,350</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$533,643</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/4/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>4/14/11</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>Unknown</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$42,112		
Internal Cost:	\$500		
External Cost:	\$41,612		
Estimated Start:	4/11	Estimated End:	4/11
Adjusted Estimated Start:	Unknown	Adjusted Estimated End:	Unknown

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Health Policy Authority (KHPA) (Continued)**

**State Medicaid Health Information Technology (HIT) Plan SMHP)**

**A**

+



CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	9/2/10		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	5/19/11		
Project Cost:	\$619,899	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$0		
Execution Project Cost:	\$419,522	Execution Cost to Date:	\$29,924
Internal Cost:	\$11,776	Internal Cost to Date:	\$7,427
External Cost:	\$407,746	External Cost to Date:	\$22,497
Execution Start:	5/20/11	Execution End:	8/15/11
		<i>*Adjusted Execution End:</i>	8/31/11
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
State General Fund	10%	Navigant	
Federal Financial Participation	90%		

This project is a planning project as no actual system will be built. The scope of this project includes the development of a State Medicaid Health Information Technology (HIT) Plan (SMHP) as well as the hiring of consultant(s) to help in that development. The SMHP will serve as the strategic vision for Medicaid HIT implementation in Kansas. This strategic vision will guide the State as it moves from the current “As-Is” HIT Landscape to the desired “To-Be” HIT Landscape. The final SMHP will include a comprehensive HIT Road Map. The roadmap will articulate a path to improve the quality, safety and efficiency of health care in Kansas through the use of health information technology that supports health information exchange. The roadmap will be designed over the next year and establish deliverables. Additional or sub-projects may be submitted when the planning is complete if research indicates additional project(s) are needed. The final SMHP, the primary project deliverable, will provide an integrated strategic plan for the next five (5) years. The development of the State Medicaid HIT Plan will begin with a detailed technical assessment of the existing and planned HIT projects underway in Kansas. The detailed assessment will capture a more complete inventory of the activities and document any gaps or overlaps which exist between state efforts and Medicaid focused efforts. The intent is to ensure that key gaps are filled, that inefficiencies created by overlaps are reduced and that future HIT plans are coordinated, and alignment with the State's Strategic Information management (SIM) plan.

**For the reporting period:** The Detailed Plan was approved by the Executive Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) on 5/19/11. The EHR (Electronic Health Record) Incentive team continues to make progress. The draft State Medicaid HIT Plan (SMHP) has been reviewed by the State project team and the contractor is addressing recommended changes. It is expected that the SMHP will be submitted to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) in early 8/11. The Implementation – Advanced Planning Document (I-APD) is beginning to be developed. The goal remains to make EHR Incentive payments by the end of calendar year 2011.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a task completion rate of 53% with nine (9) tasks currently outstanding based on the 5/19/11 approved project plan. The delay was due to the effort needed to complete two (2) project deliverables, the I-APD and SMHP. There is no impact on cost or resources. The schedule is impacted by 19 calendar days. This is still within an acceptable timeframe for the Medicaid HIT effort. The project should be back on track by the end of 8/11. The project is expected to complete by 8/31/11. The agency will submit biweekly reports to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive CITO.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**State Medicaid Health Information Technology (HIT) Plan (SMHP) (Continued)**

**Active-New-Alert-New**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$151,839		
Internal Cost:	\$79,304		
External Cost:	\$72,535		
Estimated Start:	12/2/09	Estimated End:	7/27/11

**Development**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/19/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$419,522</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$29,924</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$11,776</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$7,427</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$407,746</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$22,497</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>5/20/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/15/11</b>
		<b>*Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>8/31/11</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$48,538		
Internal Cost:	\$8,832		
External Cost:	\$39,706		
Estimated Start:	8/11	Estimated End:	1/12

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Highway Patrol, Kansas (KHP)**

**Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)/Records Management System (RMS) Project**

<b>A</b>	CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	6/21/10		
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	12/6/10		
<b>+</b>	Project Cost:	\$927,183	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
	Adjusted Project Cost:	\$959,983		
	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$292,277		
	Execution Project Cost:	\$918,269		
	Adjusted Execution Project Cost:	\$963,961	Execution Cost to Date:	\$553,677
	Internal Cost:	\$53,069	Internal Cost to Date:	\$41,177
	External Cost:	\$865,200		
	Adjusted Execution Cost:	\$910,892	External Cost to Date:	\$512,500
	Execution Start:	12/23/10	Execution End:	8/12/11
			Adjusted Execution End:	9/28/11
	<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
	State General Fund	5%	Global Software	
	Federal Forfeiture	93%		
	Kansas Civil Assessment Fund	2%		



The Kansas Highway Patrol (KHP) is the primary law enforcement group for highway safety in Kansas, covering more than 82,000 square miles and serving more than 2.8 million residents. Troopers also provide backup support to county sheriffs and municipal police departments across the state. In 2010, the agency also received certification as a secondary or backup Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). As such, it is crucial that the agency's dispatch center be functional 24 hours per day, seven (7) days a week and meet current technological standards. KHP's computer aided dispatch (CAD) and records management system (RMS) software is ten (10) years old and has far exceeded the product life cycle. The outdated platform makes it difficult to integrate with other agency applications, adding cost and complexity to development and data sharing efforts. The existing platform is also incompatible with current federal standards for E911 and Next Generation 911 (NG911) call centers. Updating the CAD and RMS platform to a National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) compatible, Extensible Markup Language (XML) platform will enable the agency to support the state Strategic Information Management Plan (SIM) plan by:

- providing better customer service to the motoring public and increasing user satisfaction;
- improving business processes and enhancing workforce efficiency;
- expanding the ability to manage enterprise information and improving collaborative relationships by sharing data across platforms;

While E-911 functionality will not be deployed within the scope of this project, it is imperative that the agency update the CAD and RMS systems in order for the agency to integrate the functionality within the next three (3) years. Likewise, a new system is needed to position the agency for implementation of the federal Next Generation 911 (NG911) initiative.

**For the reporting period:** This quarter, the Kansas Highway Patrol (KHP) completed the Kansas Law Enforcement Records System (KLER) document interface and records management system training for administrators/trainers. The agency also completed the ImageNow Interface design and has begun testing of the interface. Due to limited resource availability by the ImageNow vendor, KHP was not able to complete the interface design until mid-6/11 and the code was incomplete until the first of week of 7/11. Additional work was also required on the part of Global to implement the ImageNow enhancements. The remaining tasks have been realigned to coincide with completion of the records management system (RMS) enhancements. In order to accommodate the task realignment, staffing needs and system availability requirements around the state fair, the go-live date has been moved to 9/27 (change request 2.1).

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p> Meeting targeted goals.</p> <p> Project Stopped/Canceled.</p> <p> Project completed and waiting for PIER.</p> <p><b>I</b> Infrastructure Project</p> <p><b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received</p> | <p><b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).</p> <p><b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).</p> <p> Project on hold.</p> <p> Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).</p> <p> Reporting insufficient.</p> |
|---|---|

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Computer Aided Dispatch (CMS)/Records Management System (RMS) Project (Continued)**

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 78% with two (2) deliverables outstanding based on the 12/6/10 approved project plan. The project is also in Alert status due to an increase in the critical path from 8/12/11 to 9/28/11 resulting in a 25% extension to the project schedule based on the 12/6/10 approved project plan. Issues outlined in the April/May/June 2011 Quarterly Report indicated that the project will be unable to return to the original schedule but may return to a deliverable completion rate of above 90% by 8/11. Due to vendor resource availability, work related to developing an interface to capture bulk scanned documents and linking the associated cases in the records management system did not begin until 6/11 causing the delay. Implementation will occur in mid 7/11 with testing to follow. This delay resulted in an adjustment to the project schedule of six (6) weeks to accommodate the revised work plan. Based on the information provided, the project will reflect the above Alert Status for the quarter. We recognize that the project will be unable to return the project back to the approved plan. As a result, a recovery plan will not be required at this time. However, biweekly reporting (every two weeks) will be provided to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO). beginning immediately after the quarter. \*On 8/18/11 the agency reported that one of the outstanding deliverables completed on 8/15/11.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$7,180	Estimated End:	12/10
Internal Cost:	\$7,180	Adjusted Estimated End:	1/11
Estimated Start:	4/10		

**Computer Aided Dispatch**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>12/6/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$918,269</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$553,677</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$963,961</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$41,177</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$53,069</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$512,500</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$865,200</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/12/11</b>
<b>Adjusted External Cost:</b>	<b>\$910,892</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/28/11</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/23/10</b>		

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,734	Estimated End:	2/12
Internal Cost:	\$1,734	Adjusted Estimated End:	3/12
Estimated Start:	8/11		
Adjusted Estimated Start:	10/11		

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Historical Society, State**



**Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) III**

CITO Council High-Level Plan Approval:	5/14/09		
CITO Council Revised High-Level Plan Approval:	4/26/10		
CITO Council Detailed Plan Approval:	5/21/10		
CITO Council Recast Plan Approval:	9/13/10		
*CITO Council Recast Plan Approval:	7/28/11		
Project Cost:	\$8,207,329	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$225,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$8,204,783	Execution Cost to Date:	\$187,686
Internal Cost:	\$275,533	Internal Cost to Date:	\$19,109
External Cost:	\$7,929,250	External Cost to Date:	\$168,577
Execution Start:	4/27/11	Execution End:	3/19/12
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
State General Fund	5%	iMerge - Policy Framework	
INK Grant	2%	Propylon – System Requirements	
National Digital Information and Preservation Program – Library of Congress	1%	AOS/EMC/CISCO – Storage Facility	
KEEP fees	91%		
Unfunded Security Audit	1%		

**KEEP I** - The objective of the Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) Archives project is to design, build, test, and deploy a trusted digital repository to allow Kansas citizens to preserve and access electronic government records with enduring value. KEEP will allow agencies to archive their material under the expertise of the State Archivist. The archive will be a highly secure, trustworthy and reliable environment. Material will be available within the constraints of the Open Records Act. Agency material will be ingested programmatically. Metadata will be transferred programmatically from agency existing systems and reviewed by the archival staff. The public will retrieve material through a browser based interface. If a user requests material be certified as authentic, the State Archivist will digitally certify the material for a fee. Fees will be divided between the archive and the originating agency according to an interagency Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU). **KEEP II** - The new project plan is a recast of the original plan. The system requirements were initially due 6/30/10. Requirements were received from Propylon on 7/29/10. Unfortunately the requirements did not fully describe the system build as expected and the Kansas development team did not accept the requirements. **KEEP III** - This project plan is the second recast of the original plan. The prototype system was accepted on 6/10/11. The acceptance followed multiple delays of the project schedule placing the project in alert status. Propylon, the build vendor, has performed several demonstrations of the software but it was not released to the Kansas team according to the project schedule. This recast plan includes Subproject 1 extending the prototype build to the full production system. The project schedule is extended to 4/6/12 to accommodate the increased project scope. The production system scope includes building the capability to address variable retention periods of records, increased security and access restrictions and the public web access to the archive. The financial model is based on agencies paying a standard rate based on the Division of Information System and Communication’s (DISC) storage rate. DISC fees for hosting the KEEP system

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) III (Continued)**

and data store are recaptured through the rate model. The Kansas Historical Society will receive a portion of the rate to cover the system's ongoing costs, preservation activities and administration. The external costs reflected in this plan include DISC's fees for hosting the system and the application development effort.

<u>Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)</u>	<u>Actual expenditures (not cumulative)</u>
KEEP I - \$693,436	\$91,060
KEEP II - \$720,026	\$522,328
KEEP III \$8,729,657	See above Execution Cost to Date

**Project Gains**









KEEP I – Project planning, defined governance and management processes, RFP and procured vendor.  
 KEEP II – Define requirements, perform test scripts, perform acceptance testing, install hardware and perform planning for Phase II.  
 KEEP III – Complete KEEP prototype system, develop and implement production system build.

**For the reporting period:** \*The Recast Project Plan was approved by the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) Council on 7/28/11. The KEEP prototype system was accepted on 6/10/11. The project delays added \$21,500 internal costs to the project. The prototype project is been complete and is on budget. The external costs were negotiated on fixed price contracts so were not affected by the project delays. The 2<sup>nd</sup> recast project plan was filed 7/11/11. The recast project plan was extended to include the production system build as Subproject 1. Subproject 1 includes building the authentication inbound and outbound, submission agreement validation tools, automated batch ingest tools for agencies and the public web access modules. Work has started on developing the scope of work with Propylon for the production system build. The Service Level Agreement (SLA) with DISC tasks have been altered and extended. The original intent was to SLA for development work with DISC. KSHS has now approved a developer position and will bring these services in-house. The DISC SLA will be limited to infrastructure services. This work is now scheduled to be completed by 8/31/11. Task Orders: The task order to extend the functionality of the prototype to include the Legislature’s KLISS time machine concept is near completion. This is in final testing now. The second task order to ingest the committee meeting video files will also test closed captioning. This work will begin the week of 7/11/11. Adding Subproject 1 – Production System Build has extended the project end date to 3/19/12.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Recast New Work**

<b>*CITO Council Approval:</b>	<b>7/28/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$224,774</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$187,686</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$35,524</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$19,109</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$189,250</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$168,577</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>4/27/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>7/28/11</b>

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  **▽** Project on hold.
-  **⊕** Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  **⊖** Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) III (Continued)**

**Active-Recast-New**

**Subproject I Production System Build**

*\*CITO Council Approval:* 7/28/11

**Execution Cost:** \$7,980,009  
**Internal Cost:** \$240,009  
**External Cost:** \$7,740,000  
**Execution Start:** 7/29/11


**Execution Cost to Date:** \$0  
**Internal Cost to Date:** \$0  
**External Cost to Date:** \$0  
**Execution End:** 3/19/12

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost: \$2,546  
 Internal Cost: \$2,546  
 Estimated Start: 3/12

Estimated End: 4/12

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)**

**Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project**

C

+

CITO High-Level Approval:	2/26/09	
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	3/11/10	
Project Cost:	\$605,200	(Planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$247,556	

Execution Project Cost:	\$470,200	Execution Cost to Date:	\$48,300
Internal Cost:	\$65,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$48,300
External Cost:	\$405,200	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	3/16/10	Execution End:	11/23/11
		Adjusted Execution End:	3/1/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

State General Fund	17%
U.S. Department of Justice – Justice Assistance Grant	67%
U.S. Department of Homeland Security Grant	16%







Vendor

Computer Projects of Illinois (CPI)

On 3/9/98 the current Kansas Central Message Switch (CMS) was installed to replace the ASTRA switch/Systems Network Architecture (SNA) network. This created an instant link with criminal records at the local, state and national levels as part of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) 2000 initiative. Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) information is maintained in numerous Kansas databases, other states' criminal justice databases, as well as federal databases which allow Kansas law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies timely access to critical information in order to provide public safety. The CMS is interfaced with these various networks and databases to supply this information. Since the bankruptcy of the original CMS contractor, the CMS code and interfaces have been supported by Balance Wheel Technologies, Inc., contracted to the KBI. While Balance Wheel Technologies, Inc., has done a commendable job in maintaining the current switch, it is still a one-man shop leaving the KBI vulnerable to non-support of a critical information system should the current avenue of support become no longer available. Furthermore, the current CMS code limits the KBI's use of current technologies such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and web-services, not allowing the KBI to receive grant monies for participation in national information sharing initiatives such as the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) National Interstate Sharing of Photo's (NISP) and Criminal History Information Exchange Format (CHIEF) projects and become fully compliant with the NCIC (National Crime Information Center) CJIS Security Policy and NCIC 2000 project. It is not cost effective to upgrade the current CMS, which is ten (10) years old, to be able to use current technologies. The CMS serves all levels of law enforcement in the State of Kansas, including local, county, state, and federal. Law enforcement gains access to criminal history information, driver information, want and warrant information, stolen property, and much more through the CMS. It is an invaluable and irreplaceable tool in the hands of Kansas law enforcement. In addition, public service and safety systems such as Amber Alert, National Weather Service, and Road Condition Report information flow through the CMS. New tools, such as stolen vehicle tracking (Lojack), XML-interface warrant data to external states and other web services will provide an even better experience. This project will provide improved functionality and strategic longevity to the CMS and to the same wide-ranging set of law enforcement personnel.

**For the reporting period:** Testing is slightly behind schedule, with some innovations implemented to regain and advance project schedule. Implementation items related to the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) (particularly XML interface Driver Data go-live) have been extracted outside of the critical path where possible, and will be completed apart

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project (Continued)**

**For the reporting period: (Continued)** from the main body of the project as made available by the KDOR DMV Modernization Project. Testing is anticipated to proceed essentially on schedule for a 11/11 main cutover and essential 12/11 completion, with finalization coupled to KDOR’s Go-Live for Driver Data in second quarter 2012.

**Project Status:** The project is in Caution status due to an increase in the critical path from 11/23/11 to 3/1/12 resulting in a 14% extension to the project schedule based on the 3/11/10 approved project plan. The project is also in Caution status due to a task completion rate of 88% with thirteen tasks currently outstanding based on the 3/11/10 approved project plan. Issues outlined in the April/May/June 2011 Quarterly Report indicated the project would be unable to return to the original schedule. Due to external circumstances in the KDOR DMV Modernization Project, implementation items (particularly the XML Interface Driver Data go-live) are now expected to complete 3/12. The Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project will essentially be complete by 12/11 with finalization to KDOR’s Go-Live for Driver Data in 3/12. Based on the information provided, a recovery plan will not be required however the project will reflect the above Caution status for the quarter.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$125,000		
Internal Cost:	\$25,000		
External Cost:	\$100,000		
Estimated Start:	9/08	Estimated End:	3/10

**Execution**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>3/11/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$470,200</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$48,300</b>
Internal Cost:	\$65,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$48,300
External Cost:	\$405,200	External Cost to Date:	\$0
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>3/16/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>11/23/11</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>3/1/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$10,000		
Internal Cost:	\$10,000		
Estimated Start:	11/11	Estimated End:	12/11
Adjusted Estimated Start:	3/12	Adjusted Estimated End:	3/12

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Investigations, Kansas Bureau of (KBI) (Continued)**

**KCJIS-KDOR Data Integration**

A

+



CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	9/2/10		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	11/4/10		
Project Cost:	\$901,000	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$0		
Execution Project Cost:	\$796,300	Execution Cost to Date:	\$80,450
Internal Cost:	\$24,300	Internal Cost to Date:	\$10,450
External Cost:	\$772,000	External Cost to Date:	\$70,000
Execution Start:	11/15/10	Execution End:	9/19/11
		Adjusted Execution End:	6/11/12
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
State General Fund	4%	Analyst International Corporation	
Traffic Records Coordinating Council Grant	11%		
Justice Assistance Grant (U.S. Department Of Justice)	85%		

This project is driven by the KDOR Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) Modernization Project, and is required to integrate KCJIS systems with the new KDOR driver and motor vehicle information. This project will also greatly improve criminal justice user access to driver and vehicle information and will allow collaboration with the Traffic Records Coordinating Council (TRCC) traffic record system. The Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) is upgrading their legacy driver and vehicle registration system with a new off the shelf product that is capable of providing a decoupled interface for sharing the driver and vehicle information with Law Enforcement users. The Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) hosts the Kansas Central Message Switch (CMS) and the Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) – the two systems that provide Law Enforcement users with the ability to query the driver and vehicle information. The interface between the KBI systems and the legacy KDOR system is tightly coupled and does not fully meet the data needs of the Law Enforcement community. KBI’s goals and objectives are to create a decoupled interface to share the driver and vehicle information between KDOR and KCJIS systems. Additionally, the KBI seeks to update the KCJIS portal to include the driver and vehicle data. Some of the key features envisioned for the improved data interface include the following:

- Ability to perform advanced searches on driver and vehicle data using wildcards and soundex functions
- Ability to retrieve the chronological list of all the photos associated with a driver
- Ability to index the driver and vehicle information in KCJIS to allow for federated searches across the various data sources available in KCJIS
- Update the KCJIS Web portal to provide the driver and vehicle data to its users
- Update the Kansas CMS to consume driver and vehicle data from the new interface

**For the reporting period:** It is important to note that while the project is not “on schedule” this condition is strictly due to external factors that cannot be mitigated. First, the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) has been forced to push back the completion dates for significant portions of the DMV Modernization project. Second, a Master Entity Index, expected to be provided by the eCitation project, is being delivered later than expected. Identified early on as risks, the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) has monitored the progress of both external constraints closely, and in response the schedule for this project has been revised and resources appropriately throttled to maintain stride with those external projects. Driver and Vehicle portions of this project schedule have also been de-coupled, to provide some level of insularity to KDOR’s project schedule and so that some tasks can proceed more independently than was possible in the

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KCJIS-KDOR Data Integration (Continued)**

**For the reporting period: (Continued)** previous schedule. At this time there is every reason to believe this project will complete per the current, revised schedule barring any other unforeseen external influences.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to an increase in the critical path from 9/19/11 to 6/11/12 resulting in a 73% extension to the project schedule based on the 11/4/10 approved project plan. The project is also in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 67% with two (2) deliverables currently outstanding based on the 11/4/10 approved project plan. Issues outlined in the April/May/June 2011 Quarterly Report indicate that KBI will be unable to return to the original schedule. Due to changes in the Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) DMV Modernization project schedule, this project will impact the testing of driver related elements, the development and testing of the Master Entity Index (MEI) elements, and the testing of Vehicle related elements in the KCJIS-KDOR Data Integration project. Due to the schedule delay, the project will need to be recast. This will require the Detailed Project Plan be revised with adjusted information and submitted for Executive Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) approval. Without a current, effective project plan in place, project success will be difficult. Team members will have limited understanding of expectations, activities may not be properly defined, and resource requirements may not be understood. Biweekly reporting (every two weeks) will be provided to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive CITO beginning immediately after the quarter.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$103,600		
Internal Cost:	\$6,600		
External Cost:	\$97,000		
Estimated Start:	3/10	Estimated End:	11/10

**Execution**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>11/4/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$796,300</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$80,450</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$24,300</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$10,450</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$772,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/15/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>9/19/11</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>6/11/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,100		
Internal Cost:	\$1,100		
Estimated Start:	9/11	Estimated End:	10/11
Adjusted Estimated Start:	5/11	Adjusted Estimated End:	7/11

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  **▽** Project on hold.
-  **⊕** Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  **⊖** Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA)**



**Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite**

CITO High-Level Approval:	2/21/08		
CITO Revised High-Level Approval:	12/17/09		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	12/22/09		
Project Cost:	\$2,134,340	(Planning, execution and closeout)	
**Adjusted Project Cost:	\$2,114,460		
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$242,468		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,913,974		
**Adjusted Execution Project Cost:	\$1,897,331	Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,219,909
Internal Cost:	\$681,842		
**Adjusted Internal Cost:	\$665,199	Internal Cost to Date:	\$422,245
External Cost:	\$1,232,132	External Cost to Date:	\$797,664
Execution Start:	1/4/10	Execution End:	4/3/12
Adjusted Execution Start:	12/22/09	Adjusted Execution End:	6/8/12
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
State General Fund	45%	3MV, Inc.	
Juvenile Accountability Block Grant	55%		

The Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA) uses four (4) main applications when it comes to tracking and documenting youth in our system. These applications are the Juvenile Justice Intake and Assessment Management System (JJIAMS), the Juvenile Correctional Facility System (JCFS), the Community Agency Supervision Information Management System (CASIMS) and the Purchase of Services Management database (POSSuM). Each of these applications is reaching the end of life or twilight stage necessitating a single replacement application to incorporate all functionality of current applications for the capture of youth's information. The project will require input from state, county and local entities and is being done in coordination with Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS). The completed re-write of the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) application will incorporate the four (4) above mentioned end of life applications. The current applications will continue to be maintained and updated until a time at which the new application has been thoroughly tested and completed. \*\*Several tasks assigned to higher paid staff were delegated to lower paid staff resulting in a cost saving of \$19,880.

**For the reporting period:** During this reporting period, the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite project has continued Subproject II, Design through Pilot Release 1, the second and largest of three (3) planned subprojects for the development of an integrated system that shares common data and supports the agency's juvenile intake and assessment, case management, and juvenile correctional facilities business functions. Primary project focus has been on the design and organization of training materials and workshops, and finalizing prototypes and technical design specifications as it relates to both legacy migration and the proposed new application design. Mentoring has continued through functional and technical development activities. As with many state agencies JJA has undergone significant changes recently, this project has been affected by those changes. JJA lost two (2) full time equivalent (FTEs) that impacted the project, and as a result deliverable 2-27 Release 1 Service Layer is behind schedule. This slippage impacts all future deliverables as it is in the critical path. Focus has been placed on reevaluating the project scope, timeline, and dedicated man hours. Numerous options are being reviewed and a final decision is expected to be made on 7/15/11. All changes will be accounted for within our submission of Subproject III for approval, it is estimated that no change will exceed the imposed 10% threshold for either cost or duration. Acceptance of deliverable 2-25 Implementation Plan has been placed on hold.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$164,411		
**Adjusted Estimated Project Cost:	\$165,427		
Internal Cost:	\$85,711		
**Adjusted Internal Cost:	\$86,727		
External Cost:	\$78,700		
Estimated Start:	12/07	Estimated End:	12/09

**Subproject I – Environmental Setup & Analysis - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>12/22/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$210,742</b>		
<b>**Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$202,508</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$202,202</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$75,742</b>		
<b>**Adjusted Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$67,508</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$67,202</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$135,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$135,000</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>1/4/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>4/2/10</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/22/09</b>		

**Subproject II – Design through Core System and Intake Pilot Testing**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>4/1/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,101,498</b>		
<b>**Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,278,686</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,017,707</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$390,774</b>		
<b>**Adjusted Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$411,546</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$355,043</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$710,724</b>		
<b>**Adjusted External Cost:</b>	<b>\$867,140</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$662,664</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>4/2/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>5/31/11</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>4/5/10</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>11/23/11</b>

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  **▽** Project on hold.
-  **⊕** Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  **⊘** Reporting insufficient.
-  **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite (Continued)**

**Active**

**Subproject III – Case Management & Facilities Development through Production Rollout**

**CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested**

**Execution Cost: \$601,734**

**\*\*Adjusted Execution Cost: \$416,137**

**Internal Cost: \$215,326**

**\*\*Adjusted Internal Cost: \$186,145**

**External Cost: \$386,408**

**\*\*Adjusted External Cost: \$229,992**

**Execution Start: 5/31/11**

**Adjusted Execution Start: 9/30/11**

**Execution Cost to Date: \$0**

**Internal Cost to Date: \$0**

**External Cost to Date: \$0**

**Execution End: 4/3/12**

**Adjusted Execution End: 6/8/12**

**Close-Out**

**Estimated Project Cost: \$55,955**

**\*\*Adjusted Estimated Project Cost: \$51,702**

**Internal Cost: \$45,955**

**\*\*Adjusted Internal Cost: \$41,702**

**External Cost: \$10,000**


**Estimated Start: 4/12**

**Adjusted Estimated End: 6/12**

**Estimated End: 7/12**

**Adjusted Estimated End: 9/12**

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS)**

**Kansas eCitation**

A







+

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	10/28/10		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	3/3/11		
Project Cost:	\$1,931,522	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$112,161		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,809,122	Execution Cost to Date:	\$85,700
Internal Cost:	\$377,188	Internal Cost to Date:	\$57,800
External Cost:	\$1,431,934	External Cost to Date:	\$27,900
Execution Start:	3/21/11	Execution End:	5/1/14
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
State Traffic Record Fund	26%	Analyst International, Inc.	
National Highway Transportation Safety Administration Section 408 Grant	74%		

The Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) commissioned this Strategic Plan for the development and implementation of a statewide electronic traffic citation (eCitation) system, with a central traffic citation information repository (central repository) accessible by state, local, and federal agencies, and the public. This eCitation system is an integral part of the statewide Traffic Records Coordination Committee (TRCC) governed Traffic Records System (TRS) program initiated in 2005 and will integrate with KCJIS. The TRS will be a virtual data warehouse that will provide state and local agencies with the ability to efficiently access traffic data to increase the safety of the motoring public. It will bring together information that is currently housed in separate, isolated repositories at the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT), Kansas Highway Patrol (KHP), Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR), Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI), Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services (KBEMS) and other agencies. As a vital component of the TRS system, the goal is to implement a statewide eCitation system through which traffic citation data can be collected, analyzed, and distributed accurately, quickly, and cost effectively for the benefit of the public and state, local, and federal agencies. The approach to the eCitation system is consistent with and extends the common vision developed for the TRS. It also reflects the desires, efforts and outcomes of interested state agencies in migrating toward a more accurate, efficient, and cost effective capture and exchange of traffic data through modern technological electronic processes. Through the creation of a statewide eCitation system, KCJIS will transform the capture, storage, exchange and use of traffic citation data from the current mixed system of mostly manual data entry and some electronic storage and exchange to a fully electronic system.

**For the reporting period:** The project continued this quarter with and resulted in the completion of two (2) of the largest design deliverables by the system integrator. There were some initial communication difficulties surrounding the scope of the design, however after some corrective action taken by the project manager and the project steering committee, the misunderstanding in scope was corrected and the project brought back on schedule. While the initial two (2) deliverables were delayed somewhat, they were completed prior to the end of the quarter and had no impact on future deliverables. Significant progress has been made by the vendor to begin working on other future deliverables, many of which are ahead of schedule.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas eCitation (Continued)**

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a task completion rate of 72% with five (5) tasks currently outstanding based on the 3/3/11 approved project plan. The outstanding tasks are due to a misunderstanding between KCJIS and the State Archivist. The archive related analysis was not complete as originally planned and therefore were incomplete for the 6/11 quarterly report. The incomplete tasks will be performed by a secondary project team later in the project. They are not on the critical path and therefore will not impact the cost, schedule and resources. Representatives from KCJIS and the Office of the State Archivist have met to discuss the issue. It was determined that these tasks will be postponed until the next subproject. This will have the advantage of allowing more detailed information surrounding the upcoming eCitation system to be collected prior to analysis being performed which will result in a more accurate KEEP analysis. The project schedule has been updated to reflect this decision.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$107,400		
Internal Cost:	\$15,000		
External Cost:	\$92,400		
Estimated Start:	12/08	Estimated End:	3/11

**Subproject I – Detailed Design and Core Technology Deployment**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>3/3/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$801,934</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$85,700</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$170,000</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$57,800</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$631,934</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$27,900</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>3/21/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>2/23/12</b>

**Subproject II – Production Implementation & Functional Enhancements**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$741,250</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$191,250</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$550,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>2/24/12</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>5/30/13</b>
		<i>*Adjusted Execution End</i>	<b>6/17/13</b>

**Subproject III – System Integration**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$265,938</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$15,938</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>5/31/13</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>5/1/14</b>

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Kansas eCitation (Continued)


Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$15,000
Internal Cost:	\$15,000
Estimated Start:	5/14


Estimated End: 5/14

Active-Alert-New

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received


\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Labor, Department of (KDOL)**

**UIM Build and Deploy**

A

+

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 5/12/09  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 6/22/09  
 CITO Council Recast Plan Approval: Pending  
 Project Cost: \$18,957,746 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$2,670,000

Execution Project Cost:	\$18,957,746	Execution Cost to Date:	\$16,938,758
Internal Cost:	\$4,020,734	Internal Cost to Date:	\$1,449,413
External Cost:	\$14,937,012	External Cost to Date:	\$15,489,345
Execution Start:	6/29/09	Execution End:	10/11/11
Adjusted Execution Start:	6/23/09	Adjusted Execution End:	10/28/11

Funding Source for Project Cost

Federal - Bonds 16%  
 Reed Act 84%

Vendor

Perficient – Siebel Development  
 Nuance – Genesys  
 Automation Assistance – FileNet  
 IT21 – Independent Review and Analysis

This project is part of the Kansas Department of Labor’s (KDOL) effort to modernize their technical and operation model. The prior Unemployment Insurance Modernization (UIM) project completed the feasibility study, requirements, design, and part of the build. Currently, the Unemployment Insurance system operates on an IBM mainframe that was developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s in an era when disk space was very expensive and batch processing was the norm. The system, in its day, was very well designed and efficiently managed data by storing it in a compressed format. However, this architecture does not support the needs of today’s ever-changing unemployment insurance business and the need for on-line processing. Our new designed system will be providing feature-rich telephony and web services to meet our customers’ needs. Bringing in the organizational principles of customer relationship management and case management, the new Unemployment Insurance system will provide customers with the high quality self-service options they demand. This project is in alignment with our KDOL strategic plan that drove the design of our “To Be” concept of operations: Customer-Focused Assisted Self Service and Integrated Operations. This project will be broken into three (3) subprojects focused around iterative deployments. The first subproject will be focused on the infrastructure of the core technologies deploying the upgraded Siebel, Genesys, and FileNet Platforms. The second subproject will focus on deployment of first priority functionality, data migration, and interfaces. The last (third) subproject will deploy secondary priority functionality and wrap up the project. \*\*On 11/12/09 the agency received Chief Information Technology Officer approval to divide the original Subproject II into two (2) parts. This became Subproject II and III. Additional time was needed to review the large number of responses received for two (2) Request for Proposals (RFP), there was also a need to keep staff engaged in their new skills and lastly there was a need to continue deploying technology and business processes that immediately improved the ability to serve the public given the increase workload due to the economy.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**UIM Build and Deploy (Continued)**







**For the reporting period:** Based upon the assessment conducted in the first quarter of 2011, the project goals were altered, focusing on resolving defects, and implementing enhancements from prior releases. The results of the assessment identified 241 items that were defects, omissions and enhancements resulting from UIM Releases 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 that had not been corrected nor were there any efforts planned to correct them. With the focus on resolving defects that resulted from work done in 2010, the KDOL team closed 97.5% (235) of the original 241 reported issues. Additionally, since the beginning of 2011, 444 defects, omissions and enhancements have been identified. During this resolution stage of the project, the team has closed 81% (363) of the newly identified tickets. Many successful processes have been implemented as a result of this endeavor:

- The majority of the business functionality is now processed within the new Siebel application.
- Enhancements have been made to the Quarterly Wage Reporting (QWR) processes that have increased efficiency and reduced cost.
  - Employers now can upload their QWR data to the KDOL Tax website in a formatted Excel spreadsheet, improving service provided to employers’ and eliminating data entry and paper handling which significantly enhances productivity and efficiency within the Agency.
  - KDOL also implemented a process on the Tax website that provides Employers the ability to enter their QWR data directly into a grid on the website, again saving time and reducing the need for paper handling. One of the successes that resulted from these enhancements was realized last quarter when ADP, a large third-party administrator for Employers, was able to upload several thousand employer quarterly reports without error for the first time ever.
- KDOL has revised processes to eliminate the production of additional paper copies of forms that were being scanned and then shredded by the Imaging Unit. The new process uses Planet Press to convert the forms to .PDF documents and place them in a queue for the Imaging Unit to access. Based on volume of reports generated, the savings range between \$1.4 and \$4.9 million annually.

KDOL is now assessing the future of the UIM project. Currently KDOL administration is reevaluating the technology infrastructure for UI Benefits, doing strategic planning to align with current agency budget constraints, and looking at ways to stabilize the agency’s mainframe environment. This reevaluation process will help determine the future direction of the UIM project.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 78%, with nine (9) deliverables outstanding at quarter end based on the 6/22/09 approved plan. The project Actual versus Planned Resources reflect a deficiency gap of greater than 25% based on the 6/22/09 approved project plan. Information outlined in the January/February/March 2011 Quarterly Report indicated the project would be recast. Issues outlined in the April/May/June 2011 Quarterly Report confirmed that the project will not return to its original plan. An assessment was performed in the first quarter 2011 which altered project goals. The project is now focused on resolving defects to current functions and implementing enhancements from prior releases. KDOL is currently assessing on how best to move or not to move forward with the project. The project will reflect the above Alert status for the quarter. A recovery plan or full biweekly reporting (every two weeks) will not be required, however a status report must be submitted to the Enterprise Project Management Office every two weeks until a resolution is reached for the project.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

**UIM Build and Deploy (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	4/09	Estimated End:	6/09

Adjusted Estimated End: 8/09

**Subproject I – Infrastructure Deployment - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>6/22/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,791,548</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,864,768</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$804,147</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$413,266</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,987,401</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,451,502</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>6/29/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>11/19/09</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>6/23/09</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>12/31/09</b>

**Subproject II – Prep for Primary Business Process Build and Deployments - COMPLETED**

<b>**CITO Approval:</b>	<b>11/12/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,039,994</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$144,637</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$900,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$895,357</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/1/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>2/18/10</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>2/26/10</b>

**Subproject III – Primary Business Process Build and Deployments**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>2/22/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$11,374,650</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$11,182,086</b>
<b>**Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$10,174,650</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$636,326</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,412,440</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$10,545,760</b>
<b>**Adjusted Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,112,440</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>10/11/11</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$8,962,210</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>1/28/11</b>
<b>**Adjusted External Cost:</b>	<b>\$8,062,210</b>		
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/1/10</b>		
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>2/22/10</b>		

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**UIM Build and Deploy (Continued)**

**Subproject IV – Secondary Business Process Build and Deployments**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>11/9/10</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,851,910</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,791,548</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$255,184</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$804,147</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,596,726</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,987,401</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>10/11/11</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/1/10</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>10/28/11</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/9/10</b>		

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0	Estimated End:	10/11
Estimated Start:	10/11		

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Revenue, Department of (KDOR)**



+

**DMV Modernization Project**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 6/21/07  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 8/13/09  
 Project Cost: \$40,326,159 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$1,999,832

Execution Project Cost:	\$37,454,058	Execution Cost to Date:	\$16,851,790
Internal Cost:	\$6,841,722	Internal Cost to Date:	\$2,085,602
External Cost:	\$30,612,336	External Cost to Date:	\$14,766,188
Execution Start:	8/17/09	Execution End:	6/29/12
		Adjusted Execution End:	9/14/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

Division of Vehicles Modernization Fund	98%
Vehicle Operating Fund	1%
INK Grant	1%

Vendor

3M Company

The Division of Vehicles Modernization Project includes integration of three (3) separate systems into one (1) Vehicle system. Our current systems are separate, old mainframe emulation systems that are responsible for vehicle titling, registration, driver's licensing and inventory management for the entire state. These Vehicle Systems are the Kansas Department of Revenue's most critical public safety systems and must be available for law enforcement 24 hours a day, seven (7) days a week, and 365 days a year. The three (3) systems scheduled for replacement are the Vehicle Information Processing System (VIPS), the Kansas Driver's License System (KDLS) and the Kansas Vehicle Inventory System (KVIS). The Vehicle Information Processing System main functions are to process vehicle registration, title, and license plate and permit transactions as well as the collection of fees for all 2.7 million registered vehicles. The Vehicle Information Processing System is responsible for maintaining title and registration records for use by law enforcement and other motor vehicle agencies. The Division of Vehicles partners with all 105 County Treasurers to provide vehicle services to the citizens of Kansas. All County Treasurer offices use the Vehicle Information Processing Systems to process any vehicle transaction. The current Vehicle Information Processing System was implemented 12/87. Problems exist with the upload and download batch processes to the counties. The system lacks real time capabilities, which leads to delays of up to several days in receiving current registration information. Because of these delays, law enforcement agencies may be operating without correct information. The Kansas Driver's License System contains driving record information on all licensed drivers and allows for issuance of an initial driver's license or Kansas identification card according to Federal and State guidelines. The Kansas Driver's License System is a mainframe and FileNet application that provides a workflow process to maintain and update the driving record. Driving privileges such as restrictions, suspensions, revocations and reinstatements are processed within the Kansas Driver's License System. The Kansas Driver's License System serves all law enforcement officials, courts and other authorized entities. The Kansas Vehicle Inventory System is a mainframe application that automates the ordering and tracking of raw materials, plates, decals, 30-day permits, and placards for the State of Kansas. The Kansas Vehicle Inventory System provides for the tracking of inventory from purchase order to issuance of tags and decals. Orders for tags and decals are placed on the Kansas Vehicle Inventory System. Center Industries Corp. in Wichita, Kansas produces work orders from the Kansas Vehicle Inventory System information, and submits invoices to the state after shipment of tags and decals to the counties. Counties receipt tags and decals through an automated program, and the Kansas Vehicle Inventory System is updated nightly with county receipts and issues, to maintain accurate inventory on-hand counts. The Kansas Vehicle Inventory System has functionality for notifying users automatically, when a county is low on inventory. Reports generated by the Kansas Vehicle Inventory System ensure purchases are within the annual budget, whether purchases are complete or pending, and whether payments have been completed.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Meeting targeted goals.                      | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.                    | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER.      | Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project              | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).           |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**DMV Modernization Project (Continued)**

**For the reporting period:** During the months of April, May and June 2011 the project team continued to work on the detailed design, build and test of Phase One (1) MOVRS (the title and registration component), ATMM (the financial component) and Phase Two (2) DRIVS (the Driver's License and Identification Card Component) and associated interfaces and reports. As a result, use cases were updated and technical turnovers were completed. Work on data conversion, mapping and cleansing for Phase One (1) (MOVRS) is complete but continues for Phase Two (2) (DRIVS). Equipment (PC's, Scanners, and Printers) needed for the new MVS System has been delivered to all county treasurer locations. Drivers' License Office infrastructure is still in the process of being upgraded across the state. User Acceptance Testing continues for MOVRS (the title and registration component) and for DRIVS (the Driver's License and Identification Card Component). Training has been completed for Phase One (1) MOVRS & ATMM. Planning activities for Phase Two (2) DRIVS training have begun. The Phase Two (2) DRIVS implementation date was changed to 3/15/12 to ensure a successful implementation.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,115,418		
Internal Cost:	\$201,619		
External Cost:	\$913,799		
Estimated Start:	8/06	Estimated End:	8/09
		Adjusted Estimated End:	9/09

**Subproject 1 – Titles & Registration, Plates/Decals, Inventory**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>8/13/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$23,766,690</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$12,853,468</b>
Internal Cost:	\$2,926,861	Internal Cost to Date:	\$1,422,780
External Cost:	\$20,839,829	External Cost to Date:	\$11,430,688
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>8/17/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>4/4/12</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>5/30/12</b>


**Subproject II – Drivers License & Identification, Driver Control and Review**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>11/19/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$13,687,368</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$3,998,322</b>
Internal Cost:	\$3,914,861	Internal Cost to Date:	\$662,822
External Cost:	\$9,772,507	External Cost to Date:	\$3,335,500
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/1/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>6/29/12</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/20/09</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/14/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,756,683		
Internal Cost:	\$8,551		
External Cost:	\$1,748,132		
Estimated Start:	7/12	Estimated End:	7/12
Adjusted Estimated Start:	9/12	Adjusted Estimated End:	9/12

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Revenue, Department of (KDOR) (Continued)**



**PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement III**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 9/12/06  
 CITO Recast Plan Approval 11/5/09  
 Project Cost: \$456,392 (Planning, execution and close out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$1,262,386

Execution Project Cost:	\$456,055	Execution Cost to Date:	\$389,494
Internal Cost:	\$78,352	Internal Cost to Date:	\$202,556
External Cost:	\$377,703	External Cost to Date:	\$186,938
Execution Start:	10/1/09	Execution End:	8/11/11
Adjusted Execution Start:	9/8/09		

Funding Source for Project Cost

State General Fund 19%  
 VIPS/CAMA Fund 81%

Vendor

Tyler Technologies, Inc.

This initiative provided Kansas county appraisers with an improved, computer-assisted mass appraisal (CAMA) system. CAMA is a mass appraisal tool the appraisers use to appraise and assess all real property in the jurisdiction each 1/01. The appraisals are used for property tax purposes. The State purchased a new CAMA system for each county that features: improved analytical tools for determining estimates of fair market value; a relational database which will facilitate the interface with other assessment functions (e.g. GIS); A-tier and browser based technologies, HTML/DHTML, XML, .NET Web Services, thin client approach, COM+ Objects, C++, Visual Basic, C#, SLQ Server and ActiveX Data Objects; scalability and fault tolerance.

**Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)**

PVD CAMA I \$3,839,235  
 PVD CAMA II \$4,766,431  
 PVD CAMA III \$4,766,431

**Actual expenditures (not cumulative)**

\$3,665,554  
 \$4,310,039  
 See above Execution Cost to Date

**Project Gains**

PVD CAMA I – Completed requirements, software design, development, implementation of ten (10) beta counties, purchased all hardware for the project, conducted gap analysis and performed system modifications, created system documentation and conducted training.

PVD CAMA II – Converted and implemented 65 counties to the new system.

PVD CAMA III – Convert and implement the remaining 30 counties, extend the test mode for 25 counties one appraisal cycle so they can better understand the functionality and results of the new system.

**For the reporting period:** Subproject VII is currently 81% complete. Three (3) counties moved forward in the schedule this quarter. Barber County asked for an earlier legacy data pull and then implementation date of 6/17/11 instead of 8/05/11. Decatur requested an earlier legacy data pull and then implementation date of 4/29/11 instead of 8/05/11. Leavenworth County legacy data was pulled and then implemented 5/20/11 instead of 7/22/11. Gove County requested a later pull and implementation date of 7/8/11 instead of 6/24/11 which the conversion team is able to accommodate. On the schedule for 2011, the final year of the project, there are 14 counties remaining to go live with Orion.

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

Project Stopped/Canceled.

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project

**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

Project on hold.

Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement III (Continued)**

**Subproject VII**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>11/5/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$456,055</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$389,494</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$78,352</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$202,556</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$377,703</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$186,938</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>10/1/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/11/11</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/8/09</b>		

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$337		
Internal Cost:	\$337		
Estimated Start:	8/11	Estimated End:	8/11

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Secretary of State of Kansas

Statewide Voter Registration and Election Management System (ELVIS) Primary and Secondary Datacenter Hardware Replacement

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 3/29/11  
 Project Cost: \$522,449 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$38,742




Execution Project Cost: \$522,449  
 Adjusted Execution Project Cost: \$404,879 Execution Cost to Date: \$17,427  
 Internal Cost: \$0 Internal Cost to Date: \$0  
 External Cost: \$522,449 External Cost to Date: \$17,427  
 Adjusted Execution Project Cost: \$404,879  
 Execution Start: 4/13/11 Execution End: 7/29/11  
 \*Adjusted Execution End: 9/30/11

<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>	<u>Vendor</u>
HAVA Federal Fund 100%	Election Systems & Software (ES&S)

The statewide voter registration and election management system (ELVIS) hardware is at the end of its lifecycle and needs to be replaced with new equipment in both the primary and secondary datacenters. This is a planned upgrade and will be 100% funded with Federal dollars. KSOS has a contract with ES&S (Election Systems and Software), the vendor for the ELVIS system, for support and maintenance of the ELVIS system. ES&S will provide the equipment and installation services for the replacement. This project is in support of the Secretary of State's statutory duties related to the administration of statewide elections. It aligns with the state Strategic Information Management (SIM) plan goals by upgrading the statewide voter registration and election management system (ELVIS) hardware to the most current technology available ensuring that voter registration and election management activities can continue in an efficient manner.

**For the reporting period:** Datacenter power upgrades, primary site equipment replacement, and user acceptance testing were completed on schedule. The secondary site is on schedule for replacement in 7/11. The estimated budget decreased due to sourcing the equipment through another vendor and solidifying licensing requirements.

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Statewide Voter Registration and Election Management System (ELVIS) Primary and Secondary Datacenter Hardware Replacement (Continued)**

**Active-New**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	3/11	Estimated End:	4/11

**Deployment**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>3/29/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$522,449</b>		
<b>Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$404,879</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$17,427</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$522,449</b>		
<b>Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$404,879</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$17,427</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>4/13/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>7/29/11</b>
		<b>*Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/30/11</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	8/11	Estimated End:	8/11
<i>*Adjusted Estimated Start:</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>*Adjusted Estimated End:</i>	<i>10/11</i>

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)**




**Customer and Provider Portal (CAPP)**

<b>A</b> +	CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	4/5/10	
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	10/18/10	
	Project Cost:	\$7,328,782	(Planning, execution and close-out)
	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$825,000	
	Execution Project Cost:	\$4,355,356	Execution Cost to Date: \$1,802,297
	Internal Cost:	\$606,251	Internal Cost to Date: \$431,607
	External Cost:	\$3,749,105	External Cost to Date: \$1,370,690
	Execution Start:	10/18/10	Execution End: 9/26/11
			Adjusted Execution End: 1/12/12
	<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>
	State General Fund	1%	Oracle America, Inc. and
	Federal Funds:	99%	Oxford International, Inc.
	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Supplemental Refugee Assistance		
	Child Care Development Funds (CCFB)/ American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)		

The Customer and Provider Portal (CAPP) project is a Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) initiative. With the goal of being customer-centered and enhancing workforce efficiency, the CAPP project was initiated to create a web portal for both customers and providers. The CAPP project includes two (2) essential components: a Customer Portal and a Provider Management System that includes a Provider Portal and a professional development registry. The Customer Portal will allow a customer to enter information to do high level screening and/or apply for benefits in the following programs: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Food Assistance, Refugee Assistance, and/or Child Care. The system will automatically register customers and pass customer entered information into agency legacy systems through automated or manual processes based on applied business rules. The Provider Portal component of the Provider Management System will provide a point of access for Child Care providers to apply on line with SRS and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE). SRS works with three (3) main types of providers: in-home, relative, and KDHE regulated. KDHE provides licensing and registration, while SRS handles the enrollment process for caring for a child receiving assistance. The portal will allow providers to enter information and pass provider related information into both agencies' legacy systems through automated or manual processes based on applied business rules.

**For the reporting period:** Submitting bi-weekly reports as required. Final Design Documents for Provider Integration are being reviewed by CAPP Deliverable Review team for signoff. Integration milestones are being completed for integration with the KDHE Child Care Licensing and Registration Information System (CLARIS) system and CAPP with all issues being resolved in a timely manner. SRS Legacy Integration vendor milestones are late and pose a potential impact to the project schedule. Project leads are working with

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Customer and Provider Portal (CAPP) (Continued)**

**For the reporting period: (Continued)** the vendor to bring these tasks back in line with the project schedule. Overall impact to the project schedule, if any, will be determined and reported in subsequent bi-weekly reports. Change Orders for GAP analysis have been approved and those additional project costs and schedule impacts were reflected in the 6/24/11 bi-weekly report. Change orders are still in process for the Legacy Authentication and project schedule slippage. Once approved by the Project Team they will be included in all future reports and copies of the change orders will be submitted.

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to an increase in the critical path from 9/26/11 to 1/12/12 resulting in a 25% extension to the project schedule based on the 10/18/10 approved plan. The project is in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 50%, with three (3) deliverables outstanding at quarter end based on the 10/18/10 approved plan. The project’s Actual versus Planned Resources reflect a deficiency gap of 25% or greater based on the 10/18/10 approved plan. Issues outlined in the January/February/March 2011 Quarterly Report indicated the project would be unable to return to the original schedule. It was reported in the recovery plan that the delay resulted from:

- a. Resource constraints from overlapping projects and staff replacement for retirement
- b. Integration issues needing to be addressed for the Customer Portal to the legacy system.
- c. Integration issues needing to be addressed for the Provider Portal to KDHE CLARIS system
- d. Rejection of deliverable products not meeting the project team’s expectations.

It was determined that the project schedule would require an extension to address the issues stated above and that the deliverables would also be revised to complete by 9/11. Information provided in the April/May/June 2011 Quarterly Report indicated that the integrated deliverables are being completed with KDHE CLARIS in a timely manner. However, SRS Legacy Integration Vendor milestones are late and could potentially impact the schedule. Project leads are working with the vendor to bring these deliverables back in line. Change orders have been approved for the GAP analysis which required splitting the schedule into two (2) tracks – one (1) for the Customer Portal and one (1) for the Provider Portal. As a result, it is estimated that additional internal resources will be required impacting costs by approximately \$255,000. Based on the information provided, the project will reflect the above Alert status for the quarter. We recognize SRS will be unable to return to the approved plan. As a result, a recovery plan will not be required at this time. However, biweekly reporting (every two weeks) will need to be provided to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) beginning immediately after the quarter.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$2,968,466
Internal Cost:	\$260,112
External Cost:	\$2,708,354
Estimated Start:	11/09

Estimated End: 10/10

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.   |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.   |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER.                             |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received                                 |  Reporting insufficient.  |
|  <i>Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Customer and Provider Portal (CAPP) (Continued)**

**Active-Alert**

**CAPP Execution**

**CITO Approval:** 10/18/10  
**Execution Cost:** \$4,355,356  
**Internal Cost:** \$606,251  
**External Cost:** \$3,749,105  
**Execution Start:** 10/18/10


**Execution Cost to Date:** \$1,802,297  
**Internal Cost to Date:** \$431,607  
**External Cost to Date:** \$1,370,690  
**Execution End:** 9/26/11  
**Adjusted Execution End:** 1/12/12

**Close-Out**


**Estimated Project Cost:** \$4,960  
**Internal Cost:** \$4,960  
**Estimated Start:** 9/11  
**Adjusted Estimated Start:** 12/11

**Estimated End:** 10/11  
**Adjusted Estimated End:** 1/12

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology







**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)**

<b>A</b>	<b>Community Supports and Services (CSS) Automation</b>			
	CITO High-Level Approval:	3/18/10		
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/23/10		
<b>+</b>	Project Cost:	\$395,700	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$98,400		
	Execution Project Cost:	\$325,513	Execution Cost to Date:	\$278,680
	Internal Cost:	\$69,760	Internal Cost to Date:	\$42,280
	External Cost:	\$255,753	External Cost to Date:	\$236,400
	Execution Start:	9/1/10	Execution End:	8/17/11
			Adjusted Execution End:	9/19/11
	<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
	State General Fund	37%	Information Resource Group (IRG), Inc.	
	Federal System Transformation Grant	63%		

The Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) is adding a quality assurance survey and reporting software solution to an existing SRS Active Service Page (ASP).net system that serves the Community Supports and Services (CSS) area within the Division of Behavioral Health Services (DBHS). The development, implementation and continued support of this data base system will be a strong step toward providing data that will enable DBHS/CSS to make "evidence based" decisions with both service delivery partners, business partners and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). With the completion of this project, CSS will integrate multiple databases for Home and Community-Bases Services (HCBS) waivers and automate several manual systems that are inefficient and ineffective. The new system will also provide dynamic reporting capabilities. SRS obtained a Systems Transformation Grant which is 100% federally funded. The system must be implemented and paid for prior to 9/30/11. The need for an automated system was identified in 1/01. This opportunity will fulfill the SRS strategic direction to seek integrated technology, increasing the efficiency of its employees. 21,000 Kansas consumers are affected and approximately \$600 million worth of waived services are purchased annually. SRS expects significant loss of skilled and experienced staff, so the remaining staff will need the support this automated system will provide. The Community Supports and Services is the program area within the Division of Behavioral Health Services which develops policy, manages, and funds a service system for more than 12,000 adults and children with significant disabilities. Persons served by CSS managed programs include individuals with: a developmental disability, severe physical disability, traumatic brain injury or children whose health needs require in-home health care supports.

**For the reporting period:** The project remains on schedule and within budget. The project team is working towards the completion of the GUI Development Module. Business is reviewing and validating the rules and beginning to test the application. Pilot and training for the users is being scheduled with implementation planned in 8/11.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

**Community Supports and Services (CSS) Automation (Continued)**

**Project Status:** The project is in Alert status due to a deliverable completion rate of 50%, with two (2) deliverables outstanding at quarter end based on the 8/23/11 approved plan. Information provided in the April/May/June 2011 quarterly report indicated that one (1) of the two (2) deliverables outstanding completed on 7/14/11. The other deliverable was expected to complete on 8/9/11. At that time the project is expected to recover. Given these circumstances, a recovery plan will not be required at this time. However, the project will reflect the above Alert status for the quarter and biweekly reporting (every two weeks) will need to be provided to the agency head, project sponsor and Executive CITO beginning immediately.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$65,307	Estimated End:	8/10
Internal Cost:	\$39,720	Adjusted Estimated End:	9/10
External Cost:	\$25,587		
Estimated Start:	1/10		

**Execution**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>8/23/10</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$278,680</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$325,513</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$42,280</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$69,760</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$236,400</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$255,753</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/17/11</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/1/10</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/19/11</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$4,880	Estimated End:	9/11
Internal Cost:	\$4,880	Adjusted Estimated End:	10/11
Estimated Start:	8/11		
Adjusted Estimated Start:	9/11		

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  **▽** Project on hold.
-  **⊕** Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  **⊘** Reporting insufficient.
-  **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)**



+

**Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Quality Control (QC) Enterprise Customer/Content Management (ECCM)**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 6/22/10  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 1/6/11  
 Project Cost: \$990,472 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$75,000

Execution Project Cost:	\$685,780	Execution Cost to Date:	\$592,883
Internal Cost:	\$112,700	Internal Cost to Date:	\$91,064
External Cost:	\$573,080	External Cost to Date:	\$501,819
Execution Start:	1/19/11	Execution End:	9/7/11

Funding Source for Project Cost

Vendor

State General Fund 19%  
 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program,  
 Department of Defense Appropriations Act  
 2010 81%

EMC

This effort will provide the ability to scan, store and retrieve customer related documents electronically for the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services' (SRS) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Quality Control (QC) Unit. This project will meet Federal guidelines for states to handle Food Assistance Reviews through electronic means versus paper documents and provide staff efficiencies through a more automated and electronic business process. This will continue to move the Agency forward with the use of automation for content management and to enhance a paperless work environment. The current SNAP QC review process is based entirely on manual and paper intensive processes. When a SNAP QC review is performed, a wide variety of paper copies of supporting documentation is created. A case review file essentially becomes a large collection of paper that must be stored and passed between locations mostly by mail or SRS staff physically delivering. This project will significantly reduce the costs associated with storage, paper, postage, extra staff time in collecting/mailing, and the risk of documents being lost or delayed in the mail.

**For the reporting period:** EMC documented solution design information and created the documentation for the Project Team to review. After review of the design documentation the development activities started and have been completed. The team is currently in the first week of User Acceptance Testing (UAT). Hardware and software needed for the project has been purchased and received. It is currently being prepared for delivery to each region.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Meeting targeted goals.                      | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.                    | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER.      | Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project              | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Quality Control (QC) Enterprise Customer/Content Management (ECCM) (Continued)**

**Active**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$299,785		
Internal Cost:	\$36,994		
External Cost:	\$262,791		
Estimated Start:	4/10	Estimated End:	1/11

**SNAP QC ECCM Execution**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>1/6/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$685,780</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$592,883</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$112,700</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$91,064</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$573,080</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$501,819</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>1/19/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>9/7/11</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$4,907		
Internal Cost:	\$4,907		
Estimated Start:	9/11	Estimated End:	9/11

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)**

**Communication System Interoperability Program**



I

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	5/10/05		
**CITO Approval:	10/26/05		
***CITO Approval:	4/3/06		
*****CITO Approval:	10/9/08		
*****CITO Approval:	6/22/09		
CITO Approval:	4/5/11		
Project Costs:	\$55,476,560	(Planning, execution and closeout)	
*****Project Costs:	\$44,135,294		
*****Project Costs:	\$54,186,870		
Project Costs:	\$53,453,574		
Project Costs:	\$51,920,334		
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$12,000,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$55,410,080		
Execution Project Cost:	\$55,476,560		
*****Execution Project Cost:	\$44,135,294		
*****Execution Project Cost:	\$54,186,870		
Execution Project Cost:	\$53,453,574		
Execution Project Cost:	\$51,920,334	Execution Cost to Date:	\$51,121,327
Internal Cost:	\$410,080		
Internal Cost:	\$476,560		
*****Internal Cost:	\$439,320		
*****Internal Cost:	\$605,520		
Internal Cost:	\$622,224		
Internal Cost:	\$588,984	Internal Cost to Date:	\$525,600
External Cost:	\$55,000,000		
*****External Cost:	\$43,695,974		
*****External Cost:	\$53,581,350		
External Cost:	\$52,831,350		
External Cost:	\$51,331,350	External Cost to Date:	\$50,595,727
Execution Start:	6/10/05	Execution End:	6/30/11
		Execution End:	6/29/12
		*****Execution End:	9/30/10
		*****Execution End:	6/29/12
		Execution End:	6/28/13
		Execution End:	6/29/12

Funding Source for Project Costs

State Highway Fund	23%
State General Fund	1%
Safety	38%
Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP)	11%
Public Safety Interoperable Comm. Grant (PSIC), American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 & Other	27%

Vendor

Subproject I & II - Motorola

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- Meeting targeted goals.
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology
- \* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*

**Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)**

The communication system interoperability program will assist the Kansas Department of Transportation employees, Kansas Highway Patrol troopers, and other public safety personnel to communicate with each other during critical events on disparate radio systems. The program is to be implemented throughout the state during the next six (6) years. The initial phase of this program will be a proof of concept sub-project to ensure the intended results provide the desired interoperable communications for the different public safety entities within the vicinity of the ten towers in District 4. Upon completion of District 4 and validating the proof of concept, it is the intention of the Kansas Department of Transportation to move forward with the installation in the remaining Kansas Department of Transportation districts as funds become available. \*\*In 10/05, the Kansas Department of Transportation modified the overall project plan and revised the detailed Subproject I plan to move equipment originally scheduled for implementation in a later subproject to Subproject I in an effort to improve the capabilities of the system. However, the modified overall project plan did not affect the overall execution project cost. \*\*\*In 4/06, the Kansas Department of Transportation modified the overall project plan and revised the detailed Subproject II plan to modify the installation approach to improve system interoperability after discussions by various state officials involved. A seventh (7<sup>th</sup>) Subproject was added to allow the Kansas Department of Transportation to maximize available funding to complete two (2) Kansas Department of Transportation districts over a three (3) year period. The revision will allow the Kansas Department of Transportation to address other customer interests. \*\*\*\*This adjusted execution cost will allow the Kansas Department of Transportation to increase installation of equipment at nine (9) tower sites to thirteen tower sites during the next fiscal year. This requires \$2,000,000 being shifted from Fiscal Year 09 equipment purchases to Fiscal Year 07 equipment purchases. No impact to the overall project cost, schedule or scope is expected with the advance construction of these sites. \*\*\*\*\*The agency reported an increase from \$15,800,000 to \$17,370,727 to Subproject I costs due to delayed invoices for this subproject. \*\*\*\*\*As has been reported from the beginning of this project, Subproject V through VII had to wait until funding became available. Funding has become available for these subprojects through a Public Safety Interoperable Communication (PSIC) grant. However, the amount of funding is not enough to achieve what was originally planned for these districts. The plans have been tailored to fit the available funding. The overall project plan has been modified as a result of the reduced scope to reflect the changed schedule and budget. The original Subprojects V, VI and VII have been retained and will reflect the plan for installing equipment in Districts Three (3), Six (6) and Two (2) respectively. \*\*\*\*\*Two (2) funding sources recently became available to complete the project. A Public Safety Interoperable Communication grant to allow completion of interoperability equipment in Districts Two (2) & Six (6) and a American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) grant will allow the Kansas Department of Transportation to install P25 functionality at specified sites in Districts Two (2), Three (3) and Six (6). Completion of these sites results in the modification to the overall project plan with the addition of Subproject VIII and IX. \*\*\*\*\*It was reported in January/February/March 2011 that SP IX would not be performed. While this is true, the work involved in District Six (6) will be incorporated in Subproject VIII. This additional work will be performed within the Subproject VIII schedule and budget.




**For the reporting period: Subproject VII** – During this quarterly period the State of Kansas has received the 800 MHz P25 equipment for the seven (7) sites. All seven (7) sites have been installed except one (1). Site optimization is completed at the six (6) tower sites and they are now fully operational. As reported last quarter the Morris County site is still waiting for federal agency approval of the National Environmental Protection Act compliance prior to equipment implementation beginning.

**Subproject VIII**– The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) has purchased 800 MHz P 25 communications equipment for seven (7) sites [three (3) sites in District Six (6) and four (4) sites in District three (3)] in western Kansas. In addition, the Federal Communication Commission license applications have been submitted and approved. The contractor has been hired and is schedule to complete electrical upgrades at all sites by 10/1/11. For the second set of seven (7) sites, KDOT is waiting for federal funding that is anticipated in 10/11 to purchase equipment and begin installation.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0	Estimated End:	6/05
Estimated Start:	12/04	Estimated End:	6/11
		Estimated End	4/11

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)**

**Subproject I – District 4 Proof of Concept Project - COMPLETED**

CITO Approval:	5/10/05		
CITO Approval:	10/26/05		
Execution Cost:	\$17,072,080		
Execution Cost:	\$17,077,680		
Execution Cost:	\$17,481,647		
Execution Cost:	\$17,432,167	*****Execution Cost to Date:	\$17,432,167
Internal Cost:	\$72,080		
Internal Cost:	\$77,680		
Internal Cost:	\$61,440	Internal Cost to Date:	\$61,440
External Cost:	\$17,000,000		
External Cost:	\$17,403,967		
External Cost:	\$17,370,727	*****External Cost to Date:	\$17,370,727
Execution Start:	6/10/05	Execution End:	6/30/06
		Adjusted Execution End:	7/21/06

**Subproject II – Phase II Group-A - COMPLETED**

CITO Approval:	4/3/06		
Execution Cost:	\$7,671,480		
****Execution Cost:	\$9,656,960	Execution Cost to Date:	\$9,656,960
Internal Cost:	\$66,480		
Internal Cost:	\$51,960	Internal Cost to Date:	\$51,960
External Cost:	\$7,605,000		
****External Cost:	\$9,605,000	External Cost to Date:	\$9,605,000
Execution Start:	2/1/06	Execution End:	6/29/07










**Subproject III – Phase II Group-B - COMPLETED**

CITO Approval:	7/10/07		
Execution Cost:	\$5,170,480	Execution Cost to Date:	\$5,170,480
Internal Cost:	\$66,480	Internal Cost to Date:	\$66,480
External Cost:	\$5,104,000	External Cost to Date:	\$5,104,000
Execution Start:	7/2/07	Execution End:	6/30/08
Adjusted Execution Start:	7/23/07		

**Subproject IV – Phase II Group-C - COMPLETED**

CITO Approval:	12/20/07		
Execution Cost:	\$5,357,480		
****Execution Cost:	\$3,310,000	Execution Cost to Date:	\$3,310,000
Internal Cost:	\$66,480		
Internal Cost:	\$60,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$60,000
External Cost:	\$5,291,000		
****External Cost:	\$3,250,000	External Cost to Date:	\$3,250,000
Execution Start:	7/1/08	Execution End:	6/30/09
Adjusted Execution Start:	1/2/08	Adjusted Execution End:	12/19/08

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)**

**Subproject V – (PSIC-District 3) - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>10/9/08</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$6,662,513</b>		
***** <b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,318,103</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$4,796,480</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$66,480</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$66,480</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$6,595,033</b>		
***** <b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,251,623</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$4,730,000</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>10/24/08</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>1/8/10</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/20/10</b>







**Subproject VI – (PSIC – Districts 2&6, ARRA – Districts 2, 3, 6) - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>6/22/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$6,566,480</b>		
***** <b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$4,003,104</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$7,600,440</b>
***** <b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$7,699,440</b>		
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$66,480</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$199,440</b>
***** <b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$199,440</b>		
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>6,500,000</b>		
***** <b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,936,624</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$7,401,000</b>
***** <b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$7,500,000</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>7/2/10</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>8/4/09</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/30/10</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>6/30/09</b>		

**Subproject VII – District 2 P25 Completion**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>10/28/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$6,566,480</b>		
***** <b>Adjusted Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,244,480</b>		
***** <b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,013,296</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,417,300</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,780,000</b>		
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$66,480</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$17,300</b>
***** <b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$13,296</b>		
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>		
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$6,500,000</b>		
***** <b>Adjusted External Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,178,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,400,000</b>
***** <b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>9/30/10</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,750,000</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>6/30/11</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/7/09</b>		
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/3/10</b>		

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- \*** Updated key information, occurring after this report period.
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Communication System Interoperability Program (Continued)**

**\*\*\*\*\*Subproject VIII – District 3 & 6 P25 Completion**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	4/5/11		
<b>*****Execution Cost:</b>	\$4,053,184		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	\$3,053,184		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	\$3,553,184	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	\$1,737,500
<b>*****Internal Cost:</b>	\$53,184	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	\$2,500
<b>*****External Cost:</b>	\$4,000,000		
<b>External Cost:</b>	\$3,000,000		
<b>External Cost:</b>	\$3,500,000	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	\$1,735,000
<b>Execution Start:</b>	7/1/11	<b>Execution End:</b>	6/29/12
<b>Execution Start:</b>	5/2/11		










**Subproject IX – District 6 P25 Completion - CLOSED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	Not Yet Requested		
<b>*****Execution Cost:</b>	\$2,533,240		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	\$2,033,240		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	\$0	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	\$0
<b>*****Internal Cost:</b>	\$33,240	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	\$0
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	\$0		
<b>*****External Cost:</b>	\$2,500,000		
<b>External Cost:</b>	\$2,000,000		
<b>External Cost:</b>	\$0	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	\$0
<b>Execution Start:</b>	7/5/12	<b>Execution End:</b>	6/28/13

**Close-Out**

<b>Estimated Project Cost:</b>	\$0		
<b>Estimated Start:</b>	12/10	<b>Estimated End:</b>	12/10
<b>Adjusted Estimated Start:</b>	7/12	<b>Adjusted Estimated End:</b>	10/12

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- \*** Updated key information, occurring after this report period.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

REGENTS

Regents, Kansas Board of (KBOR)



Kansas Statewide Postsecondary Electronic Transcript System



CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	11/18/10		
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	3/24/11		
Project Cost:	\$602,306	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$26,500		
Execution Project Cost:	\$553,143	Execution Cost to Date:	\$12,998
Internal Cost:	\$28,073	Internal Cost to Date:	\$2,276
External Cost:	\$525,070	External Cost to Date:	\$10,722
Execution Start:	4/11/11	Execution End:	6/7/13
**Adjusted Execution Start:	3/4/11		

Funding Source for Project Cost

Vendor

Fund Name	100%	Ducufide by Parchment
-----------	------	-----------------------

During the late 1980s and 1990s, several national organizations embarked upon a collaborative effort to examine the need for electronic transfer of student records. In 1996, a consulting firm was charged with developing standardized transaction sets for the exchange of student records. Today, there exist national organizations charged with continued development and enhancement of those standards to fit the needs of educators in the nation. Once standards were published, many schools and states began adopting those standards and transmitting electronic student records. However, most institutions in Kansas have yet to develop systems to transmit records electronically. In 6/06, the Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC), a 12-state statutorily created interstate compact, launched the eTranscript Initiative (ETI). Several years ago, the Kansas Council of Faculty Senate Presidents (COFSP) had learned about the MHEC initiative and asked the Kansas Board of Regents to help facilitate a Kansas postsecondary eTranscript initiative. Last year, the Kansas Board of Regents, in collaboration with Kansas Department of Education, submitted a grant proposal under the Student Longitudinal Data System American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (SLDS ARRA). Included in this proposal was the statewide implementation of postsecondary electronic student record exchange. The grant was awarded. With funding from another SLDS grant, the Kansas Department of Education is implementing electronic exchange of student records at the secondary level. This project will focus on implementing electronic exchange at the post secondary level. The proposed Postsecondary Electronic Student Record Exchange (Postsecondary eTranscript) initiative is endorsed by MHEC and fully supported by the Kansas Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (KACRAO), the Kansas Independent Colleges Association and Fund (KICA), and the Kansas International Educators (KIE). \*\*The project began discovery tasks such as distributing technical documentation, conducting discovery calls and creating an institutional project plan prior to beginning formal execution. Execution formally began on 3/4/11. No development work began until 4/13/11.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Kansas Statewide Postsecondary Electronic Transcript System (Continued)**

**For the reporting period:** The project is progressing well, milestones achieved and beta institutions are on schedule for deployment before the end of the early adopter phase. Five (5) beta institutions are implementing and we have begun the process of disseminating information to institutions interested in participating in the next phase. The project has experienced peaks and valleys associated with institutional resources and conflicting projects, but we believe the project is on task for completion in the time allocated.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$25,369		
Internal Cost:	\$14,315		
External Cost:	\$11,054		
Estimated Start:	7/08	Estimated End:	4/11

**Subproject I – Early Adopter Implementation**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>3/24/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$59,822</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$12,998</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$4,551</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,276</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$55,271</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$10,722</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>4/11/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>10/7/11</b>
<b>**Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>3/4/11</b>		

**Subproject II – Statewide Rollout**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$306,904</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$13,970</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$292,934</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>10/10/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>10/5/12</b>

**Subproject II – Late Adopter Implementation**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$186,417</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$9,552</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$176,865</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>10/8/12</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>6/7/13</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$23,794		
Internal Cost:	\$7,213		
External Cost:	\$16,581		
Estimated Start:	6/13	Estimated End:	11/13

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Kansas, University of (KU)

KU HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject I – Please see Active Section – page 73

KUMC HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject II – Please see Active Section – page 75













The following two (2) projects will be a collaborative effort between the University of Kansas (KU) and the University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC) to upgrade their current human resource (HR) system to PeopleSoft 9.1.

Collaboration Summary

Several benefits will be realized in this joint effort and include the following:

- Reduced Costs
  - One (1) production application instead of two (2)
  - One (1) production database to maintain and support instead of two (2)
  - One (1) set of hardware on which the application will reside instead of two (2)
  - Reduced costs for system administration of hardware
  - Only one (1) production application to upgrade in the future instead of two (2)
- Reduced Modification effort
  - Modification needed to meet state requirements (e.g. SHaRP/SMART interfaces) are made to one (1) system instead of two (2)
  - Modifications to meet joint business needs by both campuses require only one (1) code line to be developed and maintained
- Table set sharing can be utilized where feasible for both campuses
- Utilization of separate company identification, business units and set identifications will allow both campuses to operate autonomously within the system as needed.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                                      |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.                                    |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER.                      |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                                       |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received                          |  Reporting insufficient.  |
|  Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Kansas, University of (KU) (Continued)**



**KU HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject I**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 10/28/10  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 12/2/10  
 Project Cost: \$3,770,000  
 \*\*Project Cost: \$3,511,350  
 \*\*\*Project Cost: \$3,510,000  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$735,000

(Planning, execution and close-out)

Execution Project Cost:	\$3,230,000	Execution Cost to Date:	\$2,800,000
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$3,230,000	External Cost to Date:	\$2,800,000
Execution Start:	12/28/10	Execution End:	11/18/11
Adjusted Execution Start:	12/8/10	Adjusted Execution End:	11/1/11

Funding Source for Project Cost

KU General Use Fund 37%  
 KMC Student Fees 11%  
 KMC Research Overhead 52%

Vendor

Oracle Consulting

**KU Subproject 1** - The HR/Pay System (HRSA) is a complete management information framework. The foundation for this framework is the system that captures all of the personnel, benefits, payroll, job, position, funding, time and leave data and related transactions. PeopleSoft 9.1 has been selected as the application version. This project was established to upgrade from PeopleSoft HR/Pay 7.6 (KU) and Student Admin (SA) 8.0 Service Pack (SP1) (KUMC) to Human Capital Management (HCM) version 9.1 which is a web based environment. Justification:

1. HRSA, a critical system, is currently dependent on aging technology. This project will update the system to utilize new and improved technology.
2. The current system is not fully supported by Oracle. This project will deploy the application on Oracle supported versions.
3. Currently, security patches are no longer provided for the production versions. With the improved technology, this project will provide enhanced security.
4. In response to customer needs and expectations, this project will provide more customer self-service and improve productivity.
5. This project will improve and standardize Time and Leave management.
6. This project will utilize functionality of the new version of PeopleSoft to mitigate existing modifications when business process can fit application functionality.

\*\*Correspondence at the time of the last quarterly report indicated the KU portion of the planning costs would be approximately \$281,350. This reduced the original project costs for Subproject I. \*\*\*KU and KUMC later reallocated the planning costs between both projects. This further reduced the planning cost for Subproject I to \$280,000.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Meeting targeted goals.                      | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.                    | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER.      | Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project              | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).           |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KU HC/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Project (Continued)**

**For the reporting period:** The project is on schedule, with the successful installation of the database on-site at the Lawrence campus. The design of state interfaces is complete and interface development is underway. The team is preparing to conduct end-to-end payroll testing and system integration testing, to be completed in 8/11.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$540,000		
**Estimated Project Cost:	\$281,350		
***Estimated Project Cost:	\$280,000		
External Cost:	\$540,000		
**External Cost:	\$281,350		
***External Cost:	\$280,000		
Estimated Start:	5/10	Estimated End:	12/10

**Subproject I – KU Execution**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>12/2/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,230,000</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,800,000</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,230,000</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,800,000</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/28/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>11/18/11</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/8/10</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>11/1/11</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	10/12	Estimated End:	10/12
Adjusted Estimated Start:	11/11	Adjusted Estimated End:	11/11

**Kansas Medical Center, University of (KUMC)**

**KUMC HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject II – Please see Active Section – page 75**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Kansas Medical Center, University of (KUMC)**

**KUMC HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject II**



CITO High-Level Approval: 10/28/10  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 9/30/10  
 CITO Revised High Level Approval: 5/6/11  
 CITO Subproject II Approval: 5/17/11  
 \*\*Project Cost: \$6,041,596 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$315,000

Execution Project Cost:	\$5,781,596	Execution Cost to Date:	\$946,396
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$5,781,596	External Cost to Date:	\$946,396
Execution Start:	5/23/11	Execution End:	12/24/12
Adjusted Execution Start:	5/3/11	Adjusted Execution End:	12/21/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

KU General Use Fund 37%  
 KMC Student Fees 11%  
 KMC Research Overhead 52%

Vendor

Oracle Consulting

**Subproject II** - The HR/Pay System (HRSA) is a complete management information framework. The foundation for this framework is the system that captures all of the personnel, benefits, payroll, job, position, funding, time and leave data and related transactions. PeopleSoft 9.1 has been selected as the application version. This project was established to upgrade from PeopleSoft HR/Pay 7.6 (KU) and SA 8.0 SP1 (KUMC) to HCM version 9.1 which is a web based environment.

**Justification:**

1. HRSA, a critical system, is currently dependent on aging technology. This project will update the system to utilize new and improved technology.
2. The current system is not fully supported by Oracle. This project will deploy the application on Oracle supported versions.
3. Currently, security patches are no longer provided for the production versions. With the improved technology, this project will provide enhanced security.

\*\*KU and KUMC reallocated the planning costs between both projects. The KUMC portion of the planning costs is \$260,000.

**For the Reporting Period:** The project is on schedule and on estimate. The system set up, test plan creation and Lab activities have moved more quickly and with less difficulty than planned.

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Meeting targeted goals.                 | Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.               | Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER. | Project on hold.   |
| Infrastructure Project                  | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| Project completed and PIER received     | Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**KUMC HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject II (Continued)**

Planning - **COMPLETED**

**Estimated Project Cost:	\$260,000		
**External Cost:	\$260,000		
Estimated Start:	5/10	Estimated End:	12/10

**Subproject II – KUMC Execution**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/17/11</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$5,781,596</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$946,396</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$5,781,596</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$946,396</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>5/23/11</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/24/12</b>
<b>Adjusted Execution Start:</b>	<b>5/3/10</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>12/21/12</b>

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	12/12	Estimated End:	12/12

**Kansas, University of (KU)**

[KU HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject I](#) – Please see Active Section – page 73

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Kansas Medical Center, University of (KUMC) (Continued)**



I +

**Clinical Research Center (CRC)**

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 11/4/10  
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 12/2/10  
 Project Cost: \$1,903,907 (Planning, execution and close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$24,000

Execution Project Cost:	\$1,903,907	Execution Cost to Date:	\$106,307
Internal Cost:	\$33,600	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,870,307	External Cost to Date:	\$106,307
Execution Start:	12/17/10	Execution End:	2/29/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

Johnson County Educational Triangle  
 Research Fund 100%

Vendor

AT&T

A building (4350 Shawnee Mission Parkway) is being remodeled to accommodate the Clinical Trials Department and other research organizations. This building is three and one half (3.5) miles from the KUMC Campus. The planned residents require access to high speed video, voice and data to support radiology imaging, electronic medical records and pharmacology systems. This is an infrastructure project and there are no cost savings as this is new service. AT&T will install seven (7) miles (three and one half (3.5) miles each way) of redundant fiber optic cable (48 strands of single mode). KUMC staff will be extending the University's 10 Gigabit Ethernet network to the building, providing 10/100 (1000 as needed) switched data access to offices and labs and also will be providing Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) as the voice communication medium. All wiring will be CAT6 and conform to international wiring standards. Telecom closets will be dedicated and secured. The building will also be outfitted with 802.11 wireless technology and wireless VoIP technology to enable mobility. The wireless access points will use the latest Cisco wireless (802.11b and 802.11g). The access points are managed through Cisco's wireless management server (WLSE) which uses industry standard management protocols. Authentication is performed through a secure Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) server. The network infrastructure switches will exhibit a design that maintains high availability, performance and reliability for the end user.

**For the reporting period:** The easement and right of way activities are complete. Franchise agreements with municipalities are in progress. Installation of the fiber is on schedule. The overall timeline of the building construction appears to be moving. This may shift our timeline since we are dependent on building access in order to meet our deliverables. No specific details about projected dates have been provided to us, at this time.

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Meeting targeted goals.                      | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
| Project Stopped/Canceled.                    | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
| Project completed and waiting for PIER.      | Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project              | Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).           |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received | Reporting insufficient.   |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Clinical Research Center (CRC) (Continued)**

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	10/10	Estimated End:	12/10









**Clinical Trials Building**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>12/2/10</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,903,907</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$106,307</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$33,600</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,870,307</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$106,307</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>12/17/10</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>2/29/12</b>

**Close-Out**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	3/12	Estimated End:	3/12

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**LEGISLATIVE BRANCH**

**Legislative**

**K-LISS Architecture**



I +

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	5/31/05		
Project Costs:	\$825,315		
Project Costs:	\$3,193,175		
***Project Costs:	\$13,512,683	(Planning, execution and closeout)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$1,650,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$818,365		
Execution Project Cost:	\$3,186,225		
Execution Project Cost:	\$13,505,733	Execution Cost to Date:	\$10,863,224
Internal Cost:	\$161,940		
Internal Cost:	\$612,990		
Internal Cost:	\$3,108,478	Internal Cost to Date:	\$2,856,806
External Cost:	\$656,415		
External Cost:	\$2,573,235		
External Cost:	\$10,397,255	External Cost to Date:	\$8,006,418
Execution Start:	6/6/05	Execution End:	12/12/06
Execution Start:	5/15/07	Execution End:	12/31/08
Execution Start:	1/5/09	Execution End:	5/27/11
Execution Start:	9/4/09	Adjusted Execution End:	8/31/11

Funding Source for Project Cost

State General Fund 100%

Vendor

Propylon

This project involves architecture and design specifications for replacing existing lawmaking (bill drafts and amendments, bill status to include history, statutes including statute index, and session laws), chamber automation (calendars, journals, and voting), and decision support systems (meeting minutes, Legislative Research reports, fiscal/supp notes, Post Audit reports, and related documents). These are priority systems and must become integrated in order to deliver the level of expected services. In addition, the present lawmaking system is antiquated and has limited support creating a high risk of failure situation.

**For the reporting period:** Subproject V – Kansas Legislative Information Systems and Services (KLISS) was successfully implemented on 1/10/11 for the 2011 Kansas Legislative Session. By the end of the session on 5/13/11, KLISS has successfully processed 659 bills (118 became law), 138 resolutions, 133 chamber journals, and 132 chamber calendars for the 2011 Kansas Legislative Session. Post session work is now in progress to complete permanent journals, final calendars, and publish statutes. With the successful completion of the 2011 session, the vendor was paid the \$668,000 session support payment on 5/24/11. The Decision Support Base System was scheduled to be accepted on 12/31/10, but the parts of the Decision Support system are not complete. Delivery and acceptance of the complete system is expected at the end of the project. The Budget Analysis system is in production in Kansas Legislative Research Department (KLRD). Supplemental notes, Fiscal notes, Conference Committee Report Briefs, and Committee minutes were available on the Legislative Interface during session. The conference Committee Report Brief system was accepted on 6/30/11 and the vendor was paid \$100,000. A partial acceptance of Decision Support was completed on 6/30/11 and the

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- Infrastructure Project
- Project completed and PIER received
- Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**K-LISS Architecture (Continued)**

**For the reporting period: (Continued)** vendor was paid \$384,000 of the total \$768,000 deliverable payment. Since the Decision Support Base System was not delivered on 12/31/10, as of 6/30/11 this deliverable is now six (6) months overdue. The KLISS build project scheduled completion date is 7/31/11. Due to the Decision Support remaining items that are not complete, the vendor contract extension clause may be invoked to extend the project an additional 30 days. **Subproject VI** – The integration of the International Roll Call (IRC) vote system with KLISS is severely delayed. The Chamber staff has been transferring data manually between the systems. This is inconvenient but does not impact the work of the legislative session. Payment to IRC has been held up pending completion of the integration work. The final application development tasks for the Chamber and Decision Support modules will complete in 7/11. Once these are in, the infrastructure team can complete the final performance tests and close the project. The Chamber modules have three (3) outstanding tasks, and work on Decision Support is moving quickly. If the work does not complete by 7/31/11 the Propylon contract contains a clause that allows a short extension to finish outstanding tasks. The project is currently 9.3% late on all scheduled tasks and 9.4% late in the Execution phase. The late tasks relate to testing of the KLISS infrastructure against the performance criteria identified in the contract in the Chamber and Decision Support modules. The project is on budget. Project requirements associated with completed tasks have been met.

**Planning - COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$6,950		
Internal Cost:	\$2,050		
External Cost:	\$4,900		
Estimated Start:	4/05	Estimated End:	6/05

**Subproject I – Architecture and Design specifications - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/31/05</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$562,575</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$548,276</b>
Internal Cost:	\$104,950	Internal Cost to Date:	\$119,850
External Cost:	\$457,625	External Cost to Date:	\$428,426
Execution Start:	6/6/05	Execution End:	9/30/06
		Adjusted Execution End:	7/7/06

**Subproject II – Fit Analysis - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>8/8/06</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$217,490</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$96,000</b>
Internal Cost:	\$43,750	Internal Cost to Date:	\$40,500
External Cost:	\$173,740	External Cost to Date:	\$55,500
Execution Start:	8/11/06	Execution End:	12/12/06

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  **C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  **A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  **▽** Project on hold.
-  **⊕** Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  **⊘** Reporting insufficient.
-  **+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**K-LISS Architecture (Continued)**

**Subproject III – Integrated Systems XML Appropriations Functional Requirement - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>9/28/06</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$10,250</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$38,300</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$10,250</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$13,250</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$25,050</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/1/06</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>10/23/06</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>12/22/06</b>

**Subproject IV – Detail Design Specifications and Development Data Center - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>5/10/07</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,755,941</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,367,860</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$339,161</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$451,040</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$1,416,780</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,916,820</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/31/08</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>5/15/07</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>11/24/08</b>

**Subproject V – Software Construction**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>1/7/09</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$7,247,110</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$8,908,541</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$2,185,110</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,308,541</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$5,062,000</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$6,600,000</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>5/27/11</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>1/5/09</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>8/31/11</b>


**Subproject VI – Kansas Legislative Information Systems and Services Infrastructure**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>1/7/09</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$947,807</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,152,671</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$155,815</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$178,671</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$791,992</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$974,000</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>3/21/11</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>2/17/09</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>8/31/11</b>


**Subproject VII – Avamar Grid Backup and Disaster Recovery Solution - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>9/3/09</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$257,840</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$258,296</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$6,120</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$8,276</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$251,720</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$250,020</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>10/28/09</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/4/09</b>	<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>2/10/10</b>

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Legislative (Continued)**

**Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III**



**I** +

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	10/21/05		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	3/6/06		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	7/18/06		
CITO Approval:	10/17/06		
Project Cost:	\$380,600	Planning, Execution, Close-Out (East Wing)	
Project Cost:	\$393,735	Planning, Execution, Close-Out (East Wing),	
Project Cost:	\$829,516	Planning, Execution, Close-Out (East, & West Wing)	
Project Cost:	\$1,640,673	Planning, Execution, Close-out (East, West, & South Wing)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$915,267		
Execution Project Cost:	\$363,750	(East Wing Only)	
Execution Project Cost:	\$376,885	(East Wing Only)	
Execution Project Cost:	\$812,666	(East and West Wing Only)	
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,623,823	(East, West and South Wing Only)	
		Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,404,619
Internal Cost:	\$2,100		
Internal Cost:	\$21,050		
Internal Cost:	\$47,700	Internal Cost to Date:	\$64,500
External Cost:	\$361,650		
External Cost:	\$374,785		
External Cost:	\$791,616		
External Cost:	\$1,576,123	External Cost to Date:	\$1,340,119
Execution Start:	11/1/05	Execution End:	1/31/06
		Execution End:	7/1/06
		Execution End:	10/31/06
		Execution End:	12/15/06
Execution Start:	1/30/07	Execution End:	3/30/08
Execution Start:	9/18/09	Execution End:	1/6/10
***Execution Start:	9/8/09	***Execution End:	1/22/10
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
Capitol Restoration Funds	80%	DISC	
State General Fund	20%		

The Capital Restoration Project includes replacing interior switches and wiring for telephone, data, and duress alarm services. The project includes installing RJ-11 jacks for voice services, duress (panic) alarms and RJ-45 jacks for data services. The Division of Information Systems and Communications is responsible for installing the wiring and for providing switching technologies for data services. The project includes architecture design, installation, technical support, and access to public voice networks, KANS-A-N voice, KanWIN data network, Internet, and Network Control Center services. In addition, the project includes relocating riser cable and relocating floor wiring. Finally, the project involves installing copper riser splices and terminating copper. The project has been recast due to the increase of the project schedule by more than 30%. A recast by the agency or the Chief Information Technology Officer requires refileing

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III (Continued)**

of the project plan for the Chief Information Technology Officer review and approval. The Legislative Chief Information Technology Officer refiled the project plan and approved the delay after a briefing to the Joint Committee on Information Technology. \*\*Subproject I East Wing Execution Cost to Date reflects a credit of \$67,350 for Nortel Switches which were removed and replaced by Cisco Switches. Subproject II West Wing Execution Cost to Date reflects a credit of \$32,722 for Nortel Switches which were removed and replaced by Cisco Switches. \*\*\*The estimated execution start and end dates for Subproject III was incorrectly listed and have been updated.

<u>Estimated Overall Cost (cumulative)</u>	<u>Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)</u>
Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure I \$380,600 (east wing only)	\$18,350
Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure II \$380,600 (east wing only)	<u>\$1,000</u>
Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III \$393,735 (east wing only) \$829,516 (east and west wing only)	See above Execution Cost to Date

**Project Gains**

- Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure I
  - East Wing voice and data wiring completed.
  - Installation and configure 8600 Nortel distribution switches
  - Fiber wiring and move of second switch
- Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure II
  - Cross connect Landon State Office Building core switches
  - Fiber backbone
  - Interconnection to the fiber ring to allow full redundant backup to the Eisenhower switches for core switch services from Landon.
- Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III
  - Install wiring and termination for 40 East wing panic alarms
  - Install grounding posts for two 8600 switches and equipment in the telecommunication distribution switch rooms
  - Four power outlets in SW Vault telecom room

**For the Reporting Period:** The Statehouse Restoration Subproject IV – North Wing Voice and Data project will begin execution in the second quarter of 2012, likely May or June. We will file the project plan in 2/12.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$16,850		
Internal Cost:	\$16,850		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	10/1/05	Estimated End:	10/31/05

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III (Continued)**

**Subproject I –East Wing Voice and Data - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>10/21/05</b>		
<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>3/6/06</b>		
<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>7/18/06</b>		
<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>10/17/06</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$363,750</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$276,427**</b>
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$376,885</b>	<b>Internal Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$18,950</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$2,100</b>		
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$361,650</b>	<b>External Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$257,477</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$374,785</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>1/31/06</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>11/1/05</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>7/1/06</b>
		<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>10/31/06</b>
		<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/15/06</b>

**Subproject II – West Wing Voice and Data - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>8/10/07</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$435,781</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$544,894**</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$18,950</b>	<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$18,950</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$416,831</b>	<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$525,944</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>1/30/07</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>3/30/08</b>
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>2/8/08</b>

**Subproject III – South Wing Voice and Data - COMPLETED**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>9/4/09</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>\$811,157</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$583,298</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$26,650</b>	<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$26,600</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$784,507</b>	<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$556,698</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/18/09</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>1/6/10</b>
<b>***Execution Start:</b>	<b>9/8/09</b>	<b>***Execution End:</b>	<b>1/22/10</b>


**Subproject IV – North Wing Voice and Data**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>


**Subproject V – Visitor Center Voice and Data**

<b>CITO Approval:</b>	<b>Not Yet Requested</b>		
<b>Execution Cost:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>Execution Cost to Date:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>Internal Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>External Cost:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Execution Start:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>To Be Determined</b>

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project


**P** Project completed and PIER received

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

 Project on hold.

 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

 Reporting insufficient.

**+** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**COMPLETED PROJECTS SECTION**

Projects in this section have completed the Execution Phase and the quarterly project status reporting requirement. In accordance with ITEC Policy 2530 Project Management, agencies must maintain procedures for conducting lessons learned on IT projects during the formal closing of a project close-out process and prepare a Post Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER). Projects remain in the Completed Projects section until the CITO receives and accepts the PIER.

**TERMS**

CITO Council -	A management group consisting of the three (3) Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO) representing the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of Kansas state government.
Execution Start -	This is the start date on the current CITO approved detailed plan that “triggers” the beginning of the execution phase. The trigger date is an event (i.e. hardware/software purchase or installation, code development, etc.) identified by the agency. Execution start is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements.
Execution End -	This is the end date on the current CITO approved detailed plan. The execution end date is the benchmark for JCIT reporting requirements.
Project Cost -	Planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.
Adjusted -	Agency modified schedule and or cost by less than 10%.
PIER -	Post Implementation Evaluation Report. The PIER documents the history of a project and provides recommendations for other projects of similar size and scope.
PIER Final Project Cost:	Final Project Costs as reported in the PIER.

**Completed**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED

EXECUTIVE BRANCH



Administration, Department of (DofA)

Statewide Financial Management System Pre-Implementation Planning/Activities

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	9/7/07		
Project Cost:	\$1,656,818	(Planning, Execution and close-out)	
<b>PIER Final Project Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,858,874</b>		
Execution Start:	9/17/07	Execution End:	9/30/08
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>10/3/08</b>
		PIER Received:	5/19/11

+  
P

The scope of the project is to implement a commercial-off-the-shelf statewide financial management system that includes the following functionality: General Ledger (including Grant Accounting and Cost Allocation), Accounts Payable, Procurement, Asset Management, Reporting/Data Warehouse, and to evaluate several options for Budget Development Integration with a possibility of implementing functionality in this area based on what is available in the marketplace.

**For the reporting period:** Post Implementation and Evaluation Report received with final costs reported.

Completed



Administration, Department of (DofA)

Statewide Financial Management System

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	10/3/08		
Project Cost:	\$44,777,322		
***Project Cost:	\$42,918,448	(Planning, Execution and close-out)	
<b>**PIER Final Project Cost:</b>	<b>\$35,242,943</b>		
Execution Start:	10/13/08	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>7/7/10</b>
		PIER Received:	5/19/11

P

This project consists of all activities necessary to plan, design, develop, test and implement a statewide financial management system for the State of Kansas. The scope of the project is to deploy commercial off-the-shelf enterprise resource planning software that includes the following functionality: General Ledger (including Grant Accounting and Cost Allocation), Accounts Payable, Procurement, Asset Management and Reporting/Data Warehouse.

**For the reporting period:** Post Implementation and Evaluation Report received. \*\*There are two (2) deliverables yet to pay to the contractor. \*\*Fiscal Year End Support due 7/29/11 and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) Support due 11/30/11. \*\*\*Planning-Needs Assessment and Pre-Implementation costs removed from this project and shown above.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED (Continued)



**Health Policy Authority (KHPA)**

**KHPA Document Imaging Project**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 9/4/08

+ \*\*CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 10/9/08

Project Cost: \$419,378 (Planning, execution and close-out)

P **PIER Final Project Cost: \$419,378**

Execution Start: 9/8/08

Execution End: 7/31/09

\*\*Execution End: 1/8/10

**Adjusted Execution End: 12/28/09**

PIER Received: 6/3/11

Completed

Kansas Health Policy Authority is initiating a centralized uniform document management imaging system that meets the needs of the various departments within the agency. Upon the completion of this project the clearinghouse, workers compensation, presumptive disability, the finance and operations department, and the state employee health plan will all use imaging services from a single vendor. \*\*The Kansas Health Policy Authority extended the contract of their Healthwave Clearinghouse vendor, Maximus until 12/31/09. Maximus currently provides imaging services for the Kansas Health Policy Authority as part of their contract. In order to avoid duplication of imaging services it was elected to not implement imaging services with ImageNow, until the contract with Maximus expired.

**For the reporting period:** Post Implementation and Evaluation Report received with final costs reported.



**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)**

**Brocade Switch Upgrade**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 11/4/10

+ Project Cost: \$319,585 (Planning, execution and close-out)

**PIER Final Project Cost: \$319,585**

Execution Start: 11/18/10

Execution End: 6/30/11

**Adjusted Execution End: 3/30/11**

PIER Received: 6/3/11

The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) is replacing the aging switching infrastructure that is behind our storage area networks. The current switch is nearing the end of its expected life cycle. In addition to replacing the older technology, the new switching infrastructure will provide improved fault tolerance, increased speed and extended uptime capabilities over the current switch.

**For the reporting period:** Post Implementation and Evaluation Report received with final costs reported.

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

Project Stopped/Canceled.

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

**I** Infrastructure Project

**P** Project completed and PIER received

**C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).

**A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).

Project on hold.

Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED (Continued)

REGENTS

 **Kansas, University of (KU) - NEW**

**KU Exchange 2010 Upgrade Project**

I + P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	9/30/10		
	Project Cost:	\$986,807	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
	<b>PIER Final Report Cost:</b>	<b>\$986,807</b>		
	Execution Start:	10/8/10	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>5/24/11</b>
			PIER Received:	6/30/11

This project was established to replace the legacy University of Kansas e-mail, calendaring and message security and hygiene (antivirus/antispam) system. High-level objectives include:

1. Saving money on storage and infrastructure costs.
2. Phasing-out Public Folders.
3. Providing better compliance tools.
4. Fully utilizing the technology licensed in the Microsoft Campus Agreement

**For the reporting period:** Post Implementation and Evaluation Report received with final costs reported.

**Wichita State University (WSU)**

**Banner Enrollment Management Suite Implementation Project**









+ P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	4/15/10		
	Project Cost:	\$495,050	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
	<b>PIER Final Report Cost:</b>	<b>\$488,809</b>		
	Execution Start:	4/26/10	Execution End:	11/9/10
			<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>12/10/10</b>
			PIER Received:	6/9/11

The successful management of both prospective and existing student relationships is fundamental to the mission of Wichita State University (WSU). Competition for students amongst institutions of higher education continues to increase along with the demand for real-time data and information access to support the strategic enrollment management efforts of WSU. To better recruit and serve students, WSU plans to implement Sungard Higher Education Banner Enrollment Management Suite, a recruitment and admissions information system that will tightly integrate with WSU's existing Banner information system. Once integrated, this product will improve university enrollment management processes and provide better access to strategic decision support information assets.

**For the reporting period:** Post Implementation and Evaluation Report received with final costs reported.

Completed

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology   |

PROJECTS WITH PIERS OUTSTANDING

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

 Administration, Department of (DofA) - **NEW**

**KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade III**

I +

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	10/22/07		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	6/30/09		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	1/7/10		
**Project Cost:	\$0	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Execution Start:	12/16/09	Execution End:	4/8/11
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>6/30/11</b>
		PIER Received:	

Completed

The KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade project replaces existing Nortel switching technology with Cisco switching technology. The KanWIN Infrastructure project establishes a single vendor environment for data switching and routing. This simplifies network management and technician training which in turn reduces the time necessary to implement a data Move, Add or Change (MAC). The separation of network functions increases network reliability and promotes efficiency in government networked operations. The infrastructure upgrade also allows early adoption of enhanced services like multi-cast video and digital media. It is required for Unified Communications which is the logical replacement for current communications systems like Plexar, voicemail and Automatic Call Distribution (ACD) systems. \*\*All project costs occurred prior to recast.

**For the reporting period:** All major installations of CISCO switching devices have been completed and the new network is fully designed, configured and available to all customers. There are some individual instances where completion of the conversion process could not be completed for reasons beyond the control of the Divisions of Information Systems and Communications (DISC). All decommissioned Nortel network devices have been removed from the network. DISC will continue to monitor certain locations that must complete other efforts before they can be completely moved to the new CISCO network. That project has been completed.

 Attorney General's Office










**Case Management System II**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	12/29/08		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	11/19/09		
Project Cost:	\$237,400	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Execution Start:	11/25/09	Execution End:	8/12/10
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>9/10/10</b>
		PIER Received:	

This project will implement a Case Management System (CMS) that will displace a number of individual systems existing across the Office of Attorney General. The implementation will be enterprise wide and will be used by almost all staff members. It is the goal and objective of this project to implement a consolidated case management system. This phase will focus on Criminal, Medicaid, LOGIC, Concealed Carry and Victims Divisions.

**For the reporting period:** During the reporting period, the Conceal Carry division and Victim Services divisions were completed. This will be the last quarter report as the project is now completed.

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**PROJECTS WITH PIERS OUTSTANDING**



**Labor, Department of (KDOL)**

**Unemployment Insurance Modernization III**

+	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	10/27/05		
	CITO Recast Detailed Plan Approval:	8/23/07		
	CITO Recast Detailed Plan Approval:	3/27/08		
	Project Cost:	\$27,754,871		
	Execution Start:	3/17/08	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>8/14/09</b>
			PIER Received:	

The Kansas Department of Labor is committed to modernizing its current Unemployment Insurance System. **For the reporting period:** The Unemployment Insurance Modernization (UIM) project began this quarter in the hold status as approved on 12/9/08 and discussions continued with the delivery vendor toward resolving the previously identified issues. In 1/09, the economic downturn resulted in an UI claims workload that was nearly double the workload from the previous year. All work being done at the KDOL turned to a tactical nature to deal with the surging workloads. Discussions with the vendor continued and we came to an agreement on the work performed to amicably end our relationship in 2/09. Though work was halted on the UIM project, we continued to follow the vision and strategy of UIM. We are leveraging the work completed with IBM and continue to use Siebel at the core of our existing system and as the base of our new system. Our approach into the Build and Deployment of UIM is to decompose the end goal into small pieces (iterations). This will be comprised of smaller vendor engagements and temporary augmentation of our information technology staffing. Each iteration will end with deployed technology and supporting organizational change. This will bring more immediate benefits from components that are built. This will also enable the agency/us to be more agile in responding to the environmental factors of the economy. With this move, we are closing the UIM Project II. Timeline and Budget information will be submitted to the Chief Information Technology Officer. We do not expect to require any additional funding.

**Completed**



**Lottery, Kansas**

**Expanded Gaming Central System**

	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/20/09		
	Project Cost:	\$23,595	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
	Execution Start:	4/29/08	<b>Execution End:</b>	<b>12/14/09</b>
			PIER Received:	Incomplete

This project affects the Kansas Lottery and the managers of the state-owned casinos and the racetracks with electronic gaming machines. The project goals are to provide Lottery security staff with access to alerts and other information about, and provided by, the electronic gaming machines and to provide Lottery accounting staff with information needed for balancing totals. This project is mandated and required by Senate Bill 66, the Kansas Expanded Lottery Act.

**For the Reporting Period:** The Post Implementation and Evaluation Report has not been received and the project will be removed from the report.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

PROJECTS WITH PIERS OUTSTANDING

Revenue, Department of (KDOR) - **NEW**



+

**Drivers License Photo First Model Office**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	1/9/09		
Project Cost:	\$933,154	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Project Cost:	\$1,403,280		
Execution Start:	2/2/09	Execution End:	2/9/10
		Execution End:	1/25/11
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>6/15/11</b>
		PIER Received:	

Completed

**Sub-Project I – Phase 1:** Kansas’ current driver license issuance process uses a photo-last workflow where the applicant’s photo is captured at the end of the application process. One of the major objectives of the REAL ID Act is to increase security by capturing the applicant’s photo at the beginning of the process when an individual first initiates an application. The Kansas Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is proposing the development and implementation of a secure identification management “model office” based on industry best practices, a photo first workflow design, and REAL ID compliance. This model office will serve as “proof-of-concept” for future Division of Motor Vehicles offices for both Kansas and other states transitioning to a more secure identification management and will prove that, financially and operationally, many jurisdictions can quickly and efficiently transition their existing workflow to become REAL ID compliant. **Sub-Project II – Phase 2** - L-1 and KDOR will roll-out "model office" to five (5) additional Drivers’ License offices that include County Treasurer locations.

**For the reporting period:** The Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) technical staff activated the new T1 circuit in the Emporia Driver’s License Office that resolved the slow performance of processing applicants caused by insufficient bandwidth. The three (3) remaining deliverables 1) controlled production; 2.) final execution; and 3.) L-1’s final report was completed on 6/15/11. This concludes the execution phase of this project. At this time, the projected completion date for the closeout date is 7/19/11.



+

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)**

**Human Services Management (HSM) Road Map II**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	6/2/08		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	11/6/08		
Project Cost:	\$191,024	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Execution Start:	11/17/08	Execution End:	12/23/08
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>1/23/09</b>
		PIER Received:	

The Human Services Management Roadmap will serve as the strategic implementation plan for the Human Services Management project. The Human Services Management will be a business and technology project to produce outcome-based, client-centered, integrated delivery of services across needs-based and contribution-based programs.

**For the reporting period:** Social and Rehabilitation Services and Fox Systems, Inc. have successfully met all deliverables. The project is complete.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
- Project on hold.
- Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
- Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+

PROJECTS WITH PIERS OUTSTANDING

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)

**Workflow Conversion Project III**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/22/08		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	5/12/09		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	2/9/10		
Project Cost:	\$428,946	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Execution Start:	1/18/10	Execution End:	1/18/11
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>3/31/11</b>
		PIER Received:	

The current workflow software used by the Kansas Department of Transportation is technically obsolete and was no longer supported by the vendor as of 12/31/06. The project will include the replacement of 38 automated workflows and their associated forms to K2.NET and InfoPath 2007. Additionally, 207 Fill and Print forms will be converted from Formflow 99 to InfoPath 2007 and all administrative support programs will be converted.

**For the reporting period:** The project has been completed. The workflow enabled forms have been completed and implemented in production. We have experienced very few production problems with these workflows.

Completed

REGENTS

Emporia State University (ESU) - **NEW**












**Campus Wide Network Wiring Project II**

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	2/18/10		
CITO Recast Plan Approval:	12/16/10		
Project Cost:	\$28,826	(Planning, execution and closeout)	
Execution Start:	11/15/10	Execution End:	6/24/11
		<b>Adjusted Execution End:</b>	<b>6/30/11</b>

Emporia State University (ESU), replaced outdated Type I (token ring) wiring with modern Ethernet cables and connectors.

**For the reporting period:** The end of the quarter also marked the successful end of the project. All tasks in the Execution Phase are complete. PIER document are being created and will be forwarded at the appropriate time.

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

APPROVED PROJECTS SECTION

Approved Projects have received high-level CITO project plan approval as outlined in ITEC Policy 2400 r 1 - Project Approval. Projects are still in the planning phase and vendor selection. Projects are not yet benchmarked for JCIT reporting. Percentage variances outlined in JCIT policy do not apply.

The estimated project cost and timeframes remain as estimates until they begin the Execution Phase.

TERMS

- CITO Council - A management group consisting of the three (3) Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO) representing the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of Kansas state government.
Estimated Execution Start - This is the estimated start date on the current CITO approved high level plan that "triggers" the beginning of the execution phase.
Estimated Execution End - This is the estimated end date on the current CITO approved high level plan.
Estimated Project Cost - Estimated planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.
Estimated 3 Future Years of Operational Cost - Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.
Funding Source for Project Cost - This item calls for identification of financing by percentage of funding source.

Approved

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER received
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project on hold.
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
Reporting insufficient.
Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology
\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**EXECUTIVE BRANCH**

**Health and Environment, Department of (KDHE)**

**Kansas Women Infants and Children (KWIC) System Upgrade**









CITO High-Level Approval:	5/24/11		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$7,974,651	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$3,342,206		
Estimated Execution Start:	8/4/11	Estimated Execution End:	3/27/13

Funding Source for Project Cost

American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA)	
Act (ARRA)	79%
Federal Funds (WIC Program)	21%

The Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants & Children (WIC) is a federally funded program that provides nutrition education and counseling, related preventive health services, and negotiable checks for specific nutritious foods to pregnant women, breastfeeding women up to twelve (12) months following childbirth, non-breastfeeding women up to six (6) months following childbirth, infants, and children up to their fifth birthday. Negotiable checks are provided to clients who redeem them at approved participating grocers. The Local Health Clinics (115 Clinics) that handle WIC are located throughout the state. They use the KWIC system to provide services to the Kansas participants. Clinics range from permanent locations of health departments to church basements visited four (4) times a year. The KWIC System is composed of several applications that manage all aspects of the Kansas program, such as client certification, vendor enrollment, food package assignment and risk factors just to name a few. This new KWIC solution meets the goals of the "Kansas Strategic Information Management Plan 2008-2013" by implementing a web-based Management Information System (MIS) system with the ability to share data more readily. The KWIC upgrade will convert the current PowerBuilder system to a modern, web enabled .NET framework and architecture. The conversion will leverage the current design and functionality of the PowerBuilder application, while upgrading the technology behind the system. This upgrade will benefit not only Kansas, but New Hampshire (NH) and the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA); also referred to as the Three State Consortium (3SC). Electronic signature functionality will also be added to the system. The project approach involves a one-to-one transition of each of the screens/windows in the existing suite of applications from PowerBuilder to .NET. The user interface, specific screen design, business rule implementation, navigation, and inter-screen/inter-application functionality are all maintained. This is extremely significant as state and local users in the 3SC express a high degree of satisfaction and confidence in their current user experience.

**For the Reporting Period:** The High Level Project Plan was approved by the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) on 5/24/11. A contract was initiated with the vendor. *\*A detailed project plan was filed with the Enterprise Project Management Office on 7/5/11 and is pending review and approval.*

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Approved-New

[Return to Index](#)

**Health and Environment, Department of (KDHE) (Continued)**

**Laboratory Information Management System**

CITO High-Level Approval: 4/26/11  
 Estimated Project Cost: \$2,362,270 (Est. planning, execution and closeout)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$1,050,000  
 Estimated Execution Start: 8/30/11 Estimated Execution End: 10/9/13

Funding Source for Project Cost










State General Fund 3%  
 Public Health Preparedness 20%  
 Master Lease Program 73%  
 Special Project Funds 4%

In 5/03 the U.S. General Accounting Office report to Congressional Requestors titled "Information Technology Strategy could Strengthen Federal Agencies' Abilities to Respond to Public Health Emergencies," found weaknesses in the public health official's readiness to respond to acts of bioterrorism due to vulnerable and outdated health information systems and technology. Being prepared to respond to health threats today means labs must maintain infrastructure that meets national standards, enabling fluid technical integration with other labs, numerous federal agencies (e.g., Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Environment Protection Agency (EPA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), etc.) and other health partners across the nation. In addition to meeting national preparedness, the Kansas Health and Environment Laboratory's (KHEL) mission is to provide everyday timely and accurate analytical information for the public health benefit of all Kansas citizens. In order to meet KHEL's state mission and national preparedness goals, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) is seeking assistance to replace its current outdated and difficult to maintain Informix laboratory information management system (LIMS) with a web-based LIMS. This new LIMS solution meets the goals of the "Kansas Strategic Information Management Plan 2008-2013" by implementing a web-based, customer-centric service for sample form submission, test tracking, and results reporting in real time. Additionally, the LIMS solution will integrate lab data across all business processes improving staff efficiencies and allowing easier adoption of new work flows as laboratory technology and analyses processes advance and regulations change. Furthermore, the implemented solution will enhance collaborative interfaces to a wide range of agencies and individuals including hospitals, health departments, laboratories, clinics, environment/agricultural agencies, law enforcement agencies as well as federal partners such as the CDC, EPA, FDA, etc. using national health and environment industry standards.

**For the Reporting Period:** The Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) obtained Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) approval for the high level project plan on 4/26/11 and approval of the Request for Proposal (RFP) on 5/6/11. On 6/9/11, four (4) vendors responded to the RFP. The technical and cost evaluations are complete, and two (2) vendors have been invited for demonstrations on 7/20/11 and 7/21/11.

Approved

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Health Policy Authority (KHPA)**

**Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination – (K-MED) Project**

CITO Council High-Level Approval:	9/30/10	
*CITO Council Revised High Level Approval:	7/6/11	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$62,000,000	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$3,600,000	
Estimated Execution Start:	8/22/11	Estimated Execution End: 10/1/13













Funding Source for Project Cost

State General Fund	5%
Health Resources & Services Administration	9%
Center for Consumer Information & Insurance Oversight	50%
Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services	36%

The current system Kansas Automated Eligibility Child Support Enforcement System (KAECSES) is over 20 years old and has not supported or been able to keep pace with the volume of medical eligibility/enrollment applications submitted. KAECSES is not well suited for alternative service channels such as centralized eligibility and document management, as evidenced by the estimated 50,000 documents at the Clearinghouse. This technological inadequacy hinders implementation of the Kansas legislature’s mandate to expand coverage to children between 200% - 250% of Federal Poverty Level and Presumptive Eligibility (PE) for pregnant women, and it hinders the Kansas Health Policy Authority’s (KHPA) ability to educate and reach out to eligible but uninsured Kansans regarding health insurance programs in which they may enroll. The goal of the Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination (K-MED) project is to modernize the medical assistance programs eligibility determination practices through business process design supported by an integrated “customer centric” Medical Eligibility Determination system. All medical assistance program eligibility cases will be supported by this integrated, customer-centric services model. K-MED will serve as the “medical eligibility system of record” for all users in need of consolidated, current, and historical medical assistance program eligibility information. KHPA envisions a client service model that is “customer centric,” efficient, effective, and provides a customer friendly experience. Within this vision, clients will be able to file applications for services or benefits through an online application process, as well as report changes and manage their benefit “accounts” online. Most required materials and verification documents will be scanned and stored electronically with the application. Whenever possible, verification of required information will be captured electronically through a web-based service. The K-MED solution will include core functionality to allow for expanded use of the system to other eligibility programs and services, including those managed and administered outside of KHPA. KHPA has required the system be flexible enough to support a large number of programs and services, each with unique program-level requirements. The system must

Approved-New

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                                      |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.                                    |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER.                      |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                                       |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received                          |  Reporting insufficient.  |
|  Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination – (K-MED) Project (Continued)

allow for some shared functionality, such as a common user-interface and data base structure, but it must also serve the unique needs of individual programs. Other agencies will be able to build on the K-MED platform to administer their programs.

Optional Scope / Functionality:







- The State foresees the possibility of including other Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) Human Service (HS) programs (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition and Assistance Program (SNAP), etc.) in K-MED. KHPA included content describing this possibility in the K-MED Request for Proposal (RFP) that was released in 10/10..
- A cooperative effort between K-MED/AVENUES is envisioned, which involves SRS and KHPA collaboration in building out related eligibility services for programs which are part of the Kansas Electronic Health and Human Services (EHHS) roadmap and vision.

*\*On 7/6/11 the Kansas Access to Comprehensive Health (KATCH) officially changed its name to the K-MED project. On 7/1/11 the former Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) was merged into the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) and became the Division of Health Care Finance.*

**For the Reporting Period:** *\*A Revised High Level Project Plan was approved by the Council of Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO) on 7/6/11. We are nearing the close of negotiations with our contractor. We are in the process of working with SRS and the contractor to finalize a detailed project plan to submit to the three (3) Chief Information Technology Officers (CITOs) for approval. The team is waiting for the contract negotiations to end and the scope to be set before we finalize the Detailed Project Plan. We are also in the process of obtaining federal approval for an Advanced Planning Document (APD) we submitted on 6/23/11 for enhanced federal funding. Project execution kisk-off is expected to begin no later than 8/22/11.*

Approved-New

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- +** Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  
Page 97

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)**

**KCJIS Master Entity Index (MEI)**

<i>*CITO High-Level Approval:</i>	7/15/11		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$314,850	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Execution Start:	9/14/11	Estimated Execution End:	3/6/12

Funding Source for Project Cost










Traffic Records Coordinating Council	96%
KBI Fee Fund	4%

The Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) hosts the technology and systems that comprise the Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS). The KCJIS committee works closely with the Traffic Records Coordinating Council (TRCC) to coordinate systems and activities that are of mutual interest to public and traffic safety. The KCJIS implements a master name index that is used to resolve identities that occur across the many disparate systems that comprise the KCJIS. The master name index is over 10 years old and is out-dated both technologically and functionally. Several KCJIS and TRCC projects are currently under development that will require a new Master Entity Index (MEI) be constructed. As a vital component of the Traffic Records System (TRS), the eCitation project has been initiated with the goal of implementing a statewide eCitation system through which traffic citation data can be collected, analyzed, and distributed accurately, quickly, and cost effectively for the benefit of the public and state, local, and federal agencies. The KCJIS-KDOR Data Integration project is underway, which creates a decoupled interface to share the driver and vehicle information in KDOR's driver and vehicle systems with users of the KCJIS located throughout the state and the nation. The DUI Tracking System project is in planning stages, and will integrate data related to DUI events and provide a secure portal for the prosecutors and other stakeholders to keep track of DUI offenders. All of these projects will require an entity resolution system to resolve identities and speed the searching and correlation of data. The project completely supports the goals of the Kansas Strategic Information Management (SIM) plan. It will make information in the KCJIS public safety system easier to use, more accessible, and more cost efficient. It will allow users of the KCJIS to provide those public safety services Kansans want and need. It continues the KCJIS and SIM Plan goal of making state managed data available to all levels of government, citizens, and businesses. The KBI is collaborating closely with Kansas Department of Transportation in the construction of the MEI, and its eventual use will cross multiple agency types in the public safety domain. It will drive improvements and efficiencies at the local level.

**For the Reporting Period:** *\*The High Level Project Plan was approved by the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) on 7/15/11.*

Approved-New

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- \*** *Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI) (Continued)**

**KsORT Integration Project**

CITO High-Level Approval:	6/17/11		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$538,152	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Execution Start:	8/16/11	Estimated Execution End:	4/26/12

Funding Source for Project Cost

SMART Grant	55%
Record Check Fee Fund	5%
Anticipated Funds	40%

The Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) manages the State of Kansas’ offender registry. The purpose of the registry is to collect information on persons convicted of certain sexual, drug, and violent offenses in the state of Kansas, and to distribute this information to governmental entities, law enforcement and criminal justice, schools, and the public at large. The authority and requirements for the registry are reflected in K.S.A. 22-4901 et seq., which is in support of and extends the requirements of the federal Adam Walsh Act and the associated Sexual Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA). The KBI works closely with the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering and Tracking (SMART) to understand and implement requirements of SORNA. The SMART office provides jurisdictions with guidance regarding the implementation of the Adam Walsh Act, including technical assistance to the states, territories, Indian tribes, local governments, and public and private organizations. The SMART office, under a cooperative agreement with the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR) has developed a series of technical solutions that are made available to the states to assist in maintenance of the state offender registry. The IIR is a nonprofit research and training organization, specializing in law enforcement, juvenile justice, criminal justice, and homeland security issues. IIR provides local, state, tribal, and federal law enforcement agencies with the assistance needed to implement changes that promote greater governmental effectiveness. The KBI wishes to implement the technical solutions provided by the SMART office and IIR, modifying and integrating them as necessary to fit state and agency architecture and requirements. In so doing Kansas will not only achieve SORNA compliance, but will also improve the information available to criminal justice agencies and the public regarding registered offenders, and will achieve efficiencies in the registration process for both Kansas sheriffs and KBI staff. The scope of the project will be to extend those tools provided by SMART and IIR to meet Kansas requirements by: adding Kansas specific data elements; adding/modifying Kansas-specific business, edit, and validation rules; integrating with the Kansas Criminal Justice Information for security, access, and the secure delivery of notifications to local, state, and national jurisdictions regarding changes in offenders residence; providing a portal for Kansas sheriffs to enter the requisite offender information; deployment of a new public web portal that meets the public access and notification requirements of federal and state law.

**For the Reporting Period:** The High Level Project Plan was approved by the Chief Information Technology Officer on 6/17/11.

Approved-New

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Revenue, Department of (KDOR)**

**Kansas Motor Fuel Modernization**

CITO High-Level Approval: 6/20/11  
 Estimated Project Cost: \$2,981,357 (Est. planning, execution and closeout)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$692,841  
 Estimated Execution Start: 4/19/13 Estimated Execution End: 5/14/14

Funding Source for Project Cost

KDOR Budget Actions 100%

The Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR) is legislatively mandated to collect taxes and fees, administer Kansas tax laws, issue various licenses and provide assistance to Kansas citizens and units of government. As part of this mission KDOR administers and collects motor fuel taxes from companies and individuals who are required to file returns and pay such taxes. The Motor Fuel Tax activity resides within the Division of Tax Operations, Customer Relations Bureau. In 2010, the Division of Tax Operations collected over \$430,000,000 in motor fuel taxes and fees on behalf of the State of Kansas. Approximately 65% of these collections were transferred to the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) for use in the State Highway Fund. Approximately 33% was transferred directly to Kansas counties and municipalities. Motor fuel tax collection operations today are reliant upon a combination of outdated data processing technology and manual work flows to process all registrations, licensing, return processing, billings, refunds and other activities associated with Kansas motor fuel taxation. The Kansas Motor Fuel Modernization (KMFM) project is designed to replace an ageing<sup>1</sup> mainframe-based system with a modern architecture capable of handling current and future motor fuel tax operations, both for KDOR agency personnel and Kansas taxpayers. The proposed system will provide an integrated data sharing structure for intra-agency reporting and also provide public-facing, web-based capabilities, enhancing Kansas electronic government services. Key KMFM features include:

- 24/7 Web-Based Accessibility to Selected Taxpayer Functions
- Workflow Management Tools
- Table-Driven Administrator Preferences
- System-to-System Interfaces
- Role Based Business Rules & Accessibility Controls
- Ad-Hoc Reporting & Querying


The scope of this project includes customizing a commercial-off-the-shelf system (C-COTS) in order to meet Kansas requirements.

**For the Reporting Period:** The High Level Project Plan was approved by the Chief Information Technology Officer on 6/20/11.

**Approved-New**

[Return to Index](#)

<sup>1</sup> Some elements of the current system have been in production since 1973.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)**

**Learning and Performance Management System**

CITO High-Level Approval: 6/22/10  
 Estimated Project Cost: \$428,334 (Est. planning, execution and closeout)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$78,000  
 Estimated Execution Start: 5/2/11 Estimated Execution End: 12/1/11

Funding Source for Project Cost










State General Fund 76%  
 Federal Funds: 24%  
 Disability Determination Services Federal Fund  
 Federal Food Stamp Fund  
 Medical Assistance federal Fund Administration  
 Rehabilitation Services Federal Fund  
 Child Support Enforcement Administration Federal Fund  
 Child Care Development Fund Federal  
 Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Federal Block Grant

SumTotal Systems, the vendor of the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services’ (SRS) Pathlore LMS (learning management system) software recently announced an end-of -life for maintenance and support of the product effective 12/31/13. SRS originally purchased the system in response to an American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) lawsuit in 1993, to support SRS Human Resource Policy Section 8-1 and K.A.R. 1-8-4 by providing electronic records for employee training and continuing education. Based on SumTotal Systems' announcement, SRS must now seek a replacement to meet support requirements and avoid violation of the 1993 ACLU lawsuit agreement. This project will involve the purchase, configuration, and installation of a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution or a vendor hosted system as the Pathlore replacement. In addition, the software purchase will include functionality involved with maintaining an employee performance management process database to facilitate administration of the new statewide Performance Management Process being implemented across the state.

**For the Reporting Period:** Based on organizational priorities and statewide reorganization, SRS is reevaluating the priority of this effort. SRS will file the required planning documents when priority for this effort is established.

**Approved**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)**

**Kansas Truck Routing and Intelligent Permitting System (K-TRIPS)**

CITO High-Level Approval: 9/14/10  
 Estimated Project Cost: \$2,663,590 (Est. planning, execution and closeout)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$812,159  
 Estimated Execution Start: 10/1/11 Estimated Execution End: 8/22/13

Funding Source for Project Cost










Permit Fee 50%  
 KDOT Commercial Vehicle Information System & Networks (CVISN) 25%  
 KDOR Commercial Vehicle Information System & Networks (CVISN) 25%

Since 1997, the State of Kansas has utilized a permit application system which uses a combination of methods for its customers who include truck drivers, carriers, and permit agencies. The system utilizes a web site, fax machines, e-mail, phone calls, an FTP site, and in-person meetings to complete the application process. This system has become functionally obsolete due to the advancement of technology including technical architecture, hardware and software features, and system support. In 2007, a report (Vertical Bridge Clearance Data Process; Report No. 3 – Project Recommendations; 9/25/07) was commissioned to evaluate the current permitting system and determine the strengths, weaknesses, and future steps to better serve customers. The results of the report recommended an upgraded permit application site. Specific recommendations included a "self service, Internet-based, auto-routing environment," "an advanced, graphical, mapped-based interface," and "real time access to oversize/overweight permitting, routing and incident data". Once the report was finalized, the state of Kansas approached the trucking community with a proposed increase on specific permits to help fund upgrades and advancements like the proposed K-TRIPS and other future technology advancements. The proposed system will provide those features and more while also allowing the permit process to be more automated.

**For the Reporting Period:** The project team is working on the planning phase activities with the vendor. They are finding that they will need more time with this phase than originally anticipated.

**Approved**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**PLANNED PROJECTS SECTION**

Planned projects are in the conceptual stage and have estimated costs and timeframes. The project estimates listed are rough estimates and are not yet benchmarked for JCIT reporting. Percentage variances outlined in JCIT policy do not apply.

When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available. Projects remain in the Planned Projects section until the agency decides whether or not to move forward with the project.

Approximately 95% of the projects in this section are identified in the agencies annual 3 - Year IT Management and Budget Plans, which a part of includes current and three years of long range planning for IT projects, in accordance with K.S.A 75-7210. The other 5% are disclosed through the Division of Purchases, INK, Specifications, Agency notification, etc.

**TERMS**

- CITO Council - A management group consisting of the three (3) Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO) representing the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of Kansas state government.
- Estimated Planning Start - Estimated planning start date for an identified Planned Project.
- Estimated Closeout End - Estimated planning end date for an identified Planned Project.
- Estimated Project Cost - Estimated planning, execution and close out dollars of a project.
- Estimated 3 Future Years of Operational Cost - Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project Operational Cost is completed.
- CITO Project Notification - The date the CITO issues a determination letter to the agency stating an IT effort is a CITO reportable project.
- Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost - This item calls for identification for forecasted financing by percentage of funding source.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.
- \* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.
-  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**PLANNED PROJECTS  
EXECUTIVE BRANCH**

**Commerce, Department of  
Kansas Career Pipeline (KCP) – Subscription and Integration**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$350,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 4/1/10
		Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

- Federal Funds - To Be Determined
- Kansas Board of Regents - To Be Determined
- Kansas State Board of Education - To Be Determined
- Kansas Department of Corrections - To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The current subscription in use by Kansas Career Pipeline (KCP) through Kuder has been customized for the unique needs of Kansas adults and students in grades nine (9) through post-secondary school. Over 100,000 use the current system, which includes self-assessments of individual skills and work values. The current subscription also includes career exploration, options to build a four-year educational plan, plan for postsecondary education, learn about financial aid, build a professional resume and ultimately connect with employers. The subscription includes training, hosting, and server maintenance and fees.


The proposed subscription will include self assessments providing reliable and valid information allowing users to explore personal interests as they relate to education and career/occupation, work values, aptitudes and abilities. These assessments help users understand their employable skills and match user interest and skills to possible educational and careers pathways. The outcomes of multiple assessments will be mapped to education and career choices.

Career exploration shall be organized around O\*NET occupations or descriptors, college majors, previous job skills, Holland codes and assessment results. The contractor should provide a connection to three valid and reliable self assessment surveys in the public domain:

- Interests – e.g. O\*NET Interest Profiler and Holland Codes or similar
- Skills – e.g. Skills Profiler (Career One Stop), O\*NET Ability Profiler or similar
- Work Values – e.g. O\*NET Work Importance Locator or similar

 Meeting targeted goals.	 Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
 Project Stopped/Canceled.	 Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
 Project completed and waiting for PIER.	 Project on hold.
<b>I</b> Infrastructure Project	 Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
<b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received	 Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

Commerce, Department of (Continued)

Kansas Career Pipeline (KCP) – Subscription and Integration (Continued)

- Or proprietary assessments that produce similar results.

The creation of a web portal or adaptation of existing portal and integration to connect web sites, including but not limited to Kansas Career Pipeline, **KANSASWORKS** and Career Zoom Kansas is also needed. Branding toolkit and guidelines will be provided by Commerce to ensure all Web sites are easily identifiable to the customer as a family of products working together to provide comprehensive information regarding career interests, education and employment. System integration will be required to bring together the component subsystems into one system and ensure that the subsystems function together as a system. Collaboration with subsystem contracted vendors will be required to achieve integration.

The system must integrate information from various planning and reference resources to make interaction easy and useful. The system should link to external sources of information ensuring the site’s look and feel is continuous.

All portions, interfaces, modules, and components of the career exploration and assessment system must integrate and operate with each other.

**E-Government:** See above.













**Technical Architecture:** The first phase of this project is to define the technical architecture with guidelines that are in compliance with the State IT Architecture Plan.

**Project Description and Scope:** This project is a multi-agency effort involving The Kansas Department of Commerce (Commerce), the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR), the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) and the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC).

**Project Status:** On Hold. Commerce advises that this project may be canceled as they are looking at a new direction to provide services.

Planned

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                                      |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.                                    |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER.                      |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                                       |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received                          |  Reporting insufficient.  |
|  Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

Corrections, Department of (KDOC)

Total Offender Activity and Documentation System/Offender Management Information System (TOADS/OMIS) Replacement

CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost: \$12,000,000-\$15,000,000\*\* (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: \$3,000,000\*\*
Estimated Planning Start: To Be Determined
Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
CITO Proj Notification: 11/5/07
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
State General Fund - To Be Determined
Grant Funding - To Be Determined

\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): The Department's business objective in replacing TOADS/OMIS is to support the agency's offender reentry and risk reduction efforts in addition to providing enhanced end user productivity capabilities by reducing the effort required to capture, modify and analyze the information related to activities of offender case management.

E-Government: The vast majority of this information must be secured and will not be available for public access; however, the new system will provide information necessary to populate approved data elements for viewing through our public access web site Kansas Adult Supervised Population Electronic Registry (KASPER) which provides basic information relating to all past and present offenders.

Technical Architecture: This project will leverage web and relational database technologies permitting

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER received
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project on hold.
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Corrections, Department of (KDOC) (Continued)**

**Total Offender Activity and Documentation System/Offender Management Information System (TOADS/OMIS) Replacement (Continued)**

us to move away from proprietary and inefficient document technologies. We will also be identifying technologies for use in this project which will permit both mobile and disconnected access to the system.

**Project Description and Scope:**

The replacement system will be used throughout the agency to encompass all aspects of managing offenders from Community Corrections through Post Incarceration Supervision.

**Project Status:** This is a planned project once funding has been secured.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER received
-  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
-  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Health Care Stabilization Fund (HCSF)**

**HCSF Technology Improvement Project**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$871,533** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$406,700**	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 10/8/09
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** In 2008 (FY09) the agency was evaluated by an insurance industry consultant which concluded that, “HCSF’s systems and processes are heavily manual and paper based, provide limited real time and historical information tracking, have led to process inefficiencies, do not provide the functionality needed by users and are not flexible or expandable enough to grow and adapt to the changing and evolving needs of HCSF. In addition, the systems are not fully integrated, do not provide electronic workflow and approval capabilities, and lack modern security features.”

As a result of the numerous recommendations for technology and information system improvements identified in the consultant’s report, the HCSF Board of Governors decided to pursue an information technology improvement project. Because the agency’s Information Technology (IT) funding was transferred to the General Fund, the project was delayed several months. In order to resume the project, the Board requested and received specific legislative expenditure authority for FY10 that will fund initial costs including a contract for additional consulting services to determine detailed, technical specifications for the project. It has been determined already that there are existing management information systems available which were originally designed for insurers that sell medical professional liability insurance or workers compensation insurance. Such a system would accommodate the management information system needs of the HCSF Board of Governors. A preliminary estimate provided by one of the major providers of such systems serves as the basis for the budget estimates identified above.

**E-Government:** The HCSF Board of Governors seldom has any reason to interact with the general public and most health care providers interact with the HCSF via their commercial insurer. One (1) of the Board’s objectives is to allow insurers which provide reports and other information to the HCSF to exchange data via either an interface with the HCSF information system or via a web based portal. As previously mentioned, almost half of all Kansas health care providers are insured by two companies. Both of these companies

Planned

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Health Care Stabilization Fund (HCSF) (Continued)
HCSF Technology Improvement Project (Continued)

are licensees of the same insurance industry technology company. It will be extremely important to assure that a new management information system for the HCSF Board of Governors is compatible with systems used by KaMMCo and Medical Protective Company. Ultimately, the Board desires to make it possible for all insurers and health care providers to submit information and payments electronically.

Technical Architecture: The Architecture is not yet determined. This will be a product of a contract for technical professional services in Fiscal Year (FY)10. Because the HCSF is a unique state agency, it is unlikely that any other agencies could use similar software applications. Furthermore, licensing agreements generally prevent sharing of proprietary software products.

Project Description and Scope: The project will update the technology available to the HCSF enabling electronic communication between commercial insurers and the HCSF. The new management information system will dramatically improve the operational efficiency of the paper-based agency which is currently archaic compared to property and casualty insurance companies in the private sector.

Project Status: We are continuing with current technology improvements using our own staff and maintenance of the current system, ImageNow. As a result we are no longer contemplating purchase of an enterprise management information system. The HSCF Technology Improvement Project (TIP) planned project will be removed from the next Quarterly Report.

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER received
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project on hold.
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
Reporting insufficient.
Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology
\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Health Policy Authority, Kansas (KHPA)**

**Health Information Exchange**

CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested  
 Estimated Project Cost: \$250,000-\$500,000\*\* (Est. planning, execution, close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: \$300,000\*\*  
 Estimated Planning Start: To Be Determined Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined  
 CITO Proj Notification: 10/22/07  
 Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
 To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** To direct and/or participate in State and federal initiatives to improve health care related processes and outcomes via electronic exchange of information.

**E-Government:** To be determined.


**Technical Architecture:** Conform to national standards for format and content of records allowing data from disparate systems to be shared.

**Project Description and Scope:** The goal is to make various health care information available to care providers, payers, and beneficiaries to improve access, outcomes, and administrative processes in the health care arena.

**Project Status:** KHPA is working with other stakeholders to define the strategic direction for this project. KHPA merged into the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) as the Division of Health Care Finance on July 1, 2011. This planned project will appear under KHDE in the next Quarterly Report.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Insurance Department, Kansas (KID)**

**Kansas Health Benefits Exchange**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,800,000-3,250,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$8,500,000-10,500,000**		
Estimated Planning Start:	2/1/11	Est. Close-Out End:	3/31/14
		CITO Proj Notification:	3/17/11
		Identified by Agency	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

Federal Grants, Carrier Fees and Premiums

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** This project is being initiated in order to comply with federal law, specifically the Affordable Care Act. This planning project is part of a multi-agency collaboration to provide an end-to-end solution for providing affordable healthcare coverage to nearly all Kansas citizens.

**E-Government:** The planned solution will enable individual Kansans and small Kansas businesses to make more informed decisions when obtaining health care coverage. The technology will provide a tool to quickly determine the best plan for a given situation. The objective is to create an end-to-end, fully automated on-line solution.











**Technical Architecture:** The application and the technical platform will not be “owned” by the State. However, it is expected to be service oriented and use Extensible Markup Language (XML) messaging to transmit data between K-MED and other systems such as insurance carriers. Security protocols governing transmission of medical information and medical insurance information will be requirements. As this system will not be under the ownership of the State it is doubtful the Kansas Health Benefits Exchange application or technology platform will be used by other agencies. However all, or part of, the solution may be used by other states.

**Project Description and Scope:** Organizations affected by the Exchange are KID, Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA), planned users of K-MED, Kansas health insurance industry, community-based healthcare outreach workers and, of course, the citizens and small businesses of Kansas.

**Project Status:** The Kansas Health Benefits Exchange project is in the planning phase. It is expected that a Request for Proposal (RFP) will be released 6/11. Several key requirements of the RFP are dependent on resolution of numerous policy and strategy issues being addressed by eight (8) stakeholder workgroups and a steering committee facilitated by the KID and advising the Insurance Commissioner.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)  
Kansas DUI Tracking System (KsDTrak)**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$2,706,250** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$735,000**		
Estimated Planning Start:	6/1/11	Est. Close-Out End:	7/1/14
		CITO Proj Notification:	5/10/11
		Identified by Agency	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
Kansas Department of Transportation Funds

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The State of Kansas appointed a Driving Under the Influence (DUI) commission to evaluate the available data sharing and tracking mechanisms and to recommend improvements that will enable a better and more efficient mechanism for prosecutors, courts and law enforcement to keep track of DUI offenders. Per the recommendation provided by the DUI commission, Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) will enhance the existing Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) portal to integrate additional data related to the DUI events, improve timeliness of DUI event reporting, and also provide a secure portal and new methods for the prosecutors and other stakeholders to keep track of the DUI offenders and obtain an individual’s certified DUI record.











**E-Government:** No public access to the DUI tracking system is envisioned. It will however leverage and enhance automated data exchanges of criminal history record information, and provide electronic access to consolidated records from Kansas Department of Revenue Division of Motor Vehicles (KDOR/DMV), law enforcement, courts, and prosecutors.

**Technical Architecture:** It is anticipated the system will conform to the existing KCJIS technical architecture, leveraging both the Kansas Information Technology Architecture and the Justice Reference Architecture for guidance.

**Project Description and Scope:** KBI’s goals and objectives are to create and maintain an accessible and appropriately secure DUI portal system that is designed to leverage some of the existing hardware and software components available at the KCJIS data center and enhance public safety. Some of the key features envisioned for the DUI portal and the enhanced KCJIS portal systems include the following:

**Planned-New**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI) (Continued)**

**Kansas DUI Tracking System (KsDTrak) (Continued)**

- Build a DUI system that will allow prosecutors, courts and other stakeholders to search and view DUI related records for an offender.
- Build a Subscription/Notification system that will allow prosecutors, courts and other stakeholders to get notified when the system gets an update or a new entry related to an offender or event of interest.
- Build a subscription feature within the KCJIS secure web site for the users to subscribe for alerts on a specific offender or an event.
- Build a dashboard feature within the KCJIS portal for the Quality Assurance (QA) staff at the Courts or KBI to review and correct any data errors and/or data reporting deficiencies.
- Build an electronic disposition reporting service that can be used by District and Municipal courts in Kansas to submit disposition data to the Kansas Computerized Criminal History repository (CCH).
- Update the Kansas CCH system to capture the additional data elements that may be needed for DUI-related data.
- Migrate the legacy components of the existing KCJIS portal to a SharePoint, BizTalk and SQL Server platform.
- Build a data interface to integrate Kansas Incident-based reporting system (KIBRS) data in the new KCJIS Master Entity Index, for access by the DUI tracking system.
- Build a data interface to integrate Kansas Crash/Accident data in the new KCJIS Master Entity Index, for access by the DUI tracking system.
- Update the data interface to integrate the CCH data in the new KCJIS Master Entity Index to improve access by the DUI tracking system.
- Build a data interface to retrieve images of physical documents related to the DUI case on demand from the DMV system.
- Build a data interface to retrieve images of physical documents related to the DUI case on demand from the Courts system.

**Project Status:** Efforts are underway to initiate a planning project that will develop detailed requirements and prepare a feasibility study report.

**Planned-New**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI) (Continued)**

**Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$625,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$225,000**	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 9/24/07
		Identified by Agency IT Mgmt. & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** An aged Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS) system no longer supports the needs of local law enforcement or state and federal agencies requiring incident data. The existing system does not provide timely nor accurate data and is not sufficiently extensible to meet the needs of new collaborative efforts such as N-Dex. The system must be replaced.

**E-Government:** Through the use the Internet and electronic communications the KIBRS system will collect comprehensive incident and arrest data that is essential for a comprehensive Central Criminal History Repository. The Criminal History Repository provides timely information to criminal history agencies across the nation. But only when it is coupled with timely incident and intelligence data can it realize its value as an investigative and crime analysis tool.



**Technical Architecture:** The project will move the state and the Criminal History Repository forward dramatically in the areas of Service Oriented Architecture and the adoption of robust Extensible Markup Language (XML) technologies. It will place Kansas at the leading edge of state Criminal History Repositories and crime analysis capabilities.

**Project Description and Scope:** All criminal justice agencies in the state of Kansas will have access to new, reliable incident information for crime reporting and analysis. All agencies with directly programmed connections to the existing KIBRS system will be directly affected.

**Project Status:** The KIBRS system is in dramatic need of re-engineering. The KBI continues to monitor opportunities, e.g. grants, for funding a rebuild project, but until funding is identified the redevelopment of the KIBRS system will simply remain on the list of high priority needs.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERs)**

**Active Workflow**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$775,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$30,000**	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 9/25/08
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
 KPERs Fund - To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** This project will be designed to improve and enhance customer service by tracking applications from receipt through final action.

**E-Government:** N/A




**Technical Architecture:** Active workflow will be built utilizing Kansas Information Technology System (KITS) architecture using an n-tier application architecture that allows software developers to create flexible and reusable software. In n-tier architecture, the entire application is divided into several pieces. These pieces can be logical or physical. Each piece performs a specific task such as displaying user interface or data access. There can be any number of layers of such pieces.

**Project Description and Scope:** The intent of the Active Workflow project is to improve the efficiency of several key KPERs business processes through the use of rules-based work routing and work processing. There are ten (10) key business processes that will be re-evaluated and reengineered for efficiencies. The system will provide the ability to distribute work based on defined triggering events and unique conditions from the following sources:


- Imaging and Indexing system
- Employer Self Service Web Portal
- Member Self Service Web Portal
- KPERs Internal KITS system

The system will also provide workflow management reporting.

**Project Status:** Concept

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

**Retirement System, Kansas Public Employees (KPERs) (Continued)**

**Sharp Interface**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 9/25/08
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
 KPERs Fund -To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): A direct interface with Statewide Human Resources and Payroll System (SHARP) will provide KPERs with most if not all of the data currently reported through annual contribution reporting and eliminate many reporting requirements. Additionally this direct interface would facilitate processing of benefit estimates and retirements.

**E-Government:** N/A

**Technical Architecture:** The SHARP interface will comply with the Kansas Information Technology Architecture Standards.

**Project Description and Scope:** Unknown at this time

**Project Status:** Concept

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)**

**Addiction and Prevention Services Replacement**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 9/30/10
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The current AAPS system (KCPC) is written in Microsoft FoxPro. Microsoft has stated that support for FoxPro will end in 2015. With the support for the FoxPro technology ending, this puts the AAPS system at risk of not being functional/compatible with future releases of the Windows Operating System. Many of the AAPS FoxPro applications are distributed to third party providers and are housed on their IT systems. If our software fails to operate on their systems, the AAPS business area will not be able to carry out normal business functions and providers will not be able to perform patient assessments or bill for patient services. This system is mission critical to compliance and monitoring of services. Federal funding will be jeopardized due to the inability to report patient statistics to Federal Partners.

Overall the FoxPro system is the backbone of the AAPS business area. The usage of the data provided by the AAPS Integrated Data System has grown. The number of partners utilizing or requesting data continues to grow. The number of providers using the system has increased more than 50% over the last five years. There is no reason to believe these numbers will decrease.













As the usage of the system has grown, changes have been made to the software to accommodate the needs of other agencies to the point where the increased user load is quickly outpacing the system’s capacity. Further increase of use may need to occur to meet current needs and new Legislation. There may be a need to accommodate requests of additional state agencies.

Multiple program areas within Disability and Behavioral Health Services (DBHS) maintain separate databases, sometimes for the same clients. Providers utilize similar business processes. Field staff also use similar business processes to complete their work, but enter data in multiple systems. These efforts result in duplicate work.

**E-Government:** Proposing that this new AAPS Replacement system will be web based and the SRS Business staff and Partners will have secure access through the Internet.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.   |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.   |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER.                             |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received                                 |  Reporting insufficient.  |
|  <i>Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)
Addiction and Prevention Services Replacement (Continued)

Technical Architecture: The AAPS Replacement project will comply with the State Technical Architecture standards and the technology guidelines of the Kansas Statewide Technical Architecture Version 11.2.

Project Description and Scope: The current AAPS system (KCPC) is designed and written in FoxPro, which is an end-of-life software tool. FoxPro is scheduled to be phased out by Microsoft in the year 2015. When this occurs, the agency will no longer have Microsoft updates or support for the AAPS Integrated Data System.

The business processes and high level business requirements have been documented within the assessment phase of this initiative. Business has also viewed available Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) packages and have the final recommendation for the new AAPS Replacement project.

This project will affect all DBHS programs including Addiction and Prevention Services (AAPS), Mental Health (MH), Community Supports and Services (CSS) and Management Operations (MO) which includes FISCAL and PERT unit, Value Options and RADACS. It will also affect Central Office and Regional Offices, Medicaid and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) clients, DBHS clients, Department of Corrections, Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA)/Medicaid Management Information Systems (MMIS), Statewide Management, Accounting and Reporting Tool (SMART), and SRS Operations.

Project Status: Currently this project is in the Concept/Pre-planning phase and business leaders are seeking to secure funding before proceeding to the High Level Planning phase.

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER received
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project on hold.
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
Reporting insufficient.
Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology
Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)**

**Avenues**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined		
Estimated Planning Start:	8/11	Est. Close-Out End:	12/15
		CITO Proj Notification:	2/19/07
		Identified by Agency	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The Avenues project is being initiated to enable the Economic and Employment Services (EES) and a portion of the Children and Family (CFS) Services Divisions within SRS to meet the two primary goals: 1) Delivering services which are customer-centered and promote customer self service; and 2) Enhance workforce efficiency. The systems supporting these programs are over twenty years old and are no longer able to meet program needs. SRS is also in discussions with the Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) regarding their Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination (K-MED) project with the goal of aligning both projects to develop an integrated system for both social and medical programs.

**E-Government:** The Avenues project will allow SRS customers to utilize an expanded continuum of service channels to be more self-sufficient; with choices that are not just confined to in-person contact, mail, and fax. Customers will be able to access SRS information and file applications from anywhere that internet service is available, including through home computers, public libraries and at community partner office sites. Customer case files will be electronic to provide access to more SRS staff than just the case manager, allowing customers to call in changes or questions to any number of Customer Service Representatives that are located in various locations throughout the state. Customers and providers will be able to interact with the agency from locations other than local SRS service centers, taking maximum advantage of communications alternatives, increasing both the capacity and effectiveness of SRS in delivering efficient services.

**Technical Architecture:** The over-arching objective of the Avenues project is to modernize the business processes, organization, and technology infrastructure of SRS. The Avenues system is envisioned to be a knowledge-based software solution that supports the customer service and service delivery activities of the EES and a portion of the CFS sections. The new solution will be based on a common infrastructure and service oriented architecture (SOA).

The proposed solution will comply with the State of Kansas Statewide Technical Architecture Version 11.2

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)**  
**Avenues (Continued)**







**Project Description and Scope:** The Avenues project includes three essential components: improving operational processes, realigning the organization, and modernizing the technology infrastructure. One of the major objectives of the Avenues project is to replace two very large legacy systems, Kansas Automated Eligibility Child Support Enforcement System (KAECSES-AE) and KsCares which are responsible for the eligibility determination, case management, and benefits administration for some of the largest programs within SRS.

**Project Status:** Avenues originally began as the first phase of a much larger, agency-wide effort to modernize all of SRS’s information systems called the Human Services Management (HSM) project. SRS initiated an initial planning project called the HSM Roadmap project in May of 2008 and completed the project in January of 2009. The Roadmap project was CITO reported and established the future vision for SRS business and IT systems including the State Feasibility Study Report (FSR) and Federal planning documents. The HSM CITO FSR was not submitted due to lack of State funds needed to meet the Federal matching funds on the project. The first phase of this project, called Avenues, was planned as a joint effort with the Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) to develop an eligibility system for social and medical services for the citizens of Kansas. Potential funding for Avenues has been identified and discussions have resumed with KHPA to determine the extent KHPA’s Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination (K-MED) project and Avenues may be implemented jointly. To avoid confusion going forward, SRS is replacing HSM with Avenues and is submitting this new planned project document for that project.

SRS and the Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) have come to an agreement that the K-MED project, and Avenues projects should be implemented jointly. SRS has joined with KHPA’s procurement process in an effort to implement a common eligibility system for the State of Kansas. As a reflection of this decision, KHPA and SRS will be filing all future reports for Avenues jointly under the K-MED project.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

**Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) (Continued)**

**Hospitals Electronic Medical Record**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
		CITO Proj Notification: 9/30/10
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The five (5) State Hospitals operate under the Disability and Behavioral Health Services (DBHS) division within SRS. Larned State Hospital (LSH), Osawatomie State Hospital (OSH) and Rainbow Mental Health Facility (RMHF) are the public inpatient mental health treatment facilities for adults who have Severe and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI), adults committed for forensic evaluation and treatment and children with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED). Parsons State Hospital and Training Center (PSH&TC) and Kansas Neurological Institute (KNI) are the public residential treatment, training and care facilities for persons with a developmental disability and whose needs are not met by community services. These facilities are surveyed for compliance to federal Medicaid Intermediate Care Facilities for Persons with Mental Retardation (ICFs/MR) requirements.

The need is to find a solution that will create one platform for all of the Mental Health (MH) and Developmental Disabilities (DD) Hospitals to execute from. The goal is that this product would integrate clinical, ancillary, business and financial functions that includes the Health Electronic Record (HER) compliance.

**E-Government:** Proposing that this new Hospitals Electronic Medical Record (EMR) system will be web based and the SRS Business staff and Partners will have secure access through the Internet.













**Technical Architecture:** The Hospitals EMR project will comply with the State Technical Architecture standards and the technology guidelines of the Kansas Statewide Technical Architecture Version 11.2.

**Project Description and Scope:** In the scope of the Hospital EMR project we plan to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a COTS Solution that will create one platform for all of our MH and DD Hospitals to execute from. The solution must work efficiently in both environments and enable all Hospitals to be Electronic Health Record (EHR) compatible.

**Project Status:** Currently this project is in the Concept/Pre-planning phase and business leaders are seeking to secure funding before proceeding to the High Level Planning phase.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                                      |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.                                    |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER.                      |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                                       |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received                          |  Reporting insufficient.  |
|  Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)  
Capital Inventory Management System**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined		
Estimated Planning Start:	7/1/12	Est. Close-Out End:	6/30/13
		CITO Proj Notification:	9/25/08
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The current Capital Inventory system was custom developed in the mid 1980’s. Although this application was upgraded to DB2 in the past, the environment it resides in has become more difficult to support and upgrade. The ability to integrate the information contained within this application with new KDOT applications has become an issue for continued development. KDOT business requirements have changed significantly. This system has undergone several modifications, the design has remained unchanged. New data requirements and business rules continually evolve requiring work around for the system. This Capital inventory system is utilized across the state in all KDOT offices and locations. A replacement for Capital Inventory would allow KDOT to take advantage of new business needs and allow KDOT to expose the KDOT asset data to new systems.

**E-Government:** At this time, this system is not planned to have e-government utilization.

**Technical Architecture:** Will be consistent with KDOT’s approved direction for systems architecture, but specifics have not been determined.

**Project Description and Scope:** The scope of this project would be to replace the existing Capital Inventory system. This system will maintain the inventory of equipment and capital expenditures by category and location. Inventory subsystems include; building, land, materials, office equipment, radios, shop equipment and storage areas. This system would be designed to provide a solution for KDOT agency wide. This system has interfaces to multiple KDOT systems; interfaces would also be addressed to insure that existing systems would maintain functionality. As the state Department of Administration proceeds with its new Statewide Management, Accounting and Reporting Tool (SMART) replacement application, KDOT would review the capabilities and functionality provided with that system. The new SMART system has included an Asset management module within the project scope.

**Project Status:** Planned.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.  |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology                  |

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)**

**Consumable Inventory Management System**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined		
Estimated Planning Start:	7/1/12	Est. Close-Out End:	6/30/13
		CITO Proj Notification:	9/25/08
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** The current Consumable Inventory system was custom developed in the mid 1980's. The software technology used to build this application (Virtual Storage Access Method (VSAM), Customer Information Control System (CICS), and Common Business-Oriented Language (COBOL)) has become functionally obsolete. The primary file structure has proven to be incompatible with new emerging technologies. The ability to integrate the information contained within this application with new KDOT applications has become an issue for continued development. KDOT has also had the desire to utilize 'bar' coding technologies for inventory. Bar coding solutions will not work in the current technical architecture. This system is utilized across the state in all KDOT offices and locations. By implementing a new system, including the bar coding technology would allow KDOT to upgrade systems to take advantage of new business needs and allow KDOT to expose the consumable data to new systems.

**E-Government:** At this time, this system is not planned to have e-government utilization.

**Technical Architecture:** Will be consistent with KDOT's approved direction for systems architecture, but specifics have not been determined.

**Project Description and Scope:** The scope of this project would be to replace the existing twenty-five (25) year old consumable inventory system. Consumable inventory system is responsible for maintaining inventory locations, stock item descriptions, process receipts issues and transfers. This system would be designed to provide a solution for KDOT storekeepers agency wide. This would include a bar coding solution for inventory management. This legacy system has interfaces to multiple KDOT systems, including Crew Card; interfaces would also be addressed to ensure that existing systems would maintain functionality. As the state Department of Administration proceeds with its new Statewide Management, Accounting and Reporting System Tool (SMART) replacement application, KDOT would review the capabilities and functionality provided with that system. Although the new SMART system did not include Consumable inventory as within scope, the selected software could provide an integrated tracking and procurement system at a later implementation.

**Project Status:** Planned.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 | <b>C</b> Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).   |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               | <b>A</b> Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.  |
| <b>I</b> Infrastructure Project   |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| <b>P</b> Project completed and PIER received  |  Reporting insufficient.   |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  | <b>+</b> Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology  |

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

**Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)**

**Document Management System Replacement**

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$750,000-\$1,000,000** (Est. planning, execution, close-out)		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined		
Estimated Planning Start:	1/1/12	Est. Close-Out End:	1/1/14
		CITO Proj Notification:	9/25/08
		Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
To Be Determined

**\*\* The costs listed are a rough estimate. When a project plan is developed for CITO approval, a more accurate estimate will be available.**

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** To upgrade or replace the existing technology before the products are technically obsolete and become unsupported.

**E-Government:** Not applicable.











**Technical Architecture:** The technology will be upgraded or replaced. The current architecture is a web-based system and the intent is to maintain this direction.

**Project Description and Scope:** The project will include upgrading or replacing five production document management libraries. If the products are replaced then a major conversion effort will be necessary to move the documents to the new technology. Currently there are over two million documents.

**Project Status:** KDOT is planning to analyze the existing system, evaluate existing products and determine an approach for the Document Management System Replacement project in 2012. The project is planned for SFY 2013.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
|  Meeting targeted goals.                 |  Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). |
|  Project Stopped/Canceled.               |  Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).   |
|  Project completed and waiting for PIER. |  Project on hold.   |
|  Infrastructure Project                  |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).  |
|  Project completed and PIER received     |  Reporting insufficient.  |

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Kansas, University of (KU)

KU Enterprise Storage Consolidation

CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost: To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start: To Be Determined
Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
CITO Proj Notification: 9/30/10
Identified in Agency IT Mgmt & Budget Plans

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): Consolidation of distributed file storage to centralized tiered storage architecture with enterprise backup, archiving and recovery.

E-Government: This project has no e-government components.

Technical Architecture: To be determined.

Project Description and Scope: Consolidation of distributed file storage to centralized tiered storage architecture with enterprise backup, archiving and recovery.

Project Status: \*A High Level Plan was approved by the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) on 7/13/11.

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER received
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project on hold.
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

REGENTS

Pittsburg State University (PSU)

Library Management System

CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested
Estimated Project Cost: To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
Estimated Planning Start: To Be Determined Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined
CITO Proj Notification: 5/18/07
Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): Age and capabilities of current system.

E-Government: The project will not only serve the students and faculty of Pittsburg State University but other Kansas community libraries and K-12 school districts. The PSU Axe Library system is currently used as the hub for all electronic library services in these instances.

Technical Architecture: It is our hope that with the new Integrated Library System (ILS) there will be improvements in resource accessibility, work flow, documentation, data warehousing, security, storage and mobility for users.

Project Description and Scope: Pittsburg State University and all constituent groups are working with University Library resources. The goal for the new ILS is improving resource accessibility, work flow, documentation, data warehousing, security, storage and mobility for users.

Project Status: Library Services staff is in early research stages.

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER received
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
Project on hold.
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
Reporting insufficient.
Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology
\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

**JUDICIAL BRANCH**

**Judicial Branch**

**E-Filing Project**

CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested  
 Estimated Project Cost: To Be Determined (Est. planning, execution, close-out)  
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined  
 Estimated Planning Start: To Be Determined  
 Est. Close-Out End: To Be Determined  
 CITO Proj Notification: 12/15/09  
 Identified by Agency

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost  
 To Be Determined

**Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s):** This project will implement the final step of the long-term goal of having a fully integrated electronic court system. The Electronic Filing Committee made interim recommendations to the Kansas Supreme Court regarding implementation of an Electronic Filing System (EFS) for Kansas courts. The Electronic Filing Committee represents various users of the court system and the potential users of EFS – attorneys, support staff of attorneys, and judicial branch employees (clerks, district court administrators, technology specialists, judges, attorneys employed by the appellate courts, staff of the Office of Judicial Administration (OJA) and justices). Initial recommendations included whether the Kansas judicial branch should begin to implement an EFS and, if so, the general framework for that system. The Electronic Filing Committee was also asked to determine what, if any, statutory amendments were necessary to implement an Electronic Filing System.

Previous implementations prior to the Electronic filing effort include: a software driven case management system (CMS) for every district court; document imaging and management systems within Kansas judicial districts; and implementing a pilot system for online payments of fines and fees in three judicial districts which is scheduled to be available statewide for online payments in traffic cases by 5/10.

**E-Government:** This project is being initiated to implement an e-filing environment for the use and benefit of Kansas district and appellate courts.


**Technical Architecture:** This project will implement an e-filing system that is in compliance with the Kansas Information Technology Architecture.

**Project Description and Scope:** The scope of the project is to implement an e-filing technology which will complete the long-term goal of having a fully integrated electronic court system in the Kansas district and appellate courts.

**Project Status:** Planning Phase. The Judicial CITO approved a High Level Plan on 3/23/11. On 4/1/11 the plan was placed on hold pending resolution of funding; it will re-activate upon funding direction.

**Planned**

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER received
- C** Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent).
- A** Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent).
-  Project on hold.
-  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).
-  Reporting insufficient.

\* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

## SYMBOLS



Project meeting targeted goals.



Project completed and waiting for closeout PIER

P

PIER received.

C

Caution - Project has changed scope, or missed targeted goals by more than 10 percent. Reporting to the Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) may be recommended.

A

Alert - Project has changed scope, or missed targeted goals by more than 20 percent. Reporting to the Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) may be recommended.



Project has changed scope, or missed targeted goals by more than 20 percent. Review and report to JCIT and CITO required. Review by 3rd party may be recommended. Symbol can also mean project has been stopped or canceled.



Project on hold.



Recast – Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent).

I

Infrastructure Project.



Reporting insufficient.



Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology.

\*

*Updated key information, occurring after this report period.*

**INDEX**

Quarterly Executive Summary Report	2
ACTIVE PROJECTS SECTION	12
Project Report Assessments	13
EXECUTIVE BRANCH	13
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (DOFA)	13
<i>AVPN Replacement of Legacy Wide Area Network</i>	13
<i>SHARP PeopleSoft 9.1 HR/Payroll System Upgrade</i>	15
<i>Unified Communications VoIP Project</i>	17
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF	19
<i>Statewide Broadband Project</i>	19
CORPORATION COMMISSION, KANSAS (KCC)	22
<i>KCC Project 2010 BPI – Business Innovation and Improvement</i>	22
EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF (KSDE)	24
<i>Kansas Statewide Electronic Transcript System Implementation</i>	24
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF (KDHE)	26
<i>Child Care Licensing and Registration Information System (CLARIS) Inspection Module</i>	26
HEALTH POLICY AUTHORITY (KHPA)	28
<i>Data Analytic Interface III</i>	28
<i>State Medicaid Health Information Technology (HIT) Plan SMHP</i>	31
HIGHWAY PATROL, KANSAS (KHP)	33
<i>Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)/Records Management System (RMS) Project</i>	33
HISTORICAL SOCIETY, STATE	35
<i>Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation (KEEP) III</i>	35
INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF (KBI)	38
<i>Central Message Switch (CMS) Replacement Project</i>	38
<i>KCJIS-KDOR Data Integration</i>	40
JUVENILE JUSTICE AUTHORITY (JJA)	42
<i>Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Rewrite</i>	42
KANSAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM (KCJIS)	45
<i>Kansas eCitation</i>	45
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF (KDOL)	48
<i>UIM Build and Deploy</i>	48
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF (KDOR)	52
<i>DMV Modernization Project</i>	52
<i>PVD Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal Replacement III</i>	54
SECRETARY OF STATE OF KANSAS	56
<i>Statewide Voter Registration and Election Management System (ELVIS) Primary and Secondary Datacenter Hardware Replacement</i>	56
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES (SRS)	58
<i>Customer and Provider Portal (CAPP)</i>	58
<i>Community Supports and Services (CSS) Automation</i>	61
<i>Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Quality Control (QC) Enterprise Customer/Content Management (ECCM)</i>	63
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT)	65
<i>Communication System Interoperability Program</i>	65
REGENTS	70
REGENTS, KANSAS BOARD OF (KBOR)	70
<i>Kansas Statewide Postsecondary Electronic Transcript System</i>	70
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF (KU)	72
<i>Collaboration Summary</i>	72
<i>KU HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject I</i>	73
KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF (KUMC)	75
<i>KUMC HR/Pay PeopleSoft Upgrade Subproject II</i>	75
<i>Clinical Research Center (CRC)</i>	77
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH	79
LEGISLATIVE	79

**INDEX**

<i>K-LISS Architecture</i> .....	79
<i>Statehouse Restoration Voice and Data Infrastructure III</i> .....	82
COMPLETED PROJECTS SECTION	85
PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED.....	86
EXECUTIVE BRANCH.....	86
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (DOFA).....	86
<i>Statewide Financial Management System Pre-Implementation Planning/Activities</i> .....	86
<i>Statewide Financial Management System</i> .....	86
HEALTH POLICY AUTHORITY (KHPA).....	87
<i>KHPA Document Imaging Project</i> .....	87
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT).....	87
<i>Brocade Switch Upgrade</i> .....	87
REGENTS.....	88
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF (KU) - <i>NEW</i> .....	88
<i>KU Exchange 2010 Upgrade Project</i> .....	88
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY (WSU).....	88
<i>Banner Enrollment Management Suite Implementation Project</i> .....	88
PROJECTS WITH PIERS OUTSTANDING.....	89
EXECUTIVE BRANCH.....	89
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF (DOFA) - <i>NEW</i> .....	89
<i>KanWIN Infrastructure Upgrade III</i> .....	89
ATTORNEY GENERAL’S OFFICE.....	89
<i>Case Management System II</i> .....	89
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF (KDOL).....	90
<i>Unemployment Insurance Modernization III</i> .....	90
LOTTERY, KANSAS.....	90
<i>Expanded Gaming Central System</i> .....	90
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF (KDOR) - <i>NEW</i> .....	91
<i>Drivers License Photo First Model Office</i> .....	91
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES (SRS).....	91
<i>Human Services Management (HSM) Road Map II</i> .....	91
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT).....	92
<i>Workflow Conversion Project III</i> .....	92
REGENTS.....	92
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY (ESU) - <i>NEW</i> .....	92
<i>Campus Wide Network Wiring Project II</i> .....	92
APPROVED PROJECTS SECTION	93
EXECUTIVE BRANCH.....	94
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF (KDHE).....	94
<i>Kansas Women Infants and Children (KWIC) System Upgrade</i> .....	94
<i>Laboratory Information Management System</i> .....	95
HEALTH POLICY AUTHORITY (KHPA).....	96
<i>Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination – (K-MED) Project</i> .....	96
INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF (KBI).....	98
<i>KCJIS Master Entity Index (MEI)</i> .....	98
<i>KsORT Integration Project</i> .....	99
REVENUE, DEPARTMENT OF (KDOR).....	100
<i>Kansas Motor Fuel Modernization</i> .....	100
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES (SRS).....	101
<i>Learning and Performance Management System</i> .....	101
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT).....	102
<i>Kansas Truck Routing and Intelligent Permitting System (K-TRIPS)</i> .....	102
PLANNED PROJECTS SECTION	103
PLANNED PROJECTS.....	104
EXECUTIVE BRANCH.....	104
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF.....	104

**INDEX**

<i>Kansas Career Pipeline (KCP) – Subscription and Integration</i> .....	104
CORRECTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF (KDOC) .....	106
<i>Total Offender Activity and Documentation System/Offender Management Information</i> .....	106
<i>System (TOADS/OMIS) Replacement</i> .....	106
HEALTH CARE STABILIZATION FUND (HCSF) .....	108
<i>HCSF Technology Improvement Project</i> .....	108
HEALTH POLICY AUTHORITY, KANSAS (KHPA).....	110
<i>Health Information Exchange</i> .....	110
INSURANCE DEPARTMENT, KANSAS (KID) .....	111
<i>Kansas Health Benefits Exchange</i> .....	111
INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF (KBI).....	112
<i>Kansas DUI Tracking System (KsDTrak)</i> .....	112
<i>Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement</i> .....	114
RETIREMENT SYSTEM, KANSAS PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (KPERS) .....	115
<i>Active Workflow</i> .....	115
<i>Sharp Interface</i> .....	116
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES (SRS).....	117
<i>Addiction and Prevention Services Replacement</i> .....	117
<i>Avenues</i> .....	119
<i>Hospitals Electronic Medical Record</i> .....	121
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT) .....	122
<i>Capital Inventory Management System</i> .....	122
<i>Consumable Inventory Management System</i> .....	123
<i>Document Management System Replacement</i> .....	124
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF (KU) .....	125
<i>KU Enterprise Storage Consolidation</i> .....	125
REGENTS .....	126
PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY (PSU) .....	126
<i>Library Management System</i> .....	126
JUDICIAL BRANCH.....	127
JUDICIAL BRANCH.....	127
<i>E-Filing Project</i> .....	127
SYMBOLS .....	128