



Summary of Quarterly IT Project Reports

JULY/AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2016

Prepared by the
Enterprise Project Management Office
Published: August 2016

<http://www.oits.ks.gov/kito/epmo/summary-of-information-technology-project-status-reports>

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Quarterly Executive Summary Report

Active Projects (Project Cost - \$193,492,589)

9	Projects in Good Standing
4	Projects in Good Standing/Infrastructure
2	Projects in Caution Status
3	Projects in Alert Status
1	Projects in Recast
0	Cancelled Projects
2	Projects on Hold

21

Total Number of Projects

13 Projects are managed by a Kansas Certified Project Manager

17 Executive Branch Projects

4 Regents Projects

0 Judicial Projects

0 Legislative Branch Projects

21 Total Projects by Branches and Regents

Funding Source for Project Cost

(Does not include operational cost)

76% Federal Funds

24% Other Funds (Include State General Funds and all other Funding Sources)

New Planned Projects – For This Reporting Period (\$1,017,000)

Health and Environment, Kansas Department of (KDHE)

Replace I-Steps and Build ICIS-Air Data Flow to EPA (ICIS-AIR) – Project Cost: \$672,000

Labor, Kansas Department of (KDOL)

KDOL SAN Replacement 2016 – Project Cost: \$345,000

No New Approved Projects – For This Reporting Period

New Completed Projects – For This Reporting Period (\$6,463,506)

Information Technology Services, Office of (OITS)

Central Office KanWIN Core Refresh Project – Infrastructure – Project Cost: \$1,323,371

Kansas State University (KSU)

KSU Converged Infrastructure – Project Cost: \$5,140,135

ACTIVE PROJECTS TOTAL

\$193,492,589

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Page
EXECUTIVE BRANCH			
ADMINISTRATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF			
Active-New	SHARP PeopleSoft 9.2 HR/Payroll System – PeopleTools 8.55 Upgrade	\$1,247,692	8
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, KANSAS DEPARTMENT FOR (DCF)			
Approved	Child Support Services System Modernization	\$972,480	55
Approved	HB2015 Project	\$2,467,454	56
Planned	DCF Cloud Computing (DCC)	To Be Determined	61
Planned	DCF Enterprise Content Management Assessment (DECMA)	To Be Determined	62
Planned	DCF Mainframe Application Migration (DMAM)	To Be Determined	63
Planned	DCF Office 365 Implementation (DOI)	To Be Determined	64
CORPORATION COMMISSION, KANSAS			
Active	Ks Trucking Regulatory Assistance Network (KTRAN)	\$990,115	10
CORRECTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF			
Planned	Kansas Juvenile and Adult Correction System (KJACS)	\$17,000,000- \$22,000,000	65
EDUCATION, KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF			
ACTIVE-ALERT	KN-CLAIM System Replacement	\$1,381,163	12
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF			
ACTIVE-RECAST-ALERT	Ks Eligibility Enforcement System IV (KEES IV) Project	\$25,077,223	14
Active	KDHE/DHCF MMIS Modernization and Fiscal Agent Operations Takeover Services Reprocurement Project	\$91,054,801	18
Approved	eWIC Implementation Project	\$2,530,955	57
Planned-New	Replace I-Steps and Build ICIS-Air Data Flow to EPA (ICIS-AIR)	\$672,000	67
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES, KANSAS OFFICE OF			
Active-Caution	Executive Branch Electronic Mail Consolidation	\$9,747,325	21
ACTIVE-HOLD	Exec. Branch Tech. Modernization (EBTM) - Infra	\$23,167,842	23
ACTIVE-HOLD	Internet Upgrade FY 2015 - Infrastructure	\$2,361,834	25
Completed-New	Central Office KanWIN Core Refresh Project – Infrastructure	\$1,323,371	50
Completed	State Defense Building Fiber Infrastructure	\$1,299,879	50
INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF			
Active-New	Livescan Equipment Purchase Project - Infrastructure	\$304,781	27
Active	Security Arch. Modernization – Identity Access Mgmt. (SAM-IAM) - Infrastructure	\$1,223,094	28
Planned	Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement	\$625,000	68
KANSAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM			
ACTIVE-RECAST-	Kansas eCitation Project II	\$480,140	30

Department	Project Name	Project Cost	Page
LABOR, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF			
Active	KDOL Incarceration Database & Victim Notification Service	\$620,564	32
Active	KDOL Worker's Compensation Digitization Planning Project	\$583,620	34
Approved	KDOL Worker's Compensation Digitization Implementation Project	\$8,678,450	58
Planned-New	KDOL SAN Replacement 2016	\$345,000	71
REVENUE, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF			
Active	CDL Knowledge and Skill Testing System	\$469,960	35
Active	KanDrive	\$6,134,114	36
Completed	County Scanner and Signature Pad Refreshment – Infra	\$358,589	51
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF			
Active	Construction Mgmt System (CMS) Replacement – Implementation Effort	\$6,397,659	38
Active	K-Hub	\$4,871,957	40
Completed	Document Management System Replacement II	\$32,867	51
Completed	Construction Mgmt System (CMS) Replacement – Planning Effort	\$555,800	52
Completed	Coordinated Dispatch Software	\$658,702	52
Approved	Grant Tracking Software	\$379,703	59
Planned	Capital Inventory Management System (CPIN) Replacement	\$300,000 - \$600,000	72
Planned	Consumable Inventory Management System (CIMS)	\$300,000 - \$450,000	73
Planned	Equipment Management System (EMS)	\$600,000 - \$1,200,000	74
REGENTS			
FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY			
Active-Caution	FHSU ERP Implementation	\$11,563,378	42
KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF			
Active	Network Infrastructure Upgrade 2015-Infrastructure	\$4,003,600	44
Active	KUMC Security Infrastructure II – Infrastructure	\$2,568	45
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY			
Completed - New	KSU Converged Infrastructure	\$5,140,135	53
PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY			
ACTIVE-RECAST	PSU Oracle Cloud Implementation II	\$1,809,159	47
JUDICIAL BRANCH			
Completed	Judicial Branch (OJA) Electronic Filing Statewide Implementation	\$315,867	53

Introduction

This report is a summary of reports about 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 are approved by the respective branch Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO). The current CITO approved Detailed 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 and the Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT) Review of Active Projects Policy 2 - <http://oits.ks.gov/kito/itec/itec-policies>, projects are monitored on a quarterly basis.

JCIT Policy 2 establishes the following specific measures as the basis to evaluate project status. The measures below are addressed individually. However, when a project experiences problems the impact is often reflected in more than one measure. JCIT has determined 30% to be the threshold when a project should be stopped and recast.

JCIT Policy 2 Reference	JCIT Policy 2 Measurement	Primary Documentation used in Analysis	JCIT Policy 2 Condition
5.1 – Critical Path	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.
5.2 – Task Completion Rate	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.
5.3 – Deliverable Completion Rate	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.
5.4 – Issues		Top Five Issues	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.
5.5 Cost – Deviation from Financial Plan	10%-20% deviation from plan.	Transmittal Letter	The project will be considered in a yellow or caution status.
	20%-30% deviation from plan.	Transmittal Letter	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
	30% or more deviation from plan.	Transmittal Letter	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.
5.6 – Actual v Planned Resources	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.
5.7 – Risk		Top Five Risks	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 K.S.A. 79-7209.

ACTIVE PROJECTS SECTION

Projects in this section have received CITO approval of their Detailed Project Plan 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 (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.
Est. 3 Future Yrs. 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 including 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 identifies project financing by percentage of funding source.
Infrastructure	These are primarily hardware or software initiatives that do not involve system development work. They are the underlying foundation or basic framework of a system or resources.
On Hold Until	A significant event and or change. The agency head has asked the project be placed in a temporary hold status. The CITO has approved the request.
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 approved

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.

Project Report Assessments

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Administration, Kansas Department of

SHARP PeopleSoft 9.2 HR/Payroll System – PeopleTools 8.55 Upgrade

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	8/1/16	Project Manager: Sarah Gigous,
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/30/16	Connie Guerrero, Nancy Ruoff
Project Cost:	\$1,247,692	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$1,493,736	

Execution Project Cost:	\$1,197,501	Execution Cost To Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$719,371	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$478,130	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	8/1/16	Execution End:	6/27/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

SGF	5%
Accounting Services Recovery Fund	94%
State Buildings Operating Fund`	1%

Vendor

None Reported

The Oracle/PeopleSoft Human Capitol Management System (HCM) v9.1 software supporting the Statewide Human Resource and Payroll System (SHARP), will become unsupported by the vendor in September, 2017. 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. 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) 9.2 will mitigate these risks because the system will again be supported by the vendor, maintenance/development tools will use current technology and be supported. Both SHARP and the Statewide Management, Accounting, and Reporting Tool (SMART) will be upgraded to the latest PeopleTools release to ensure stability in the product. Another benefit of the project will be to reduce custom programming modifications which should result in reduced maintenance costs associated with those modifications over time. Upgrading the SHARP System will enhance workforce efficiency by the potential reduction of system customizations. In turn, this will reduce costs to maintain the system. In addition, the State of Kansas is currently under an Unlimited Licensing Agreement (ULA) with Oracle that ends November, 2017. It is in the best interest of the State of Kansas (SOK) to have the upgrade completed prior to the expiration of the ULA in order to have an accurate final database count going forward. Upon reaching v9.2 with this upgrade, all future updates/fixes/enhancements will be released by Oracle as PeopleSoft Update Manager (PUMs) throughout the year. Installation of PUMs is part of the SOK/Sierra-Cedar hosting agreement and included in our hosting contract.

Active-New

[Return to Index](#)

For the Reporting Period: The project received CITO detailed level approval on 8/30/16.

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

SHARP PeopleSoft 9.2 HR/Payroll System – PeopleTools 8.55 Upgrade (Continued)

Active-New

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$48,198		
Internal Cost:	\$40,198		
External Cost:	\$8,000		
Estimated Start:	8/1/16	Estimated End:	5/31/17

Execution

Subproject II – Analyze and Design

CITO Approval:	8/30/16		
Execution Cost:	\$337,160	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$128,315	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$208,845	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	8/29/16	Execution End:	2/7/17

Subproject III – Configure and Develop

CITO Approval:	8/30/16		
Execution Cost:	\$285,541	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$138,421	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$147,120	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	9/28/16	Execution End:	4/17/17

Subproject IV – Test and Train

CITO Approval:	8/30/16		
Execution Cost:	\$412,524	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$352,989	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$59,535	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	12/12/16	Execution End:	5/15/17

Subproject V – Deploy and Optimize

CITO Approval:	8/30/16		
Execution Cost:	\$151,146	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$99,646	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$51,500	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	4/28/17	Execution End:	6/15/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,993		
Internal Cost:	\$1,993		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	5/17	Estimated End:	6/17

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

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

Corporation Commission, Kansas (KCC)



Kansas Trucking Regulatory Assistance Network (KTRAN)

CITO High-Level Plan Approval: 10/17/13 Project Manager: Cathy Rinehart

CITO Revised High-Level Plan Approval: 1/3/14

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 1/8/14



Project Cost: \$990,115 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)

Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: \$90,000

Execution Project Cost: \$905,010 Execution Cost To Date: \$726,899

Internal Cost: \$430,363 Internal Cost to Date: \$299,157

External Cost: \$474,647 Execution Cost to Date: \$427,742

Execution Start: 1/13/14 Execution End: 1/31/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

KCC Comm. Vehicle Info. Sys. & Networks 100%

Vendor

None Reported

Active

KCC Motor carrier regulatory activities currently utilize a system comprised of disparate database tables and an Oracle Forms front-end. The current system also provides limited online functionality to the Kansas motor carrier community. Motor Carrier Division personnel use extensive manual and semi-automated procedures to accomplish multiple functions supporting KCC’s regulatory mission.

Two key areas of estimated cost savings in the form of carrier economic benefits have been identified in support of the KTRAN project. The first benefit area revolves around the concept of KTRAN providing a more efficient platform upon which Kansas motor carriers may do business with KCC. A second benefit area can be found in the costs avoided by potential motor carriers who utilize KTRAN to determine the feasibility of starting a carrier business in Kansas. In this case, potential carriers decide not to incur common start-up expenses. Each of these benefit areas are discussed in the next sections.

For the Reporting Period: The Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) Kansas Trucking Regulatory Assistance Network (KTRAN) project team completed the Correspondence module. The project team are developing and testing the following: Customer Account module for the motor carrier to apply for authority, Financial module that displays and accepts payments for fees, fines, civil assessments, and penalties, and the Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) module that will allow motor carriers to pay their UCR fees.

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

Project Stopped/Canceled.

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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 Trucking Regulatory Assistance Network (KTRAN) (Continued)

Active

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$82,292		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
External Cost:	\$82,292		
Estimated Start:	5/13	Estimated End:	1/14

Execution

Subproject I – Detailed Design

CITO Approval:	1/8/14		
Execution Cost:	\$342,875	Execution Cost to Date:	\$185,203
Internal Cost:	\$188,495	Internal Cost to Date:	\$58,799
External Cost:	\$154,380	External Cost to Date:	\$126,404
Execution Start:	1/13/14	Execution End:	7/2/15

Subproject II – System Development

CITO Approval:	6/9/15		
Execution Cost:	\$562,135	Execution Cost to Date:	\$541,696
Internal Cost:	\$241,868	Internal Cost to Date:	\$240,358
External Cost:	\$320,267	External Cost to Date:	\$301,338
Execution Start:	7/3/15	Execution End:	1/31/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$2,813		
Internal Cost:	\$2,813		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	2/17	Estimated End:	2/17

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Education, Kansas State Department of (KSDE)

KN-CLAIM System Replacement

A	CITO High-Level Approval:	8/7/14	Project Manager: Suzie Sebring
	CITO Detailed Level Approval:	11/17/14	
+	Project Cost:	\$1,381,163	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
	Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$203,747	

Execution Project Cost:	\$1,366,618	Execution Cost To Date:	\$803,794
Internal Cost:	\$242,698	Internal Cost to Date:	\$116,310
External Cost:	\$1,123,920	External Cost to Date:	\$687,484
Execution Start:	11/18/14	Execution End:	4/14/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	4/15/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	6/28/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	9/23/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	12/20/16

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

USDA Admin. Reviews and Training Grant	73%
USDA Direct Cert. Outstanding Perf. Award	18%
State Administrative Expense Fund	9%

Vendor

Dynamic Internet Solutions

Active-Alert

The Kansas Nutrition – Claims and Information Management (KN-CLAIM) system, used to collect data and process claims in all the child nutrition programs administered by Child Nutrition and Wellness (CNW) staff, was purchased in 2004 and is based within the now-obsolete class Active Server Pages (classic ASP) engine and Visual Basic 6 (VB6) runtime language. Primarily due to its inherent security flaws, inefficiencies, interpreted processing, component model and poor performance, class ASP is now obsolete technology. Microsoft discontinued mainstream support in March 2005, with final end of life in April 2008. The use of classic ASP and its necessary VB6 runtime-only files will be available only throughout the lifetime of Windows 7 client and 2008 R2 server in order to allow organizations time to redevelop their classic ASP application. Because classic ASP is obsolete and unchanging, there also exists an ongoing, compounding lack of resources and degrading skill set for support within the application development community.

It is essential that KN-CLAIM be rewritten in ASP.NET format so that child nutrition professionals and KSDE staff members have access to Microsoft-supported technology that includes crucial improvements to processing, performance and security. The upcoming release of the new federal guidelines for administrative review of school nutrition service administration further compounds the need to expand the functionality that exists in the current KN-CLAIM system, as KSDE staff members rely on KN-CLAIM to provide data to complete reviews. The need to replace KN-CLAIM with a Microsoft-supported .NET system also presents an opportunity to reduce administrative error among users by including functionality to eliminate redundant data collection, enhance reporting, improve workflow process, increase automation and allow for more effective data integration between programs.

[Return to Index](#)

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

KN-CLAIM System Replacement (Continued)

For the Reporting Period: Seven project deliverables were approved and accepted by CNW this past quarter, leaving four project deliverables and three technical documentation deliverables to complete by 12/31/16. A considerable increase in direct communication with the service provider has resulted in more productivity from them. The positive progress of the overall project has proven to be a great motivator for the service provider as well as for CNW.

Project Status: Project is in alert due to a schedule overrun of 49%

KN-CLAIM System Replacement (Continued)

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$13,640		
Internal Cost:	\$13,640		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	4/14	Estimated End:	11/14

Execution

CITO Approval:	11/17/14		
Execution Cost:	\$1,366,618	Execution Cost to Date:	\$803,794
Internal Cost:	\$242,698	Internal Cost to Date:	\$116,310
External Cost:	\$1,123,920	External Cost to Date:	\$687,484
Execution Start:	11/18/14	Execution End:	4/14/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	4/15/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	6/28/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	9/23/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	12/20/16

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$905		
Internal Cost:	\$905		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	4/16	Estimated End:	4/16

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER approved
-  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 and Environment, Kansas Department of (KDHE)

Kansas Eligibility Enforcement System IV (KEES IV)

<p>A</p>  <p>+</p>	<p>CITO Council High-Level Plan Approval: 9/30/10</p> <p>CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 2/10/12</p> <p>CITO KEES II Recast Plan Approval: 7/26/12</p> <p>CITO KEES III Recast Plan Approval: 9/29/14</p> <p>CITO KEES IV Recast Plan Approval: 4/29/15</p> <p>Project Cost: \$25,077,223</p> <p>Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$33,535,610</p> <p>Execution Project Cost: \$24,877,223</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Internal Cost: \$4,806,877</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">External Cost: \$20,070,346</p> <p>Execution Start: 1/1/15</p>	<p>Project Manager: Mike Wilkerson</p> <p>(Planning, execution and close-out)</p> <p>Execution Cost to Date: \$16,157,520</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Internal Cost to Date: \$3,583,951</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">External Cost to Date: \$12,573,569</p> <p>Execution End: 4/6/16</p> <p>Adjusted Execution End: 4/29/16</p> <p>Adjusted Execution End: 5/12/17</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Funding Source for Project Cost

State General Fund	16%
Health Resources & Services Administration	2%
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Svcs (90)	48%
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Svcs (75)	9%
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Svcs (50)	0%
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	13%
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program	5%
Adoption	0%
Low Income Energy Assistance Program	4%
Child Care	3%
Foster Care	0%

Vendor

Accenture, LLP – Project Management, Infrastructure, Application, Implementation

The Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Division of Health Care Finance (DHCF) received High-Level Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) project approval for the Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination (K-MED) Project on 7/6/11. On 8/30/11 KDHE-DHCF expanded the scope of the contract with Accenture to include the Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF) AVENUES Project. On 8/30/11 the State of Kansas re-named the combined K-MED and AVENUES project the Kansas Eligibility Enforcement System (KEES). While this is a single project it has multiple funding sources. In order to maintain continuity with historical documentation, project-related contracts, and previous official correspondence with Federal Partners providing funding through its Advanced Planning Document (APD), the medical eligibility scope (KDHE-DHCF) of KEES will be referred to as K-MED and other Health and Human Services eligibility (DCF) will continue to be referred to as AVENUES. K-MED will handle all insurance eligibility determinations, and also determine the appropriate source and ratio of federal, state, and individual funding, including any subsidy amounts that may be available for those who qualify. Eligibility for all Medicaid groups, Child Health Insurance

Active-Recast-Alert

[Return to Index](#)

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

Kansas Eligibility Enforcement System IV (KEES IV) (Continued)

Program (CHIP), and subsidized insurance will be integrated into one (1) eligibility system. An online application for all Medicaid, CHIP, and insurance programs is being procured as a part of K-MED as well as an online presumptive eligibility tool. K-MED will provide a single integrated portal so individuals applying for health coverage will be considered for all medical programs as prescribed by federal law. In addition to the above functionality, the overall architecture of KEES will be such that the entire system or its components can be reused by other programs and agencies. One example of potential reuse may occur when the state’s Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) is re-procured in 2015 – Kansas intends to use the eligibility system as the beneficiary sub-system rather than to rebuild or replace the current one. Functionality will have to be added later to accommodate these changes, but the system is being designed with this type of reusability in mind. Kansas is intentionally building a system other agencies and states can reuse in whole or in part to modernize the technology supporting human services programs. Kansas’ intent is to design and implement a system that will economize by reducing the number of redundant purchases for similar functionality and/or technology across state agencies. Kansas is even in discussions with other states about how they might be able to reuse this technology. KEES will play a large role in helping reduce costs associated with Medicaid and other state benefits by streamlining the eligibility determination phase of the process, which is essential in our efforts to improve health outcomes in Kansas. The state expects to realize significant savings from improved accuracy in determining eligibility for state medical, cash and food assistance programs. KEES will automatically cross-reference state and federal data sources to identify ineligible applicants. At the same time, the system will streamline service delivery for those who qualify.

KEES II -- The Kansas Department of Health and Environment, Division of Health Care Finance received high-level CITO project plan approval for the Kansas Medical Eligibility Determination (K-MED) Project on 7/6/11. Since receiving this approval several significant events have taken place in the state of Kansas that changed the scope of the K-MED project. These changes are noted: On 7/1/11, the KHPA, the state’s Medicaid agency, transitioned into the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) as the Division of Health Care Finance (DHCF). The merger was achieved through an executive reorganization order designed to create a more efficient state government and save Kansas taxpayers more than \$1 million the first fiscal year; on 8/9/11 Kansas returned a \$31.5 million “early innovator” grant it received from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in February 2011 in full. Consequently, money from that grant has been removed from this detailed budget and cost allocation in this re-submittal; on 8/29/11 KDHE-DHCF executed a contract with Accenture, LLP to implement K-MED; on 8/30/11 KDHE-DHCF expanded the scope of the contract with Accenture to include the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services AVENUES Project; on 8/30/11 the State of Kansas re-named the combined K-MED and AVENUES project the Kansas Eligibility Enforcement System (KEES). KEES is designed with the entire State of Kansas in mind. As the electronic front door to state services, this system will improve the eligibility process and identify significant savings for the state. The state expects to realize significant savings from improved accuracy in determining eligibility for state medical, cash and food assistance programs. On 7/1/12 SRS was re-named by executive order of the Governor as the Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF). KEES II is a multi-program system built using a Service Oriented Architecture and has received strong support from KDHE’s and DCF’s federal partners; The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), United States

Active-Recast-Alert

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER approved
-  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 Eligibility Enforcement System IV (KEES IV) (Continued)

Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). While this is a single project it has multiple funding sources. **KEES III** – KEES III will handle all insurance eligibility determinations, and also determine the appropriate source and ratio of federal, state, and individual funding, including any subsidy amounts that may be available for those who qualify. Eligibility for all Medicaid groups, CHIP, and subsidized insurance will be integrated into one eligibility system. An online application for all Medicaid, Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and insurance programs is being procured as a part of K-MED as well as an online presumptive eligibility tool. K-MED will provide a single integrated portal so that individuals applying for health coverage functionality, the overall architecture of KEES III will be such that the entire system or components of it can be reused by other programs and agencies. One example of potential reuse is that when the state’s Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) is re-procured in 2015, Kansas intends to use the eligibility system as the beneficiary sub-system rather than to rebuild or replace the current one. Functionality will have to be added later to accommodate these changes, but the system is being designed with this type of reusability in mind. **KEES IV** – KEES IV will continue the efforts begun in KEES III. Phases 2 (K-MED) and 3 (AVENUES) will be completed.

Kansas is intentionally building a system that other agencies and other states can reuse in whole or in part to modernize the technology supporting its human services programs. Kansas’ intent is to design and implement a system that will economize by reducing the number of redundant purchases for similar functionality and/or technology across state agencies and is even in discussions with other states about how they might be able to reuse this technology. KEES IV will play a large role in helping reduce costs associated with Medicaid and other state benefits by streamlining the eligibility determination phase of the process, which is essential in our efforts to improve health outcomes in Kansas. The state expects to realize significant savings from improved accuracy in determining eligibility for state medical, cash and food assistance programs. KEES IV will automatically cross-reference state and federal data sources to identify ineligible applicants. At the same time, the system will streamline service delivery for those who qualify.

<u>Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)</u>		<u>Actual expenditures (not cumulative)</u>
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System I	\$90,663,436	\$30,349,580
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System II	\$60,658,088	\$56,476,673
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System III	\$18,345,736	\$5,589,771

On 5/4/15, KDHE submitted revised documentation for expenditures incurred during KEES I-III. The amended numbers are as follows:

<u>Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)</u>		<u>Actual expenditures (not cumulative)</u>
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System I	\$90,663,436	\$41,301,633
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System II	\$60,658,088	\$66,707,834
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System III	\$18,345,736	\$5,689,771
Ks Eligibility Enforcement System IV	\$24,877,223	See Above Execution Costs

Active-Recast-Alert

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER approved
-  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 Eligibility Enforcement System IV (KEES IV) (Continued)

Project Gains

Ks Eligibility Enforcement System I: conducted Performance Testing for Phase 1; conducted Security Penetration Testing for Phase 1; completed load of Production software into Production Environment; completed Phase 1 Training; and finalized Phase 1 Post-Implementation User Support Guide.

Ks Eligibility Enforcement System II: completed Phase 2.5 Build. Finalized preparations for November go-live for Phase 2.6 Build. Began work on Phase 3 Build.

Ks Eligibility Enforcement System III: continued work on Phase 2.6 and Phase 3.

For the Reporting Period: Phase 3 Milestones for system build, data conversion, and system testing continue to be met by our vendor. Executive Leadership from KDHE, DCF and Accenture have completed a series of meetings to define, discuss and determine a consensus strategy for eliminating further delays. They have outlined and agreed to a consensus strategy. Project leadership from KDHE, DCF and Accenture are in the process of aligning project tasks and deliverables with this strategy and finalizing a revised project schedule. Once complete, this project schedule will form the basis for the KEES V recast which will be filed next quarter.

Project Status: Project is in Alert status due to a schedule overrun of 87% and a deliverable completion rate of 64%. Project is in the process of recasting the project plan.

Recast – KEES IV

CITO Approval:	4/29/15	Execution Cost to Date:	\$16,157,520
Execution Project Cost:	\$24,877,223	Internal Cost to Date:	\$3,583,951
Internal Cost:	\$4,806,877	External Cost to Date:	\$12,573,569
External Cost:	\$20,070,346	Execution End:	4/6/16
Execution Start:	1/1/15	Adjusted Execution End:	4/29/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	5/12/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$200,000	Estimated End:	4/16
Internal Cost:	\$150,000		
External Cost:	\$50,000		
Estimated Start:	7/15		

Active-Recast-Alert

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

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

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

KDHE/DHCF MMIS Modernization and Fiscal Agent Operations Takeover Services Reprocurement Project



CITO High-Level Approval: 9/11/14 Project Manager: Lou Ann Gebhards
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 2/29/16
 Estimated Project Cost: \$91,054,801
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost: \$117,444,136

Execution Project Cost:	\$85,337,714	Execution Cost to Date:	\$8,062,744
Internal Cost:	\$12,915,037	Internal Cost to Date:	\$183,953
External Cost:	\$72,422,677	External Cost to Date:	\$7,878,792
Execution Start:	3/1/16	Execution End:	12/13/19

<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>	<u>Vendor</u>
SGF	10%
Medicaid	90%

Active

The statutory mission of the KDHE-DHCF is to develop and maintain a coordinated health policy agenda that combines effective purchasing and administration of health care with health promotion oriented public health strategies. The powers, duties, and functions of the Department are intended to be exercised to improve the health of the people of Kansas by increasing the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of health services and public health programs. The proposed project will allow KDHE-DHCF to develop, enhance and implement an MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System) which is a critical cornerstone of KDHE’s overall vision of accessible quality health care services for Kansans at an affordable cost to the State. The modernized MMIS will support KDHE’s strategic plans for the increased use of health information technologies and emerging health care initiatives that will improve health care quality, effectiveness, and efficiencies in Kansas. KDHE wants to construct the modernized MMIS in such a way that it is modular and reusable. The Kansas Eligibility and Enforcement System (KEES) and the modernized MMIS will form the basis for the entire enterprise. The estimated project costs include estimated costs for consulting services supporting Internal Verification and Validation (IV&V) and a System Architect.

For the Reporting Period: The project is in the Execution phase for Stage 1, with the design and implementation of the first four modules (Customer Self Service Portal, Provider Management, Program Integrity and Data Warehouse), plus a portion of the fifth module (Dashboard reporting). KDHE has approved Stage 1 Requirement Validation Document and Business Design Document deliverables for these Stage 1 modules. The first Detailed System Design (DSD) iterations (there will be four for most of the modules) have also been approved for these modules, Design meetings are being held to work out more detail for some requirements. Requirement Validation review sessions began for Stage 2 modules (Claims, Financial, Managed Care, and KEES Integration). These are listed in detail on the Work Product Identification form ITECPMO2-06.

[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 approved | Reporting insufficient. |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period. | Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

KDHE/DHCF MMIS Modernization and Fiscal Agent Operations Takeover Services Reprocurement Project (Continued)

Active

For the Reporting Period (Continued): The Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V) vendor (Software Engineering Services) continues to provide monthly and quarterly reports. The first quarterly report was delivered at the end of April. A second quarterly on-site visit was held July 11 - 15, 2016 with delivery of the report at end of July. The third quarterly on-site visit occurred the first week of October.

PMO, Team Leads, Steering Committee, and Change Control Board continue to meet regularly. PMO and Team Lead meetings are weekly; Steering Committee and Change Control Board meet every other week.

After examination of planned testing time, it was decided that sixteen weeks of additional testing time was needed for Stage 1. This has resulted in a more than 10% extension of the schedule for that Stage 1. KDHE submitted a recast request to the ECITO on September 29 to reflect that schedule change. There has been no increase in budget.

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$1,041,272		
Internal Cost:	\$53,000		
External Cost:	\$988,272		
Estimated Start:	11/15	Estimated End:	8/16

Execution

Subproject I – Takeover and Operation Set-Up

CITO Approval:	2/29/16		
Execution Cost:	\$3,541,142	Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,555,272
Internal Cost:	\$590,190	Internal Cost to Date:	\$79,798
External Cost:	\$2,950,952	External Cost to Date:	\$1,475,474
Execution Start:	3/1/16	Execution End:	6/5/16

Subproject IIa – Stage 1 Development-Implementation

CITO Approval:	2/29/16		
Execution Cost:	\$27,121,201	Execution Cost to Date:	\$6,507,472
Internal Cost:	\$23,083,334	Internal Cost to Date:	\$104,155
External Cost:	\$4,037,867	External Cost to Date:	\$6,403,318
Execution Start:	3/11/16	Execution End:	6/23/17

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

KDHE/DHCF MMIS Modernization and Fiscal Agent Operations Takeover Services Reprocurement Project (Continued)

Active

Subproject IIb – Stage 2 Development-Implementation

CITO Approval:	5/16/16		
Execution Cost:	\$48,321,208	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$6,904,480	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$41,416,728	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	6/2/16	Execution End:	7/10/19

Subproject III – Fiscal Agent Certification and Operations

CITO Approval:			
Execution Cost:	\$5,811,088	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$1,382,500	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$4,428,588	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	4/4/16	Execution End:	12/13/19

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$4,675,815		
Internal Cost:	\$136,220		
External Cost:	\$4,539,595		
Estimated Start:	6/19	Estimated End:	12/19

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Information Technology Services, Office of (OITS)

Executive Branch Electronic Mail Consolidation

C	CITO High-Level Approval:	4/16/13	Project Manager: J.R. Growney	
	CITO Revised High-Level Approval:	7/22/15		
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	7/23/15		
	Estimated Project Cost:	\$9,747,325		
	Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost:	\$300,000		
	Execution Project Cost:	\$9,532,986	Execution Cost to Date:	\$6,016,443
	Internal Cost:	\$849,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$313,000
	External Cost:	\$8,683,986	External Cost to Date:	\$5,703,443
	Execution Start:	7/21/15	Execution End:	6/7/17
			Adjusted Execution End:	12/19/16
	<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
	Clearing Fund (OITS)	100%	AOS, AGS, Microsoft	

Active-Caution

Senate Bill 572 authorized the Chief Information Technology Architect (CITA) of the State of Kansas to evaluate the feasibility of information technology consolidation opportunities. From 6/1/10 to 10/1/10 the CITA facilitated meetings with state agency IT leaders regarding consolidation topics, researched other state governments' IT consolidation initiatives. The data obtained was analyzed and used to formulate a list of consolidation strategies and recommendations. Electronic mail was included in the list of recommendations:

The expected benefits from a consolidated state-wide email shared services are:

- Reduce the State’s email support costs with a single managed environment that is less expensive to maintain and support;
- Improve service levels for end users through high availability and disaster recovery capabilities;
- Consolidate specialized services into a smaller footprint requiring lower investment;
- Provide a single statewide address book;
- Provide consistent archival and message retrieval support, and
- Enable enhanced inter-agency and intra-agency collaboration

An Executive Branch committee recommended that Kansas should pursue a cloud-based electronic mail and collaboration system for all executive branch agencies. Kansas will be the 10th state to move to a cloud-based electronic mail system.

[Return to Index](#)

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

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Executive Branch Electronic Mail Consolidation (Continued)

For the Reporting Period: The necessary infrastructure to migrate the Departments of Agriculture, Aging and Disabilities, and Child and Families was completed. Migration of the Departments of Agriculture and Aging and Disabilities completed during the quarter. Department for Children and Families’ migration is on track to complete in July.

Simultaneously, the team has begun working with the next four agencies to prepare migrating during Q1FY17. These agencies are the Departments of Revenue, Labor, Transportation, and Health and Environment. The overall schedule is coming closer to the original baseline and with current trajectory the project should be ahead of schedule by the end of the next quarter.

Project Status: Project is in Caution due to a deliverable completion rate of 88%.

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$214,339		
External Cost:	\$214,339		
Estimated Start:	12/12	Estimated End:	8/15

Execution

Execution Cost:	\$9,532,986	Execution Cost to Date:	\$6,016,443
Internal Cost:	\$849,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$313,000
External Cost:	\$8,683,986	External Cost to Date:	\$5,703,443
Execution Start:	7/21/15	Execution End:	6/7/17
		Adjusted Execution End:	12/19/16

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	6/17	Estimated End:	8/17

Active-Caution

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER approved
-  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.

Information Technology Services, Office of (OITS) (Continued)

Active-Hold



Executive Branch Technology Modernization (EBTM) Project - Infrastructure

Formerly (OITS Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) Infrastructure)

**+
I**

CITO High-Level Approval: 9/23/13
 Revised CITO High-Level Approval: 7/14/15
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 8/6/15
 Estimated Project Cost: \$23,167,842
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost: \$9,592,963

Project Manager: Jennifer Busch
 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)

Execution Project Cost:	\$23,157,678	Execution Cost to Date:	\$16,950,215
Internal Cost:	\$322,566	Internal Cost to Date:	\$40,678
External Cost:	\$22,835,112	External Cost to Date:	\$16,909,537
Execution Start:	8/17/15	Execution End:	9/13/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	2/13/17
		On Hold Until:	6/30/16

Funding Source for Project Cost

Rates (OITS) 99%
 Overhead (OITS) 1%

Vendor

Alexander Open Systems (AOS)

The Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) Infrastructure project will acquire the hardware to host a shared service private cloud that will be owned, operated, and maintained by the Office of Information Technology Services. Agencies have been moving toward a more virtualized environment over the last decade. The next step in this transformation is for agencies to move to shared infrastructure. Over the course of the next 3-5 years, OITS will be transitioning all current agency run virtual hardware to this new shared infrastructure. OITS believes that the traditional model of agency maintained silos of infrastructure leads to added costs, support, and needless complexity in the State of Kansas’ technical architecture. Currently, with a few exceptions, State agencies select and manage their own infrastructure solutions and end-user applications. This includes separate hardware, software, maintenance fees, and technical staff to provide support at each agency. To add to the complexity, many agencies use different products within each of the product types, resulting in a large variety of solutions. The maintenance of these independent infrastructure environments is considered inefficient and not conducive to the modernization of Kansas IT infrastructure, nor widely sustainable.

OITS is partnering with AOS to provide: 1) The Kansas Private Government Cloud infrastructure (Kansas GovCloud), which shall be a converged infrastructure. Over the next three to five years this infrastructure will host the complete compute, storage, and networks needs for OITS agencies plus any additional growth. 2) Services for the implementation, deployment, and migration of existing logical systems onto the Kansas GovCloud infrastructure and all additional services.

[Return to Index](#)

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

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Executive Branch Technology Modernization (EBTM) Project (Continued)

For the Reporting Period: A request to place the EBTM project on hold effective 3/31/16, pending outcome of financial and scope reviews has been submitted. Active tasks not dependent on this review have been filed in a new project, KanWIN Core Refresh.

Active-Hold

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$10,164		
Internal Cost:	\$10,164		
Estimated Start:	10/12	Estimated End:	8/15

Execution

Execution Cost:	\$23,157,678	Execution Cost to Date:	\$16,950,215
Internal Cost:	\$322,566	Internal Cost to Date:	\$40,678
External Cost:	\$22,835,112	External Cost to Date:	\$16,909,537
Execution Start:	8/17/15	Execution End:	9/13/16
		Adjusted Execution End:	2/13/17
		On Hold Until:	6/30/16

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	9/16	Estimated End:	9/16

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Information Technology Services, Office of (OITS) (Continued)

Active-Hold



OITS Internet Upgrade FY 2015 - Infrastructure

CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	12/22/14	Project Manager: Jay Coverdale
Estimated Project Cost:	\$2,361,834	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost:	\$0	



I Execution Project Cost:	\$2,356,014	Execution Cost to Date:	\$933,326
Internal Cost:	\$35,520	Internal Cost to Date:	\$15,048
External Cost:	\$2,230,494	External Cost to Date:	\$918,278
Execution Start:	11/10/14	Execution End:	7/15/15
		Adjusted Execution End:	9/15/15
		On Hold Until:	9/30/16

Funding Source for Project Cost

OITS Fund	53%
OITS Depreciation Fund	47%

Vendor

AT&T, Cox Communications & AOS

The State of Kansas, Office of Information Technology Services, currently provides Internet services to all customers residing on the Kansas Wide Area Information Network (KanWIN). Current usage of the Internet service has exceeded available capacity resulting in degraded service to Agency Staff and applications. To address this issue the Internet Service Provider (ISP) circuits must be upgraded. Also, network equipment linking the ISP circuits to the KanWIN network must be replaced with new equipment that can support the increased capacity. Following the upgrade, new network management tools will be acquired to improve the management and reporting of internet consumption. A vacant FTE position will be filled to provide support, maintenance, and capacity planning for the new tools along with the other network management tools that have been unsupported internally due to the vacancy.

The infrastructure project will include contract services with established contract vendors to upgrade the internet circuits and acquire the necessary hardware and software. All State Agencies connected to the KanWIN network will benefit from this project by improved response time when researching information on the internet and also an increase in productivity (not quantified) resulting from improved Web application response time. This project will provide twice the bandwidth of the existing service, improved reliability from new network equipment, and improved security and management from new tools and feature/functionality. Savings will also be achieved during this project resulting from monthly reoccurring charge reductions from both ISP providers of the internet circuits. These reductions are archived by cost reductions occurring in the marketplace for Internet services.

For the Reporting Period: This project remains on hold for the review period awaiting funding to acquire the monitoring and utilization solution needed to analyze Internet traffic. At that time, the project will be recast.

Project Status: Project has been placed on hold. A recast will be required when the project resumes.

[Return to Index](#)

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

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

OITS Internet Upgrade (Continued)

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$900		
Internal Cost:	\$900		
Estimated Start:	10/14	Estimated End:	11/14

Execution

CITO Approval:	12/22/14		
Execution Cost:	\$2,356,014	Execution Cost to Date:	\$933,326
Internal Cost:	\$35,520	Internal Cost to Date:	\$15,048
External Cost:	\$2,320,494	External Cost to Date:	\$918,278
Execution Start:	11/10/14	Execution End:	7/15/15
		Adjusted Execution End:	9/15/15
		On Hold Until:	6/30/16

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$4,920		
Internal Cost:	\$4,920		
Estimated Start:	6/15	Estimated End:	8/15

Active-Hold

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Investigation, Kansas Bureau of

KBI Livescan Equipment Purchase – Infrastructure

CITO High-Level Approval:	2/29/16	Project Manager: Nicole Hamm	
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	8/26/16	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Project Cost:	\$304,781		
Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost:	\$0		
I Execution Project Cost:	\$304,781	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$304,781	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	8/15/16	Execution End:	11/14/16
<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
Nat'l Criminal History Improvement Program	99%	TBD	
Record Check Fee Fund	1%		

Active-New

This project will allow for the purchase to ten new livescan fingerprint machines for local agencies in the state of Kansas. Currently, there are several counties that do not currently have a livescan machines for criminal justice purposes. Additionally, there are many other counties who are operating under old, outdated technology with their livescan machines. In calendar year 2014, KBI received and processed 9,551 manual adult criminal fingerprint cards and 1,739 manual juvenile criminal fingerprint cards. Adding ten additional livescan machines would ensure that every county in the state has the ability to electronically capture fingerprints and palm prints. Purchasing these machines would allow for electronic fingerprint capture and will ensure that criminal history data is a collected quickly and more accurately. KBI would have the ability to receive and process approximately 12,000 criminal fingerprint submissions electronically with the purchase of these ten additional machines. The jurisdictions have established an automated fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) and are implementing procedures to ensure their AFIS is compatible with FBI Next Generation Identification standards.

For the Reporting Period: The project is currently on schedule to have all the machines placed by 11/14/16. However, this project will need recast as we have received additional grant funds to purchase 18 more livescan machines. We will begin that process in the coming quarter.

Planning - COMPLETED			
Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	12/15	Estimated End:	8/16
Execution			
CITO Approval:	8/26/16		
Execution Cost:	\$304,781	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$384,781	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	8/15/16	Execution End:	11/14/16
Close-Out			
Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	11/16	Estimated End:	12/16

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  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. |
| I Infrastructure Project |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). |
| P Project completed and PIER approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

[Return to Index](#)

Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (Continued)

Active



Security Architecture Modernization – Identity Access Management (SAM-IAM) – Infrastructure

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	1/12/15	Project Manager:	Laura Bohnenkemper
CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	5/23/16		
Project Cost:	\$1,223,094	(Planning, execution and close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$135,000		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,020,094	Execution Cost to Date:	\$514,221
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,020,094	External Cost to Date:	\$514,221
Execution Start:	6/9/16	Execution End:	4/24/17



<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>	<u>Vendor</u>
State General Fund (SGF)	1%
Traffic Records Coord. Council (TRCC) Grant	37%
National Hwy Traffic Safety Admin (NHTSA)	61%
State Traffic Records Enhancement Fund (TREF)	1%

The existing Kansas Criminal Justice Information Services (KCJIS) Security Architecture has been in place essentially unchanged since 1999. This architecture has been robust and strong enough to serve the needs of the KCJIS community and the nationwide law enforcement community (who have a need to access Kansas criminal justice information) over that time. While system upgrades and updates have occurred in the intervening years, the overall architecture has not changed.

With the assistance of a Justice Assistance Grant (JAG), the KBI and KCJIS began the process in SFY2013 of performing a Strategic Assessment of the KCJIS Security Architecture. This assessment was thorough and assisted in the development of a strategic plan, adopted by the KCJIS Committee and currently in the process of implementation in a phased approach. The assessment identified areas of opportunity and necessary adaptation for KCJIS.

Additionally, KCJIS is involved in several projects designed to improve or provide new information to its users when they are complete. These projects have necessitated an architecture change within KCJIS applications. While the current KCJIS Security Architecture may be sufficient to support the modified KCJIS application architecture, it is unknown to what extent updated security architecture could provide additional flexibility and opportunity for the KCJIS user base.

The overall management of user and user group rights to applications is performed by an Identity and Access Management (IAM) solution. Previously KCJIS has been limited in its ability to provide services and information to a wide range of user types due to limitations of its IAM solution. Furthermore, the implementation of new applications could be greatly streamlined and simplified with a stronger and more standards-based IAM solution. Local agency ease of use is a primary driver for this change as well.

The assessment, procurement/development, and deployment of a new IAM solution is a critical piece of the overall strategic plan laid out in the previously completed Strategic Assessment of the KCJIS Security Architecture.

[Return to Index](#)

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

Security Architecture Modernization Identity Access Management (SAM-IAM) (Continued)

Project Status: The project is in the beginning of the execution phase. The vendor has set up the development environment and is currently working on configurations in that environment. The project team is and will be reviewing the progress of the configuration and process creation every month from August to December 2016.

Active

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$203,000		
Internal Cost:	\$3,000		
External Cost:	\$200,000		
Estimated Start:	11/14	Estimated End:	6/16

Execution

CITO Approval:	5/23/16		
Execution Cost:	\$1,020,094	Execution Cost to Date:	\$514,221
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,020,094	External Cost to Date:	\$514,221
Execution Start:	6/9/16	Execution End:	4/24/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	4/16	Estimated End:	6/17

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS)

Kansas eCitation II

	CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	10/28/10	Project Manager: Gordon Lansford
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	3/3/11	
	CITO Recast II Plan Approval:	1/26/15	
	Project Cost:	\$480,140	(Planning, execution and close-out)
	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$30,000	

Execution Project Cost:	\$468,440	Execution Cost to Date:	\$69,495
Internal Cost:	\$96,381	Internal Cost to Date:	\$16,037
External Cost:	\$372,059	External Cost to Date:	\$53,458
Execution Start:	2/6/15	Execution End:	1/3/17
		Adjusted Execution End	2/3/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

State Traffic Record Fund	85%
National Highway Transportation Safety Administration Section 408 Grant	15%

Vendor

Analysts International Corporation

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 Coordinating 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. **Project received Subproject II Detailed Plan approval on 12/8/11. The adjusted costs removed Master Entity Index (MEI) costs from the project. This work is being performed in a separate project. **Recast:** Recast plan will complete the System Integration subproject of the original plan.

Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)

Kansas eCitation I	\$1,931,522
Kansas eCitation II	\$480,140

Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)

\$1,156,164
See above Execution Cost to Date

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
|  * Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Active-Recast-Alert

Kansas eCitation II (Continued)

Project Gains

Kansas eCitation I – Detailed design and core technology deployment completed. Production implementation and functional enhancements completed.

For the Reporting Period: As of the end of the quarter (9/30/16), the team has successfully engaged seven agencies, providing technical packages of information. With this information the agencies will begin developing test files.

Detailed design activities for the eCitation Manual Entry Portal have been completed during the quarter.

The team will continue to reach out to agencies to start technical engagement with the KBI staff. We expect to receive test data, and potentially live data to begin populating the repository, from several agencies during the upcoming quarter.

Project Status: Project is in Alert due to a deliverable completion rate of 71%.

Recast -- Corrected

CITO Approval:	1/26/15		
Execution Cost:	\$468,440	Execution Cost to Date:	\$69,495
Internal Cost:	\$96,381	Internal Cost to Date:	\$16,037
External Cost:	\$372,059	External Cost to Date:	\$53,458
Execution Start:	2/6/15	Execution End:	1/3/17
		Adjusted Execution End:	2/3/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$11,700		
Internal Cost:	\$2,700		
External Cost:	\$9,000		
Estimated Start:	1/17	Estimated End:	3/17

Active-Recast-Alert

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER approved
-  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

Labor, Kansas Department of (KDOL)

Active



KDOL Incarceration Database and Victim Notification Service (ID & VNS)

CITO High-Level Approval: 9/22/15 Project Manager: Wayne Dirks
 CITO Detailed-Level Approval: 3/24/16
 Estimated Project Cost: \$620,564 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost: \$1,629,000



Execution Project Cost:	\$620,564	Execution Cost to Date:	\$579,000
Internal Cost:	\$20,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$600,564	External Cost to Date:	\$579,000
Execution Start:	10/28/15	Execution End:	12/14/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

USDOL UI Automation Grant	97%
UI Operational Grant	3%

Vendor

Appriss, Inc.

Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claims and Incarceration:

Under unemployment regulations, unemployment insurance claimants cannot receive benefits while incarcerated. They must be able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work – this is not possible while incarcerated. Applying for unemployment benefits while in jail is an act of fraud. Catching such violations demands time-consuming cross-matching of records from dissimilar sources. KDOL’s unemployment division does not enjoy a fully automated process in identifying these attempts.

Victim Notification Services in Kansas:

Despite the growing use of automated victim notification systems, non-automated victim notification delivered by agency staff via phone, email, mail, or in person is still in use. Kansas does not have a statewide victim notification system which places the task of notification on victim’s advocates, sympathetic law enforcement agents, and the limited resources of agencies that may have been involved in a case. The Attorney General’s office, Kansas Sheriff’s Association and other Kansas Law enforcement agencies wish to provide a statewide victim notification service to alert citizens who want to know when an offender is released from incarceration.

For the Reporting Period: This project began execution on 10/28/15 with the detailed level plan not receiving CITO approval until 3/24/16.

Planned completion date is December 2017. All tasks are on schedule. There are no impediments to completing the project by December 2017.

[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 approved | Reporting insufficient. |

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

KDOL Incarceration Database and Victim Notification Service (ID & VNS) (Continued)

Active

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	10/15	Estimated End:	2/16

Execution

Execution Project Cost:	\$620,564	Execution Cost to Date:	\$579,000
Internal Cost:	\$20,000	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$600,564	External Cost to Date:	\$579,000
Execution Start:	10/28/15	Execution End:	12/14/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	12/17	Estimated End:	2/18

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Labor, Kansas Department of (KDOL) (Continued)



KDOL Worker's Compensation Digitization Planning Project

CITO High-Level Approval: 5/27/14 Project Manager: Sheryl Linton
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 12/11/14
 Project Cost: \$583,620 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: \$0

Execution Project Cost: \$535,821 Execution Cost to Date: \$537,839
 Internal Cost: \$79,800 Internal Cost to Date: \$61,476
 External Cost: \$456,021 External Cost to Date: \$476,363
 Execution Start: 1/6/15 Execution End: 9/30/16

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost Vendor
 Kansas Worker's Compensation Fee Fund 100% WorkComp Strategies LLC

Active

The current Worker's Compensation system is antiquated and consequently results in many inefficient manual, paper-driven processes. KDWC intends to create a paperless system that would improve customer service, reduce administrative costs, and increase operation efficiency. The future system will utilize a web-based user interface. This interface would improve access to the system and case management documents by creating a workflow management system of tasks and documents.

The primary objective of the development project is to create a paperless system. The goals of this paperless system would be to improve customer service, reduce administrative costs, and increase operational efficiency. This paperless system would utilize three tools: electronic transactions, web access, and digital storage.

For the Reporting Period: The DigiComp Project Team received approval to publish the RFP on 7/7/16. Bids have been received and the team is in the final process of vendor selection. DigiComp Team filed a change request to obtain additional consulting for assistance in developing an RFP for a backscan project with Steering Committee approval received on 8/12/16. The Steering Committee approved the change request for a maximum of 80 hours at \$207 per hour.

Planning - **COMPLETED**
 Estimated Project Cost: \$35,529
 Internal Cost: \$7,980
 External Cost: \$27,549
 Estimated Start: 4/14 Estimated End: 1/15

Execution Project Cost: \$535,821 Execution Cost to Date: \$537,839
Internal Cost: \$79,800 Internal Cost to Date: \$61,476
External Cost: \$456,021 External Cost to Date: \$476,363
Execution Start: 1/6/15 Execution End: 9/30/16

Close-Out
 Estimated Project Cost: \$12,270
 Internal Cost: \$3,990
 External Cost: \$8,280
 Estimated Start: 9/16 Estimated End: 9/16

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- Infrastructure Project
- Project completed and PIER approved
- 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, Kansas Department of (KDOR)



Commercial Driver Licenses (CDL) Knowledge and Skill Testing System Project

CITO High-Level Approval: 4/20/15 Project Manager: Sandra Bach

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 8/6/15



Estimated Project Cost: \$469,960 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)

Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost: \$0

Execution Project Cost: \$469,960 Execution Cost to Date: \$408,064

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

External Cost: \$469,960 External Cost to Date: \$408,064

Execution Start: 8/18/15 Execution End: 5/25/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

2013 CDL Grant Fund 100%

Vendor

Analysts International Corporation (AIC)

Active

The Division of Vehicles (DOV) intends to implement a solution for driver skill testing to be utilized in approximately thirty-four locations across the State of Kansas. The State's current system is paper based and does not have the functionality to meet all of the Division's needs and leaves the State's testing methods vulnerable to fraud and lack of control. Paper tests also have limited functionality in data tracking and therefore data such as duration of tests, final scores, what employee administered and scored the test is not as reliable or accessible for analysis as would be using all electronic testing equipment.

The goal of this project is to automate CDL skill tests, and in doing so follow the Governor's directive to move away from paper-based operations. Allowing more testing stations, quicker grading times and drastically reducing the probability of grader error is in line with the Kansas Strategic Information Management Plan to promote citizen access, information sharing and improved government performance.

For the Reporting Period: The testing of all development work and ADA compliance requirements for this software solution has been completed by the developer. Test Scripts are close to being developed in preparation for User Acceptance testing. Development of Custom Reports has been completed.

Planning – Completed

Estimated Project Cost: \$0

Estimated Start: 6/14 Estimated End: 8/15

Execution Project Cost: \$469,960 Execution Cost to Date: \$408,064

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

External Cost: \$469,960 External Cost to Date: \$408,064

Execution Start: 8/18/15 Execution End: 5/25/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost: \$0

Estimated Start: 5/17 Estimated End: 6/17

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

Project Stopped/Canceled.

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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.

Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR) (Continued)



KanDrive

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 11/4/15 Project Manager: Herb Clark
 Project Cost: \$6,134,114 (Planning, execution and close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$895,000

Execution Project Cost:	\$6,123,725	Execution Cost to Date:	\$3,969,314
Internal Cost:	\$1,910,286	Internal Cost to Date:	\$597,665
External Cost:	\$4,213,439	External Cost to Date:	\$3,371,649
Execution Start:	5/1/15	Execution End:	12/27/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

DMV Mod Fund 2390 100%

Vendor

Allied Global Services, Inc.

Active

KDOR is in the process of replacing its old, mainframe systems responsible for driver licensing for the entire state. The vehicle system is one of KDOR’s most critical public safety systems and must be available for law enforcement 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and 365 days a year. The system scheduled for replacement is the Kansas Driver’s License System (KDLS).

The KanDrive Project’s initial focus will be to stand-up the current KDLS legacy mainframe system functionality into a web-based .Net environment along with a SQL Server relational database on the back end. The lift from the .Net and DQL technologies will greatly enhance and improve the business processes of issuing licenses and managing driver records. The use of newer technologies will also improve usability and allow for greater ease to access the system data for reporting needs ongoing and ad-hoc.

For the Reporting Period: The KanDrive project is on schedule to have the application developed and unit tested by end of December 2016. Our KanDrive Card Vendor MorphoTrust deployment team has established timelines to implement KanDrive integration, a new card design and new hardware/software field office refresh.

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

Project Stopped/Canceled.

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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.

KanDrive (Continued)

Active

Planning - COMPLETED			
Estimated Project Cost:	\$120		
Internal Cost:	\$120		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	5/15	Estimated End:	9/15

Subproject I

CITO Approval:	11/4/15		
Execution Cost:	\$4,764,613	Execution Cost to Date:	\$3,969,315
Internal Cost:	\$1,145,097	Internal Cost to Date:	\$597,665
External Cost:	\$3,619,516	External Cost to Date:	\$3,371,649
Execution Start:	5/14/15	Execution End:	11/22/16

Subproject II

CITO Approval:	11/4/15		
Execution Cost:	\$1,359,112	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$765,189	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$593,923	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	11/1/16	Execution End:	12/27/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$10,269		
Internal Cost:	\$7,669		
External Cost:	\$2,600		
Estimated Start:	12/17	Estimated End:	12/17

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)



Construction Management System (CMS) Replacement Project – Implementation Effort

CITO High-Level Approval: 4/4/16 Project Manager: Lanny Campbell/Javier Zarazua
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 4/28/16
 Estimated Project Cost: \$6,397,659 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: \$571,500

Execution Project Cost: \$6,391,779 Execution Cost-To-Date: \$312,442
 Internal Cost: \$1,515,624 Internal Cost-To-Date: \$57,225
 External Cost: \$4,876,155 External Cost-To-Date: \$255,217
 Estimated Execution Start: 5/9/16 Estimated Execution End: 4/14/21

<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>	<u>Vendor</u>
State Highway Fund (SHF) 84%	Info Tech
Federal Hwy Admin (FHWA) Accelerated Innovative Deployment (AID) Grant 16%	

Active

KDOT is seeking to replace its current CMS system in order to lower future support costs and minimize the risk of system downtime as a result of technology failure. KDOT is seeking a solution that has low implementation and maintenance costs and allows for technology and business process improvements to be achieved readily. KDOT has a relatively stable business environment that has a low demand for business transformation. As a result, the direction the analysis led us was to consider and ultimately select a Commercial-Off-The-Self (COTS) solution to address our needs.

KDOT decided to implement AASHTOWare Project Construction and Materials™ to replace its legacy CMS system. This solution goes well together with KDOT’s other AASHTOWare modules we are currently using for Preconstruction and Civil Rights.

For the Reporting Period: The project completed several tasks during the time period including holding several onsite meetings with Info Tech in August and September to review and finalize the data mapping document for the project. In Addition, the data migration process began in Subproject I and Info Tech has completed the migration of the Reference Data. Migration preparation is proceeding with Construction and Materials data on the new environment.

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER approved
- 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.

Construction Management System (CMS) Replacement Project – Implementation Effort (Continued)

Active

Planning – COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Internal Cost:	\$0		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	7/15	Estimated End:	5/16

Execution

Subproject I – Kick Off and Workshops

CITO Approval:	4/28/16		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,879,157	Execution Cost to Date:	\$312,442
Internal Cost:	\$476,874	Internal Cost to Date:	\$57,225
External Cost:	\$1,402,283	External Cost to Date:	\$255,217
Execution Start:	5/9/16	Execution End:	4/14/21

Subproject II – Workshops and Configuration

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,687,334	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$229,419	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,457,915	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	10/23/17	Execution End:	2/7/19

Subproject III – Configuration, Testing and End User Documentation

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,264,612	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$194,055	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,070,557	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	2/8/19	Execution End:	1/29/20

Subproject IV – Pilot, End User Training and Production

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Project Cost:	\$1,566,556	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$615,276	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$951,280	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	1/30/20	Execution End:	4/14/21

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$5,880		
Internal Cost:	\$5,880		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	4/21	Estimated End:	5/21

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Transportation, Kansas Department of (Continued)



K-Hub

CITO High-Level Approval: 7/29/15 Project Manager: Mary Beth Pfrang
 Revised High-Level Approval: 5/23/16
 CITO Detailed-Level Approval: 6/13/16
 Estimated Project Cost: \$4,871,957 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: \$2,985,156



Execution Project Cost: \$4,408,818 Execution Cost-To-Date: \$60,113
 Internal Cost: \$593,052 Internal Cost-To-Date: \$7,890
 External Cost: \$3,815,766 External Cost-To-Date: \$52,223
 Execution Start: 7/15/16 Execution End: 11/2/20

Funding Source for Project Cost

KDOT Budget 80%
 Federal Hwy Admin (FHWA) Accelerated Innovative Deployment (AID) Grant 20%

Vendor

Transcend

Active

Today Kansas has over 140,000 miles of roadway making Kansas third in the nation in terms of public road miles. This road network includes over 10,500 miles of federal and state highways, coupled with over 130,000 of non-state highways that cover 105 counties and 627 cities. The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) is tasked with the responsibility of planning, building and maintaining a statewide transportation system that meets the needs of Kansas. A statewide transportation system provides the basis for KDOT's Strategic Management Plan.

Crucial to KDOT's mission, the Bureau of Transportation Planning maintains the Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) through the bureau's Geospatial Information Systems (GIS) group. The current CANSYS II database houses Kansas road network information and went through the last major upgrade in 1999/2000. The K-Hub project is an opportunity to develop a combined statewide geospatially enabled roadway and transporting data management system that allows KDOT to efficiently meet current and future business requirements. The scope of K-Hub includes: replacement of the current CANSYS II database; installation of new user interfaces; development of customized reports and data output routines; development of customized interfaces to KDOT and external business areas; and deployment of mobile and distributed data entry capabilities.

Project Status: K-Hub Detailed Project Plan approval was received 6/13/2016. Since that time the vendor and agency project teams have been fully engaged in project execution activities. Two, multi-day, onsite requirements gathering meetings have helped both the vendor and agency team understand system requirements and future capabilities. Weekly project status meetings have proved successful in identifying issues, discussing risks and aligning KDOT resources to support scheduled activities. The planned quarterly deliverables for quarter end 09/30/16 were accomplished ahead of schedule. The Iteration 1 Data Migration Plan has been drafted and presented to the KDOT team for review, ahead of schedule. The project continues to progress ahead of schedule.

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

Project Stopped/Canceled.

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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

K-Hub (Continued)

Planning - COMPLETED

Estimated Project Cost:	\$446,350		
Internal Cost:	\$50,000		
External Cost:	\$396,350		
Estimated Start:	10/14	Estimated End:	7/16

Execution

Subproject I – R&H COTS Implementation 1 & 2 / System Interfaces

CITO Approval:	6/13/16		
Execution Cost:	\$1,046,852	Execution Cost to Date:	\$60,113
Internal Cost:	\$137,397	Internal Cost to Date:	\$7,890
External Cost:	\$909,455	External Cost to Date:	\$52,223
Execution Start:	7/15/16	Execution End:	12/21/17

Subproject II – R&H COTS Implementation 3 / System Interfaces / SLD

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Cost:	\$1,380,645	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$185,286	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,195,359	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	12/8/17	Execution End:	5/6/19

Subproject III – Custom Modules / System Interfaces

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Cost:	\$1,315,277	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$183,804	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,131,473	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	4/13/18	Execution End:	10/28/19

Subproject IV – System Interface Development 2

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Cost:	\$666,044	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$86,565	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$579,479	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	10/11/19	Execution End:	11/2/20

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$16,789		
Internal Cost:	\$1,789		
External Cost:	\$15,000		
Estimated Start:	7/16	Estimated End:	8/16

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

REGENTS

Fort Hays State University (FHSU)

FHSU Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Implementation

C	CITO High-Level Approval:	6/10/15	Project Manager:	Jackie Ruder
	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	12/9/15		
+	Project Cost:	\$11,563,378	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)	
	Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost:	\$3,564,420		
	Execution Project Cost:	\$11,553,378	Execution Cost-To-Date:	\$3,818,781
	Internal Cost:	\$773,054	Internal Cost-To-Date:	\$252,598
	External Cost:	\$10,780,324	External Cost-To-Date:	\$3,566,182
	Execution Start:	11/30/15	Execution End:	7/23/18
	<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>		<u>Vendor</u>	
	China Partnership	100%	Workday	

Active-Caution

The Fort Hays State University Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Implementation project seeks to increase operational efficiencies and support university growth through incorporation of modern information technology facilitating centralized data and streamlined processes. For this objective to be realized FHSU must replace aging legacy systems which are nearing end-of-life in terms of both support and the scalable functionality required to meet the fluctuating needs of twenty-first century higher education.

For the Reporting Period: Three of five project lifecycle phases are 100% complete on schedule (Planning, Architect, Configure and Prototype). The overall status of the two subprojects is currently in a Yellow (Caution) status due to those projects falling behind schedule in the fourth project lifecycle phase, Testing. A discussion of a potential subproject extension is presently under consideration by FHSU Leadership.

Project Status: Project has improved the deliverable completion rate to 100% moving the project out of Alert status. The project remains in Caution status with a task completion rate of 88%.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost:	\$10,000		
Internal Cost:	\$10,000		
External Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	8/12	Estimated End:	11/15

Subproject I – HR/Payroll

CITO Approval:	12/9/15		
Execution Cost:	\$1,816,237	Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,533,588
Internal Cost:	\$146,880	Internal Cost to Date:	\$84,199
External Cost:	\$1,669,357	External Cost to Date:	\$1,449,389
Execution Start:	11/30/15	Execution End:	1/24/17

[Return to Index](#)

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

FHSU ERP Implementation (Continued)

Active-Caution

Subproject II – Financials

CITO Approval:	12/9/15		
Execution Cost:	\$1,709,838	Execution Cost to Date:	\$1,533,588
Internal Cost:	\$146,880	Internal Cost to Date:	\$84,199
External Cost:	\$1,562,958	External Cost to Date:	\$1,449,389
Execution Start:	11/30/15	Execution End:	1/3/17

Subproject III – Student Wave I-Admissions and Recruiting

CITO Approval:	12/9/15		
Execution Cost:	\$2,151,680	Execution Cost to Date:	\$715,158
Internal Cost:	\$146,880	Internal Cost to Date:	\$63,150
External Cost:	\$2,004,800	External Cost to Date:	\$652,008
Execution Start:	1/11/16	Execution End:	8/29/16

Subproject IV – Student Wave II-Curriculum Management, Financial Aid, Student Records

CITO Approval:	12/9/15		
Execution Cost:	\$2,151,680	Execution Cost to Date:	\$36,447
Internal Cost:	\$146,880	Internal Cost to Date:	\$21,050
External Cost:	\$2,004,800	External Cost to Date:	\$15,397
Execution Start:	7/11/16	Execution End:	10/31/17

Subproject V – Student Wave III-Academic Advising and Student Financials

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Cost:	\$2,151,679	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$146,880	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$2,004,799	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	8/15/17	Execution End:	6/1/18

Subproject VI – Post-Production Support

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested		
Execution Cost:	\$1,521,607	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$38,652	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$1,482,955	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	6/4/18	Execution End:	6/29/18

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	7/18	Estimated End:	7/18

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER approved
- 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 Medical Center, University of (KUMC)



KUMC Network Infrastructure Upgrade 2015 Project– Infrastructure

CITO High-Level Approval: 11/17/15 Project Manager: Steve Selaya/Bob Pisciotta
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 12/16/15
 Project Cost: \$4,003,600 (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$0



Execution Project Cost: \$4,003,600 Execution Cost-To-Date: \$3,408,149
 Internal Cost: \$0 Internal Cost-To-Date: \$0
 External Cost: \$4,003,600 External Cost-To-Date: \$3,408,149
 Execution Start: 1/4/16 Execution End: 10/5/16

Funding Source for Project Cost

SGF 100% Vendor Cisco

Active

The purpose of this project is to upgrade all campus network infrastructure to allow for gig connectivity to the desktop. It also includes replacing end of life equipment as the majority of the current network infrastructure is 5+ years old. There is also a component to remove network bandwidth constraints and restrictions to ensure all users can take advantage of higher network speeds regardless of building or floor location. The current switches do not provide enough bandwidth for our users and lack adequate PoE (power over Ethernet) capability. This project will address these issues by replacing approximately 340 data networking switches located in all of our campus buildings. These switches will also be compatible with a future network design as we would like to deploy a 40-100 gigabit Ethernet backbone in a few years. This upgrade will also allow us to provide gigabit Ethernet capabilities to the desktop to all areas on campus.

For the Reporting Period: The project will be wrapping up the access layer upgrades soon. Plans have been started to hold a “Lessons Learned” session in November and prepare a PIER for submission in December. The project is on schedule across the board.

Planning - **COMPLETED**

Estimated Project Cost: \$0
 Estimated Start: 10/15 Estimated End: 12/15

Execution

CITO Approval: 12/16/15
Execution Cost: \$4,003,600 Execution Cost to Date: \$3,408,149
Internal Cost: \$0 Internal Cost to Date: \$0
External Cost: \$4,003,600 External Cost to Date: \$3,408,149
Execution Start: 1/4/16 Execution End: 10/5/16

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost: \$0
 Estimated Start: 10/16 Estimated End: 11/16

[Return to Index](#)

- Meeting targeted goals.
- Project Stopped/Canceled.
- Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- Infrastructure Project
- Project completed and PIER approved
- 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 Medical Center, University of (KUMC) (Continued)



KUMC Security Infrastructure II- Infrastructure

CITO High-Level Approval: 11/17/15 Project Manager: John Godfrey/Daniel Cox
 CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 12/16/15
 CITO Recast II Plan Approval: 8/18/16
 Project Cost: \$2,568 (Est. planning, execution and closeout)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$990,000

Execution Project Cost: \$2,568 Execution Cost-To-Date: \$2,568
 Internal Cost: \$0 Internal Cost-To-Date: \$0
 External Cost: \$2,568 External Cost-To-Date: \$2,568
 Execution Start: 9/5/16 Execution End: 1/20/17

<u>Funding Source for Project Cost</u>	<u>Vendor</u>
SGF	100% M&S Technologies

Active

This project is designed to help KUMC implement the most appropriate hardware and software infrastructure (the solution) for its requirements as part of an initial installation, as a migration, or an upgrade from an existing installation. The solution to be implemented will enable the organization to meet the following high-level requirements: compliance with common federal regulatory requirements; compliance with common State of Kansas laws and regulatory requirements (Information Technology Executive Council policies); compliance with common industry best practices; meet or exceed industry best practices for an Information Security infrastructure; and a solution that will easily allow for flexibility, interoperability, and growth or expansion across an expected five (5) year minimum lifecycle. **KUMC Security Infrastructure II:** This project is designed to help KUMC implement the most appropriate hardware and software infrastructure (the solution) for its requirements as part of an initial installation, as a migration, or an upgrade from an existing installation. The solution to be implemented will enable the organization to meet, at a minimum, the following high-level requirements: compliance with common federal regulatory requirements: FERPA, HIPAA, FDA Part 21, GLBA, SOX, DMCA, Export Control, ITAR, FISMA, and others; compliance with common State of Kansas laws and regulatory requirements (Information Technology Executive Council policies); compliance with common industry best practices: PCI DSS, NIST 800 Series, FIPS compliance, CIS Benchmarks, etc.; meet or exceed industry best practices for an Information Security infrastructure; and a solution that will easily allow for flexibility, interoperability, and growth or expansion across an expected five (5) year minimum lifecycle.

Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)

KUMC Security Infrastructure I \$2,851,710
KUMC Security Infrastructure II \$2,568

Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)

\$2,852,565
See Above Execution Costs

For the Reporting Period: Our project recast indicated three unfinished tasks; one of which has been completed since the recast. Currently, this project recast is on track for both cost and schedule. With the schedule still dependent on vendor availability, we are cautiously optimistic this recast will be completed on schedule.

[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 approved | Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

KUMC Security Infrastructure II – Infrastructure (continued)

Project Gains

KUMC Security Infrastructure I: project completed planning and design for four out of the seven primary tasks. The project was recast due to schedule change required due to vendor availability.

Active

Recast – KUMC Security Infrastructure II - Infrastructure

CITO Approval:	8/18/16		
Execution Cost:	\$2,568	Execution Cost to Date:	\$0
Internal Cost:	\$0	Internal Cost to Date:	\$0
External Cost:	\$2,568	External Cost to Date:	\$0
Execution Start:	9/5/16	Execution End:	1/20/17
Close-Out			
Estimated Project Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Start:	1/17	Estimated End:	4/17

[Return to Index](#)

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

Pittsburg State University (PSU)

PSU Oracle Cloud Implementation II



(Formerly PS Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP))

CITO High-Level Approval: 9/3/13

Project Manager: Barbara Herbert

CITO Detailed Plan Approval: 8/17/15



CITO Recast II Plan Approval: 6/27/16

Project Cost: \$1,809,159

(Est. planning, execution and closeout)



Est. 3 Future Yrs of Operational Cost: \$654,000

Execution Project Cost \$1,809,159

Execution Cost-To-Date: \$527,602

Internal Cost: \$130,956

Internal Cost-To-Date: \$39,908

External Cost: \$1,678,203

External Cost-To-Date: \$487,694

Execution Start: 6/13/16

Execution End: 8/31/17

Funding Source for Project Cost

General Fees Fund 100%

Vendor

Oracle Cloud Services

Active-Recast

The core enterprise system at PSU is a UniVerse database written in UniVerse Basic language. The original system was built in 1984. There have been many successes over the years; however, with the advances in technology, we have a system that is outdated and fragile. After much consideration, the university leadership is in agreement that a stable, industry-standard solution that allows for advancement in the areas of emerging technologies and data integrity needs to be identified.

The Pittsburg State University (PSU) Oracle Cloud Project will implement solutions for Finance (ERP), Human Capital Management (HCM) and Planning and Budget (PBCS). These systems comprise the core of the administrative system for the University.

Recast: PSU will be replacing two core systems (ERP and HCM). The remaining core system, which will not be replaced at this time, is our SIS (Student Information Services). As can be imagined, these three systems have a high degree of interaction and integration. We also have numerous third-party products that communicate with our core systems. It will be critical that core processes be modified during the Oracle Cloud implementation for continuity of service to our campus and users.

Planned Overall Cost (cumulative)

PSU Oracle Cloud Implementation I - \$2,254,563

PSU Oracle Cloud Implementation II - \$3,014,837

Actual Expenditures (not cumulative)

\$1,205,676

See above Execution Cost to Date

For the Reporting Period: The Oracle Cloud Implementation Project II is moving forward as planned. Sub-Project #1 is completed. Sub-Project #2, Implementing ERP (Finance) was scheduled for go-live on 10/1/16. Training of campus users is complete and the cutover plan is in process to transition to the new system, GUS Finance and GUS Procurement. Sub-Project #3, Introduction to HCM, has completed the first round of testing and is preparing for running several parallel payroll processes beginning mid-October.

[Return to Index](#)

Meeting targeted goals.

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

Project Stopped/Canceled.

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

Project completed and waiting for PIER.

Project on hold.

I Infrastructure Project

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

P Project completed and PIER approved

Reporting insufficient.

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

PSU Oracle Cloud Implementation II (Continued)

Recast

Subproject II – Complete ERP Implementation

CITO Approval: 6/27/16
Execution Cost: \$242,136
Internal Cost: \$19,949
External Cost: \$222,187
Execution Start: 6/13/16

Execution Cost to Date: \$182,794
Internal Cost to Date: \$19,949
External Cost to Date: \$162,845
Execution End: 10/17/16

Subproject III – Implementation of HCM

CITO Approval: 6/27/16
Execution Cost: \$682,274
Internal Cost: \$46,483
External Cost: \$635,791
Execution Start: 6/13/16

Execution Cost to Date: \$344,808
Internal Cost to Date: \$19,959
External Cost to Date: \$324,849
Execution End: 2/10/17

Subproject IV, V & VI

CITO Approval: 6/27/16
Execution Cost: \$884,749
Internal Cost: \$64,524
External Cost: \$820,225
Execution Start: 1/16/17

Execution Cost to Date: \$0
Internal Cost to Date: \$0
External Cost to Date: \$0
Execution End: 8/31/17

Close-Out

Estimated Project Cost: \$0
Internal Cost: \$0
External Cost: \$0
Estimated Start: 9/17

Estimated End: 9/17

Active-Recast

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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.

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.

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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.

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Information Technology Services, Office of (OITS)

Central Office KanWIN Core Refresh Project - Infrastructure

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	3/28/16	Project Manager: Jay Coverdale \Jennifer Busch
	Project Cost:	\$1,323,371	
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$1,298,714	
	Execution Start:	8/17/15	Execution End: 7/1/16
			PIER Approved: 9/19/16

The KanWIN Core Refresh Project is comprised of scope and tasks previously part of the Executive Branch Technology Modernization (EBTM) Project. While EBTM undergoes financial and scope reviews, the scope in the KanWIN Core Refresh Project has been identified as necessary to implement regardless of the EBTM review. Therefore, this separate project is being filed to allow the continuation of those tasks while EBTM is put on hold. The project includes implementation of upgraded networking and security infrastructure components, including a refresh of the KanWIN core routing, upgrade of Optical Networking System, and replacement of aging security hardware and outdated licenses.

Completed

Information Technology Services, Office of (OITS)

State Defense Building Fiber Project – Infrastructure

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	6/26/15	Project Manager: Jay Coverdale/Jennifer Busch
	Project Cost:	\$1,299,879	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$1,184,380	
	Execution Start:	7/1/15	Execution End: 2/22/16
			PIER Approved: 8/8/16

The State Defense Building Fiber Project ran two redundant paths of fiber optic cable to the State Defense Building on Topeka Boulevard, which was to be a new data center and State employee location. The infrastructure included services from established contract vendors to perform the task of boring and trenching to lay conduit for pulling fiber underground to the State Defense Building, and various agency locations along the two paths.

[Return to Index](#)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">  Meeting targeted goals.  Project Stopped/Canceled.  Project completed and waiting for PIER. I Infrastructure Project P Project completed and PIER approved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED

Revenue, Kansas Department of (KDOR)

County Scanner and Signature Pad Refreshment – Infrastructure

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	1/28/16	Project Manager:	Donnita Thomas
	Project Cost:	\$358,589	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$326,842		
	Execution Start:	3/7/16	Execution End:	8/5/16
			PIER Approved:	8/8/16

The objective of this project was for KDOR to refresh desktop scanners and signature pads at each county treasurer office. Scanners and signature pads were last purchased in 2011 and 2012 respectively and were reaching the end of their product life cycle.

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)

Document Management System Replacement II

P	CITO Recast II Plan Approval:	11/24/15	Project Manager:	Steve Locke
	Project Cost:	\$32,867	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)	
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$34,497		
	Execution Start:	11/30/15	Execution End:	1/4/16
			PIER Approved:	2/1/16

The objectives of the effort involved acquisition of a replacement Enterprise Document Management System to be accessed daily by approximately 70 users and available to nearly 1800 internal KDOT users across the state and an unknown number of public users.

Completed

[Return to Index](#)

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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.

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

Construction Management System (CMS) Replacement Project – Planning Effort

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	10/15/15	Project Manager: Lanny Campbell/ Javier Zarazua
	Project Cost:	\$555,800	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
	Execution Start:	11/6/15	Execution End: 4/1/16
			Lessons Learned Received: 5/16/16

The current Construction Management System (CMS) was custom developed in the mid-1980s. This application consists of a Contract Management System and a Materials Test System which is used in keeping with Federal guidelines and in support of agency construction projects. The CMS application is currently on an architectural platform that is sun-setting and is becoming increasingly difficult and expensive to support and upgrade. In addition, KDOT is looking for opportunities to integrate CMS information with other applications. KDOT business requirements and processes have also changed over the years. This system has undergone modifications but the design has remained the same. New data requirements and business rules continually evolve requiring workarounds for the system. The CMS is utilized across the state in all KDOT offices and locations. A replacement for CMS would allow KDOT to address new business needs and allow the agency to further the integration of core management information systems. This project will be divided into two parts. The first part will involve this Planning Effort. The Planning effort will deliver the Feasibility Study Report, the High Level Plan for Implementation, the Detailed Project Plan for Implementation and the Requirements Analysis Study. The second project will follow and will concentrate solely on the Implementation Phase.

Completed

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

Coordinated Dispatch Software

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	2/16/16	Project Manager: Cory Davis/Steve Locke
	Project Cost:	\$620,896	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$658,702	
	Execution Start:	2/29/16	Execution End: 7/1/16
			PIER Approved: 8/8/16

The new technology allows the transit agencies to improve their level of service by more efficiently allocating and dispatching their resources. The technology also allows these agencies to better manage their operations and costs by providing them with real time data and metrics to support their decisions. The scope of the project was to install the “base” system which includes both hardware and the vendor software in the vehicles of the agencies.

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER approved
- 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.

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED

Judicial

Office of Judicial Administration

Judicial Branch Electronic Filing Statewide Implementation Project

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	3/18/15	Project Manager: Steve Berndsen
	Project Cost:	\$315,867	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$296,950	
	Execution Start:	3/26/15	Execution End: 4/26/16
			PIER Approved: 8/8/16

This project completed the installation of electronic filing statewide in Kansas. Software licenses were installed in the District Courts per the project schedule. Training of court staff and filers occurred as the licenses were installed across the state. Various stakeholders participated in the project including the judges and court staff, attorneys, information technology professionals, and administrative staff. Documents are now submitted to the court in electronic format using the electronic filing system.

Completed

Regents

Kansas State University

KSU Converged Infrastructure

P	CITO Detailed Plan Approval:	6/17/14	Project Manager: Ashley Wondra
	Project Cost:	\$5,140,135	(Est. planning, execution and closeout)
	PIER Final Project Cost:	\$5,307,630	
	Execution Start:	6/23/14	Execution End: 9/13/16
			PIER Approved: 10/28/16

The objective of the project is to replace the central campus production computer and storage systems and build a disaster recovery site off campus. These components are essential to university operations and have reached or exceeded their end of service lifecycles. Consolidating these systems will result in decreased operational costs, improved systems reliability, and a reduction in administration overhead. The decreased operational costs directly impact the K-State Data Center by using less power and the reliability of K-State systems will be improved by gaining redundant hardware in multiple locations. Additionally, there will be a reduction in administrative overhead due to the automation of work that is currently being done manually. Lastly, the equipment is at end-of-life and is starting to fail. This results in increased maintenance costs to care for the failing equipment and increased staff time to troubleshoot those issues instead of working on new initiatives.

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER approved
- 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

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 or vendor selection phase. 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 the agency submits a detailed project plan, has it approved by the appropriate CITO and begins 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. The trigger date is an event (i.e. hardware/software purchase and or installation, code development, etc). This date remains an estimate until the execution phase begins.
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.
Est. 3 Future Yrs. 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.

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project

P Project completed and PIER approved

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.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Children and Families, Kansas Department for (DCF)

Child Support Services System (CSSS) Modernization Planning Project

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	9/26/2013		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$972,480	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$0		
Estimated Execution Start:	3/26/14	Estimated Execution End:	7/28/15

Funding Source for Project Cost

SGF	34%
Federal Match	66%

The CSSS Modernization Planning Project will generate the feasibility study required by DCF management to determine the most cost effective means to meet the needs of CSS program objectives. Should DCF management elect to pursue a new system, based on the results of this study, this project will also generate the documentation required for State and Federal approval of the CSSS Modernization Project to implement a new system. In this regard, the CSS Modernization Planning project, by itself, will have no immediate or independent payback and could result in not choosing to pursue as a larger, much more costly, Modernization project.

Project Status: A vendor for the CSSS Modernization planning effort has been selected and contract negotiations completed. The contract was submitted to the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) on June 9, 2016 for approval. Following Federal approval, DCF will initiate CITO Detailed Plan development.

Approved

Return to Index

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER approved
-  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

Children and Families, Kansas Department for (DCF) (Continued)

HB2015 Project

CITO High-Level Plan Approval:	6/19/14		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$2,467,454	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$16,578		
Estimated Execution Start:	7/3/14	Estimated Execution End:	7/1/15

Funding Source for Project Cost

Social Welfare Fund	34%
Federal Match	66%

This project is to modify the DCF KAECSES-CSE (Department for Children and Families, Kansas Automated Eligibility Child Support Enforcement System -Child Support Enforcement) to include non IV-D Child Support collections which are currently being handled by the firm of Young Williams through their management of the Kansas (Child Support) Payment Center.

This work effort is required by Kansas House Bill 2015. This will allow for all Child Support cases (Title IV-D of the Social Security Act and Non-Title IV-D) to be created and stored in one central location.

The child support collections will be distributed pro-rata over all child support debtor’s orders.

This work is also required by Federal law mandating the creation of a Federal Case Registry containing all Child Support cases (IV-D and non IV-D) that are issued or modified as reported to the State Case Registry.

KAECSES-CSE will be modified to include non IV-D Child Support information in the database, provide for interfaces with the Kansas Payment Center and district courts as required, modify user interfaces and provide additional reporting functionality to support the non IV-D activities.

For the Reporting Period: Tasks associated with this project remain on hold. DCF Executive Management continues to examine its long term IT strategy and determine the correct prioritization of its short term IT initiatives to achieve its primary objectives with the current funds available.

Approved

[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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Health and Environment, Kansas Department of (KDHE)

eWIC Implementation Project

Table with 4 columns: Metric, Value, Description, Date. Rows include CITO High-Level Approval (2/17/16), Estimated Project Cost (\$2,530,955), Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost (\$2,627,589), and Estimated Execution Start/End (11/28/16 to 6/8/18).

Funding Source for Project Cost

Table with 2 columns: Source, Percentage. Rows include USDA Nutrition Services and Administrative (11%) and USDA Technology Funds (89%).

The purpose of this project is to move the Kansas Woman, Infants and Children (WIC) Program from issuing client’s food benefits on paper checks to an electronic benefit transfer (eWIC) process. In December 2010, the Health Hungry-free Kids Act was signed into law, which mandates that all states implement eWIC by October 2020.

The move to eWIC includes issuance of benefits; client’s redemption of the benefits at WIC authorized grocery stores and settlement procedures to insure fiduciary integrity. Project deliverables will include specific implementation activities, services, hardware and materials.

For the Reporting Period: The High Level Plan received CITO approval on 2/17/16. Our contract is currently at USDA under review; their comments are due back by 9/9/16. Once that is completed, we can move forward. The detailed plan will be submitted after the schedule has been received from the contractor.

Approved

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals. (Green smiley)
Project Stopped/Canceled. (Red circle)
Project completed and waiting for PIER. (Yellow star)
Infrastructure Project (Purple I)
Project completed and PIER approved (Black P)
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). (Black C)
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). (Red A)
Project on hold. (Black inverted triangle)
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). (Blue plus)
Reporting insufficient. (Black minus)

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

Labor, Kansas Department of (KDOL)

KDOL Worker’s Compensation Digitization Implementation Project

CITO High-Level Approval:	6/3/16		
Estimated Project Cost:	\$8,678,450	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)	
Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost:	\$1,575,000		
Estimated Execution Start;	12/12/16	Estimated Execution End:	1/10/19

Funding Source for Project Cost

KS Div. of Worker’s Comp Fee Fund	100%
-----------------------------------	------

The State of Kansas has a traditional workers’ compensation program, requiring employers to insure workers’ compensation coverage for their employees, who receive benefits, including medical treatment and income replacement benefits, for workplace accidents and diseases, regardless of fault. In exchange for these benefits, workers are barred from bringing tort lawsuits against their employers and co-workers for their injuries. In lieu of insurance, employers can apply to become self-insured, or can join a group self-insured risk pool.

Most Kansas workers are covered by workers’ compensation - provided they work for an employer that has an annual payroll of more than \$20,000; agricultural employers are exempt from coverage. Such employers may elect to come under the workers’ compensation laws, however. Similarly, sole proprietors, partners, limited liability company members, and certain unpaid volunteers are not covered unless they elect to do so. Conversely, employees who own more than 10% of the stock of a corporation may elect out of coverage.

The overall purpose of the Kansas workers’ compensation program can be summarized as follows:

- Ensure accident prevention and workplace safety programs are adopted across Kansas
- Ensure workers have a straightforward and certain remedy for workplace injuries
- Ensure employers have a predictable cost for the risk of covered workplace injuries
- Ensure injuries are dealt with quickly and efficiently, minimizing lost time from work
- Ensure workers’ compensation laws are administered fairly and without bias
- Keep administrative costs low

In fulfilling this purpose, the Division’s functions can be outlined as follows:

- Collect, store, and publish information
- Ensure adequate insurance coverage
- Establish allowable medical services
- Resolve disputes
- Investigate and prosecute fraud
- Monitor safety programs

To fulfill its business requirements, KDWC utilizes a variety of technologies and systems. The core information system, Biltmore, is outdated and organized around an inefficient and inflexible data model, utilizes manual status updates based on numerous action codes, and is not integrated with other systems, such as the imaging system and various other databases. History and audit tracking is not well supported.

Approved

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
|  * Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Transportation, Kansas Department of

Grant Tracking Software (GTS)

CITO High-Level Approval: 4/27/16
 Estimated Project Cost: \$379,703 (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. Of Operational Cost: \$162,702

Estimated Execution Start; 7/1/16 Estimated Execution End: 10/28/16

Funding Source for Project Cost

Nat'l Hwy Traffic Safety Admin Grant 99%
 Traffic Records Enhancement Fund 1%

The Traffic Safety Office is working to secure software to administer more than 200 federal grants. The project will enable potential grantees to electronically submit grant proposals, electronically approve grant requests, electronic submission of reimbursement vouchers and electronic submission of activity. This new system will enable staff to have a single point of entry to view all contract documents. Federal reporting will also be streamlined through an online submission of activity reports.

For the reporting period: The High Level Plan received CITO approval on 4/27/16.

Approved

[Return to Index](#)

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
-  Infrastructure Project
-  Project completed and PIER approved
-  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 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.
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost	Three future years of operational/maintenance/ongoing costs after the project is completed.
CITO Project Determination	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.

-  Meeting targeted goals.
-  Project Stopped/Canceled.
-  Project completed and waiting for PIER.
- I** Infrastructure Project
- P** Project completed and PIER approved

- 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

PLANNED PROJECTS
EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Children and Families, Kansas Department for (DCF)

DCF Cloud Computing (DCC)

Table with 2 columns: Metric (CITO Approval, Estimated Project Cost, etc.) and Value (Not Yet Requested, To Be Determined, etc.)

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost
To Be Determined

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): The Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) infrastructure project will lead to savings in a number of different ways.

DCF is planning this project to coordinate its resources and activities in support of the Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) Infrastructure project.

E-Government: This project will have the same E-Government elements as the Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) Infrastructure project.

Technical Architecture: This project will have the same technical architecture elements as the Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) Infrastructure project.

Project Description and Scope: The scope for this project essentially mirrors the Kansas Private Government Cloud (Kansas GovCloud) Infrastructure project, but is limited to DCF tasks, activities and responsibilities.

Project Status: HS EBIT is primarily undertaking this effort in support of the Kansas Private Cloud Infrastructure project that was rebranded as the Executive Branch Technology Modernization (EBTM) Project.

This project will be removed from future Quarterly Reports.

- Meeting targeted goals.
Project Stopped/Canceled.
Project completed and waiting for PIER.
Infrastructure Project
Project completed and PIER approved
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
Return to Index

Children and Families, Kansas Department for (DCF) (Continued)

DCF Enterprise Content Management Assessment (DECMA)

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined	(Est. plan, exec, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Close-Out End:	To Be Determined	
CITO Project Determination:	12/22/14	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

To Be Determined

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): DCF is a large State agency with more than 2,500 employees distributed across the state, in more than 35 offices, administering State and Federal programs for Child Support, Economic and Employment, Protection and Prevention and Vocational Rehabilitation for the most vulnerable citizens of Kansas. This size and diversity of our programs provides for a wide range of content management requirements. Currently, DCF is predominately supported by paper processes. Due to the complexity of the agency and its content needs, it is critical that DCF have a comprehensive content management solution.

DCF is planning this project to analyze its current business and technical requirements for a DCF enterprise content management solution and identify a strategic roadmap for implementation of that solution. This assessment will examine the current technical solutions, business processes and requirements to transition from our current paper-driven process to a comprehensive electronic enterprise content management solution.

E-Government: The E-Government elements of this project will be determined as a comprehensive list of requirements are gathered, analyzed and finalized by DCF management.

Technical Architecture: The technical architecture for this project will be determined as part of the scope of the project.

Project Description and Scope: This scope for this project is to analyze DCF current business and technical requirements for a DCF enterprise content management solution and identify a strategic roadmap for implementation of that solution.

Project Status: This project currently remains on hold pending ECITO strategic decisions regarding direction for Enterprise Content Management for the State as a whole. As a result, HS EBIT is requesting this effort be removed from being reported as a planned project effort until ECITO strategic decisions have been reached.

This project will be removed from future Quarterly Reports.

Planned

[Return to Index](#)

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

Children and Families, Kansas Department for (DCF) (Continued)

DCF Mainframe Application Migration (DMAM)

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined	(Est. plan, exec, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Close-Out End:	To Be Determined	
CITO Project Determination:	12/22/14	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

To Be Determined

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): DCF operations primarily depend on legacy mainframe-based computer systems. DCF faces potentially significant increases to the cost of its mission-critical operations due to the rising costs associated with maintaining and supporting these mainframe computer systems and the State’s strategic decision to move away from mainframe-based computing.

DCF is planning this project to retire the remainder of its mainframe legacy systems following the Kansas Eligibility and Enforcement (KEES) project implementation. DCF’s goal is to migrate the entirety of its systems from the current mainframe environment to another more current and cost-effective platform. With this migration, DCF intends to change the underlying technology only, not the functionality of the system. Fundamental business rules/processes will not change. Once migration to a new platform is complete, DCF plans future subsequent modernization projects to align the systems with current and future business needs.

E-Government: The project is limited in scope to only replacing the underlying technology and will have only E-Government functionality already present in the current DCF applications.

Technical Architecture: The technical architecture for this project will be determined as a part of the scope of the project.

Project Description and Scope: The scope for this project is to migrate the DCF mainframe legacy systems to another more current and cost-effective platform. It will include all programs with legacy mainframe systems remaining after KEES goes live.

Project Status: This project currently remains on hold pending ECITO strategic decisions regarding the ongoing maintenance and operation of the State’s mainframe. As a result, HS EBIT is requesting this effort be removed from being reported as a planned project effort until ECITO strategic decisions have been reached.

This project will be removed from future Quarterly Reports.

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Children and Families, Kansas Department for (DCF) (Continued)

DCF Office 365 Implementation (DOI)

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	To Be Determined	(Est. plan, exec, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Close-Out End:	To Be Determined	
CITO Project Determination:	12/22/14	

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

To Be Determined

Project Business Objective(s) or Motivator(s): Senate Bill 272 authorized the Chief Information Technology Architect (CITA) of the State of Kansas to “evaluate the feasibility of information technology consolidation opportunities”. From June 6, 2010 to October 1, 2010, CITA facilitated meetings with State agency IT leaders regarding consolidation topics. It also researched other state governments’ IT consolidation initiatives and had discussions with IT experts with Forrester and Gartner. Careful analysis of the information gathered led to the formulation of a list of consolidated strategies and recommendations. Electronic mail was one of the leading recommendations resulting from this analysis: The State should consolidate into one email solution for all Executive Branch agencies. The project should occur regardless of any other IT consolidation strategy.

DCF is planning this project to coordinate its resources and activities in support of the Statewide Email Consolidation project.

E-Government: This project will have the same E-Government elements as the Statewide Email Consolidation project.

Technical Architecture: This project will have the same technical architecture elements as the Statewide Email Consolidation project.

Project Description and Scope: The scope for this project essentially mirrors the Statewide Email Consolidation project, but is limited to DCF tasks, activities and responsibilities.

Project Status: HS EBIT has completed O365 migration for DCF and KDADS Topeka Offices and DCF Field Offices. KDADS State Hospitals are currently projected to complete in the first or second quarter of 2017. HS EBIT is undertaking this effort in support of the Statewide O365 Implementation and will not meet separate ECITO project reporting requirements. As a result, HS EBIT is requesting this effort be removed from being reported as a planned project effort. HS EBIT will continue to support OITS efforts as requested and perform tasks assigned and directed by the overall project.

This project will be removed from future Quarterly Reports.

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| * Updated key information, occurring after this report period. |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Corrections, Kansas Department of (KDOC)

Kansas Juvenile and Adult Correction System (KJACS)

Previously Titled: “Total Offender Activity and Documentation System / Offender Management Information System (TOADS/OMIS)”

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$17,000,000-\$22,000,000*	(Est. plan, exec, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	\$3,000,000*	
Estimated Planning Start:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Close-Out End:	To Be Determined	
CITO Project Determination Date:	11/5/07	
CITO Project Determination Updated:	1/20/15	

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/Juvenile Applications 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. OMIS originated from a purchased package acquired approximately 35 years ago and TOADS was developed approximately 15 years ago. The three main juvenile systems are currently being combined into one. However, that new system will be lacking in several key areas including reentry and risk reduction. Having juvenile and adult information together in one system will allow for our users to see a person’s full history and allow for more informed decisions in the case management process. The new system will permit us to create and leverage a robust data model enabling us to enhance our analytical capabilities while adhering to new federal Extensible Markup Language (XML) standards for communications with other criminal justice agencies. It will also be more efficient to use by the agency as well as enable KDOC to realize added functionality. When implemented, the system will provide the lowest possible level of annual recurring costs while enhancing public safety.

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. This new system will be completely mapped to the new Extensible Markup Language (XML) standard defined by the federal government which is designed to facilitate communications between all criminal justice agencies.

Planned

[Return to Index](#)

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

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Corrections, Kansas Department of (KDOC) (Continued)

Kansas Juvenile and Adult Correction System (KJACS) (Continued)

Previously Titled: “Total Offender Activity and Documentation System / Offender Management Information System (TOADS/OMIS)

Technical Architecture: This project will leverage web and relational database technologies permitting 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. Original Project Determination Letter was dated 11/5/07. Updated Project Determination Letter provided on 1/20/15.

Planned

[Return to Index](#)

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

Health and Environment, Kansas Department of (KDHE)

Replace I-Steps and build ICIS-Air data flow to EPA (ICIS-Air)

Table with 2 columns: Item and Value. Items include CITO Approval, Estimated Project Cost, Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost, Estimated Planning Start, Estimated Close-Out End, and CITO Project Determination.

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

EPA Exchange Network Grant, Air Fee & Fines Fund

* 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): Since the late 1990s, KDHE has used the I-Steps database to manage permitting, compliance, enforcement and emissions inventory data.

E-Government: One application that is slated to be replaced with this implementation allows construction permits to be applied for online.

Technical Architecture: Infrastructure will be comprised of an external cloud hosted server environment consisting of a physical web, application, and database server.

Project Description and Scope: Replace I-Steps, thirteen external databases, and develop an ICIS-Air data flow to EPA utilizing current server platforms and latest software features.

Project Status: Planning and Design Phase

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals. Project Stopped/Canceled. Project completed and waiting for PIER. Infrastructure Project. Project completed and PIER approved. 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.

Investigation, Kansas Bureau of (KBI)

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	
Estimated Close-Out End:	To Be Determined	
CITO Project Determination:	9/24/07	

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 of 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: A needs assessment is planned for FY17. A Task Proposal Request has been sent to the relevant state contract vendors for assistance with this assessment. On completion of the assessment, a high level project plan will be developed.

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Labor, Kansas Department of (KDOL)

KDOL Data Management and Data Analytics (ITSC DMDA)

Table with 2 columns: Metric and Value. Rows include CITO Approval (Not Yet Requested), Estimated Project Cost (\$1,550,000*), Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost (\$900,000*), Estimated Planning Start (1/2/17), Estimated Close-Out End (6/30/18), and CITO Project Determination (11/8/16).

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

Federal grants. Specifically, federal-fiscal year (“FFY”) 2013 and FFY 2014 supplemental budget request funds (“SBR”) made available by the United States Department of Labor for “activities that support the prevention and detection of UI improper benefit payments, improve state performance, and address outdated Information Technology system infrastructures. See Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 13-14.

* 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): Unemployment Insurance (“UI”) is a joint state-federal program. The program is federally funded and administered by states who must conform and comply with requirements of federal law. Further, states must meet federal performance mandates and standards. A key area of emphasis for UI performance is “integrity.” Integrity is the ability of states to properly pay valid UI claims to authentic claims. To this end, the federal government has provided SBR opportunities to the states to enhance integrity performance. The objective of this project is to enhance KDOL’s integrity initiatives through an improvement in UI-related data quality and the subsequent deployment of data analytics tools. The data quality work encompassed by this project has a dual objective and benefit of facilitating future efforts to modernize KDOL’s outdated UI information technology infrastructure.

E-Government: Not applicable

Technical Architecture: Install Business Intelligence (BI) reporting layer for portals, dashboards, reporting capabilities. Install a Data integration (DI) layer for movement of all data for internal and external interactions. Install Name, Address, and Contact (NAC) Data quality products for real time and batch data quality checks/updates on this data. Some of these capabilities could be used by other agencies but most other agencies have comparable BI and DI capabilities already. Customer related agencies could utilize the NAC products. There will be GIS data for address location and minimal GIS reporting tools used. Special Security constraints will require the overall solution to be IRS 1075 Compliant for protection of personal and privacy information. This will allow KDOL to move forward with Real-time and predictive analytics.

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals. (Green smiley)
Project Stopped/Canceled. (Red circle)
Project completed and waiting for PIER. (Yellow star)
Infrastructure Project (Purple I)
Project completed and PIER approved (Black P)
Caution - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 10 percent). (Black C)
Alert - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 20 percent). (Red A)
Project on hold. (Black inverted triangle)
Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by more than 30 percent). (Blue plus)
Reporting insufficient. (Black circle with slash)
Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology (Pink plus)

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

KDOL Data Management and Data Analytics (ITSC DMDA) (Continued)

Project Description and Scope: (1) Perform data management/integration-type activities with the end objective creating, persisting, and refreshing a single, cleansed, high quality, system of record data store that is fed by multifarious current KDOL UI production data bases. One outcome of this activity will be to better position KDOL for full UI IT System Modernization; the second outcome is to enable a quality data repository in which UI Integrity and Fraud analytics and reporting can be executed. (2) Using the data store created above and a contractor-provided Business Intelligence suite of tools enhance KDOL’s current integrity related discovery and case investigation automation capabilities, and augment with pattern discovery, predictive analysis and ranking high risk potential fraud. KDOL require additional data matching capabilities and data enrichment capabilities to provide further insight into integrity analysis as well as normal benefit adjudication processes. An overall outcome expected from this effort is reducing fraud prior to payments being improperly distributed by KDOL.

Project Status: ITSC is acquiring design and development resources, tool vendors, and other project relevant services before starting the execution phase.

Planned

[Return to Index](#)

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

Labor, Kansas Department of (KDOL)

SAN Replacement 2016

Table with 2 columns: Item and Value. Items include CITO Approval, Estimated Project Cost, Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost, Estimated Planning Start, Estimated Close-Out End, and CITO Project Determination.

Anticipated Funding Source for Project Cost

State \$1,630, Federal \$179,000, Fee Fund \$147,000, Office Budget \$18,000

* 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): Our current SAN hardware is over 5 1/2 years old. The manufacturer (X-IO) has ended all production and our support will end Feb. 2017.

E-Government: Not applicable

Technical Architecture: Production Site (LSOB): 12 VMware hosts, 2 fiber switches (being replaced as part of this project), existing rack.

Project Description and Scope: Project will acquire, install, and make operational the KDOL's storage-area network (SAN) hardware.

Project Status: SAN has been acquired and delivered. Installation and configuration will start 10/10/16.

Planned

Return to Index

- Meeting targeted goals. Project Stopped/Canceled. Project completed and waiting for PIER. Infrastructure Project. Project completed and PIER approved. 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.

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT)

Capital Inventory Management System (CPIN) Replacement

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$300,000-\$600,000*	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	SFY 2016	
Estimated Close-Out End:	SFY 2017	
CITO Project Determination Date:	9/25/08	
CITO Project Determination Updated:	1/12/15	

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): The current Capital Inventory system was custom developed in the mid-1980s. 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 a issue for continued development and KDOT business requirements have changed significantly. This system has undergone several modifications but the design has remained unchanged. New data requirements and business rules continually evolve requiring workarounds for the system. This Capital Inventory system would allow KDOT to address new business needs and allow the agency to expose 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 will be designed to provide a solution for KDOT agency wide. It has interfaces with multiple KDOT systems and those interfaces will also be addressed to ensure that existing functionality is maintained.

Project Status: Planned. This project is a part of the Application and Architecture Review / Refresh Program (AARP). The original Project Determination Letter was dated 9/25/08. Updated Project Determination Letter provided on 1/12/15.

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

Consumable Inventory Management System (CIMS)

CITO Approval:	Not Yet Requested	
Estimated Project Cost:	\$300,000-450,000*	(Est. planning, execution, close-out)
Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost:	To Be Determined	
Estimated Planning Start:	SFY 2015	
Estimated Close-Out End:	SFY 2016	
CITO Project Determination:	9/25/08	
CITO Project Determination Updated:	1/12/15	

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): The current Consumable Inventory system was custom developed in the mid-1980s. The software technology (VSAM, CICS, COBOL) utilized to build this application 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. This system is utilized across the state in all KDOT offices and locations. Implementing a new system would allow KDOT to upgrade systems to address changing 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 is to replace the existing twenty-five (25) year old Consumable Inventory system which is responsible for maintaining inventory locations, stock item descriptions, process receipt issues and transfers. This system would be designed to provide a solution for KDOT’s storekeeper’s agency wide. This legacy system has interfaces to multiple KDOT systems including Crew Card. Interfaces will be addressed to ensure that existing systems maintain functionality.

Project Status: An effort has gotten underway this quarter to try a tool that develops documentation and can optionally convert code from the mainframe environment into code that can be utilized in a .NET environment. This is not intended to be a rewrite or development of a replacement for the Consumable Inventory Management System but simply a prototype effort to convert to a new environment which retains the current business processes. Results from this effort will influence whether this approach will be taken with our other AARP conversions.

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

Transportation, Kansas Department of (KDOT) (Continued)

Equipment Management System (EMS)

CITO Approval: Not Yet Requested
 Estimated Project Cost: \$600,000-\$1,200,000* (Est. planning, execution, close-out)
 Est. 3 Future Yrs. of Operational Cost: To Be Determined
 Estimated Planning Start: SFY 2017
 Estimated Close-Out End: SFY 2019
 CITO Project Determination: 1/12/15

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): The EMS system was developed around 1980 utilizing internal staff resources for programming and system development. The current system has many capabilities but also has many limitations. The Shop Management System (SMS) and the Equipment Preventive Maintenance System (EPMS) might be considered subsystems of EMS since they interact closely together. All three systems are located on the mainframe, and the current goal is to move them into a different environment.

KDOT’s objective for this project is to either build or purchase a system which will allow more efficient management of KDOT’s fleet of equipment. The new system should allow timelier data transfer between systems and reduce duplication of effort. Expected outcomes would include easier reporting, improved preventive maintenance utilization and tracking, and improved budgeting and performance measurement tools.

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 goal of this project is to move all three of the related systems (EMS, SMS, and EPMS) off the mainframe. This will most likely require assessing the relationship between EMS and the other systems, including Crew Card, which uses and passes EPMS data to the Cost Center Feedback (CCFB) system. The project also calls for a review of business rules and processes, defining each system’s requirements.

Project Status: A business analysis effort was started in July, 2015. A vendor with expertise in Equipment Management Systems was engaged to lead the effort of assessing current state business processes and developing the future state processes. Current state is complete and future state is being developed. Requirements will be developed with intentions of putting together a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a COTS solution. The RFP is expected to be ready for release shortly after the first of the 2017 year.

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 approved |  Reporting insufficient. |
| <i>* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.</i> |  Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology |

SYMBOLS



Project meeting targeted goals.



Project completed and waiting for closeout PIER

P

PIER approved.

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.



Meeting targeted goals.



Project Stopped/Canceled.



Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I

Infrastructure Project

P

Project completed and PIER approved

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.*

Quarterly Executive Summary Report 3

ACTIVE PROJECTS SECTION 7

Project Report Assessments 8

EXECUTIVE BRANCH 8

ADMINISTRATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF 8

SHARP PeopleSoft 9.2 HR/Payroll System – PeopleTools 8.55 Upgrade..... 8

CORPORATION COMMISSION, KANSAS (KCC) 10

Kansas Trucking Regulatory Assistance Network (KTRAN) 10

EDUCATION, KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF (KSDE) 12

KN-CLAIM System Replacement 12

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDHE) 14

Kansas Eligibility Enforcement System IV (KEES IV) 14

KDHE/DHCF MMIS Modernization and Fiscal Agent Operations Takeover Services Reprocurement Project 18

Executive Branch Electronic Mail Consolidation 21

Executive Branch Technology Modernization (EBTM) Project - Infrastructure..... 23

OITS Internet Upgrade FY 2015 - Infrastructure 25

INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF 27

KBI Livescan Equipment Purchase – Infrastructure 27

Security Architecture Modernization – Identity Access Management (SAM-IAM) – Infrastructure 28

KANSAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM (KCJIS)..... 30

Kansas eCitation II 30

LABOR, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOL) 32

KDOL Incarceration Database and Victim Notification Service (ID & VNS)..... 32

KDOL Worker’s Compensation Digitization Planning Project..... 34

REVENUE, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOR) 35

Commercial Driver Licenses (CDL) Knowledge and Skill Testing System Project 35

KanDrive..... 36

TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT) 38

Construction Management System (CMS) Replacement Project – Implementation Effort 38

K-Hub 40

REGENTS 42

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY (FHSU) 42

FHSU Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Implementation..... 42

KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF (KUMC) 44

KUMC Network Infrastructure Upgrade 2015 Project– Infrastructure 44

KUMC Security Infrastructure II– Infrastructure..... 45

PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY (PSU) 47

PSU Oracle Cloud Implementation II 47

COMPLETED PROJECTS SECTION 49

PROJECTS WITH PIERS RECEIVED 50

EXECUTIVE BRANCH 50

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES, OFFICE OF (OITS) 50

Central Office KanWIN Core Refresh Project - Infrastructure 50

State Defense Building Fiber Project – Infrastructure..... 50

REVENUE, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOR) 51

County Scanner and Signature Pad Refreshment – Infrastructure 51

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  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 more than 30 percent). |  Recast - Changed scope, or missed targeted goals (by |
|  Project completed and PIER approved |  Reporting insufficient. |

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.

 Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT) 51
Document Management System Replacement II..... 51
Construction Management System (CMS) Replacement Project – Planning Effort..... 52
Coordinated Dispatch Software..... 52
OFFICE OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION..... 53
Judicial Branch Electronic Filing Statewide Implementation Project..... 53
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY 53
KSU Converged Infrastructure 53
APPROVED PROJECTS SECTION 54
EXECUTIVE BRANCH..... 55
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, KANSAS DEPARTMENT FOR (DCF) 55
Child Support Services System (CSSS) Modernization Planning Project 55
HB2015 Project..... 56
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDHE)..... 57
eWIC Implementation Project..... 57
LABOR, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOL)..... 58
KDOL Worker’s Compensation Digitization Implementation Project..... 58
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF..... 59
Grant Tracking Software (GTS)..... 59
PLANNED PROJECTS SECTION 60
PLANNED PROJECTS 61
EXECUTIVE BRANCH..... 61
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, KANSAS DEPARTMENT FOR (DCF) 61
DCF Cloud Computing (DCC)..... 61
DCF Enterprise Content Management Assessment (DECMA)..... 62
DCF Mainframe Application Migration (DMAM)..... 63
DCF Office 365 Implementation (DOI)..... 64
CORRECTIONS, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOC) 65
Kansas Juvenile and Adult Correction System (KJACS) 65
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDHE)..... 67
Replace I-Steps and build ICIS-Air data flow to EPA (ICIS-Air)..... 67
INVESTIGATION, KANSAS BUREAU OF (KBI)..... 68
Kansas Incident Based Reporting Replacement 68
LABOR, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOL)..... 69
KDOL Data Management and Data Analytics (ITSC DMDA) 69
LABOR, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOL)..... 71
SAN Replacement 2016 71
TRANSPORTATION, KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF (KDOT) 72
Capital Inventory Management System (CPIN) Replacement..... 72
Consumable Inventory Management System (CIMS)..... 73
Equipment Management System (EMS)..... 74

 Meeting targeted goals.

 Project Stopped/Canceled.

 Project completed and waiting for PIER.

I Infrastructure Project
more than 30 percent).

P Project completed and PIER approved

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

 Reporting insufficient.

+ Project Manager certified in Project Management Methodology

* Updated key information, occurring after this report period.