

Exhibit 300 FY2008

FY2008 Exhibit 300

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

In Part I, complete Sections A, B, C, and D for all capital assets (IT and non-IT). Complete Sections E and F for IT capital assets.

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments.

I. A. 1. Date of Submission:

2006-09-01

I. A. 2. Agency:

005

I. A. 3. Bureau:

96

I. A. 4. Name of this Capital Asset:

(short text - 250 characters)

Fire Program Analysis System - Phase 2 (FPA-2)

I. A. 5. Unique ID: (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)

005-96-01-11-01-0172-00-404-142

I. A. 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?

(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)

Mixed Life Cycle

I. A. 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?

FY2005

I. A. 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this, closes in part or in whole, an identified agency performance gap:

(long text - 2500 characters)

This project, Fire Program Analysis - Phase 2 (FPA-2), is an interagency project of the five federal wildland fire management agencies: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service (FS) Department of Interior (DOI) Bureau of Land Management (BLM) DOI National Park Service (NPS) DOI U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) DOI Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). FPA has also involved the National Association of State Foresters. FPA will allow for involvement of state and local fire organizations. FPA-2 has been chartered by the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG). The CPIC managing partner is the USDA Forest Service. CPIC documentation is managed through USDA. The FPA project will close important performance gaps for the interagency wildland fire management agencies, including gaps identified in: Federal Wildland Fire Policy National Fire Plan The Hubbard Report, officially titled, Developing an Interagency, Landscape Scale Fire Planning Analysis and Budget Tool (November 2001) Discussions with and direction from OMB. Discussions with and direction from the Congressional Appropriations Committee FPA will assess tradeoffs between fire programs including preparedness, fuels management and prevention. This will help managers determine cost effective programs at any level of national funding. Status The USDA E-Board approved FPA-2 to move to the Select Phase in August 2004. FPA has been in the CPIC Control Phase since August 2005. The FPA project will deliver a functional prototype in June 2007 and an operational application by June 2008.

I. A. 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?

yes

I. A. 9. a. If "yes", what was the date of this approval?

2006-09-06

I. A. 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

yes

I. A. 11. Contact information of Project Manager?

I. A. 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.

no

I. A. 12. a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?

yes

I. A. 12. b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)

no

I. A. 12. b. 1. If "yes", is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

I. A. 12. b. 2. If "yes", will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

I. A. 12. b. 3. If "yes", is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

I. A. 13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?

yes

I. A. 13. a. If "yes", check all that apply:

Budget Performance Integration
Expanded E-Government

I. A. 13. b. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s).

(medium text - 500 characters)

Developing FPA-2 will support budget and performance integration and expanded e-government. FPA-2 will result in a federal interagency, objective-driven, performance-based fire program analysis for budgeting and organizational planning. FPA-2 will use the Web to provide government-to-government functionality and will result in a signlee, common planning and budgeting application for all five wildland fire agencies, state, and tribal governments

I. A. 14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

(For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)

no

I. A. 14. a. If "yes", does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?

I. A. 14. b. If "yes", what is the name of the PARTed Program?

(short text - 250 characters)

I. A. 14. c. If "yes", what PART rating did it receive?

I. A. 15. Is this investment for information technology? (see section 53 for definition)

yes

I. A. 16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?

Level 1 - Projects with low-to-moderate complexity and risk. Example: Bureau-level project such as a stand-alone information system that has low- to-moderate complexity and risk. Level 2 - Projects with high complexity and/or risk which are critical to the mission of the organization. Examples: Projects that are part of a portfolio of projects/systems that impact each other and/or impact mission activities. Department-wide projects that impact cross-organizational missions, such as an agency-wide system integration that includes large scale Enterprise Resource Planning (e.g., the DoD Business Mgmt Modernization Program). Level 3 - Projects that have high complexity, and/or risk, and have government-wide impact. Examples: Government-wide initiative (E-GOV, President's Management Agenda). High interest projects with Congress, GAO, OMB, or the general public. Cross-cutting initiative (Homeland Security).

Level 3

I. A. 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per OMB's PM Guidance):

(1) - The project manager assigned for this investment has been validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (2) - The project manager assigned for this investment is in the process of being validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (3) - The project manager assigned for this investment is not validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (4) - The qualifications for the project manager named have not been evaluated.; (5) - No project manager is currently assigned for this investment.; (6) - N/A -- This is not an IT investment.

(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

I. A. 18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?

no

I. A. 19. Is this a financial management system?

no

I. A. 19. a. If "yes", does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?

yes

I. A. 19. a. 1. If "yes" which compliance area?

(short text - 250 characters)

I. A. 19. a. 2. If "no", what does it address?

(medium text - 500 characters)

I. A. 19. b. If "yes", please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

(long text - 2500 characters)

I. A. 20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

I. A. 20. a. Hardware

10

I. A. 20. b. Software

5

I. A. 20. c. Services

85

I. A. 20. d. Other

0

I. A. 21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

n/a

I. A. 22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

I. A. 22. a. Name

(short text - 250 characters)

John Noneman

I. A. 22. b. Phone Number

I. A. 22. c. Title

(short text - 250 characters)

Deputy Project Manager

I. A. 22. d. Email

(short text - 250 characters)

John_Noneman@blm.gov

I. A. 23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

yes

Section B: Summary of Funding

I. B. 1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table.

All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

	PY-1 Spending Prior to 2006	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008					
Planning	3.28	3.68	0	0					
Acquisition	0	3.176	5.606	5.430					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	3.28	6.856	5.606	5.430					
Operations & Maintenance	2.875	0.577	1.427	2.000					
TOTAL	6.155	7.433	7.033	7.430					
Government FTE Costs	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82					
Number of FTE represented by cost	8	8	8	7					

I. B. 2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

no

I. B. 2. a. If "yes", How many and in what year?

(medium text - 500 characters)

I. B. 3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

(long text - 2500 characters)

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

(Character Limitations: Contract or Task Order Number - 250 Characters; Type of Contract/Task Order - 250 Characters; Name of CO - 250 Characters; CO Contact Information - 250 Characters)

[illegible]

(medium text - 500 characters)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

I. D. 1. Table 1

(Character Limitations: Strategic Goal(s) Supported - 250 Characters; Performance Measure - 250 Characters; Actual/baseline (from Previous Year) - 250 Characters; Planned Performance Metric (Target) - 250 Characters; Performance Metric Results (Actual) - 250 Characters; Measurement Indicator - 250 Characters; Baseline - 250 Characters; Planned Improvement to the Baseline - 250 Characters; Actual Results - 250 Characters)

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

I. D. 2. Table 2

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2006	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Information Lifecycle Management are achieved	Life cycle cost of \$36 million. Version 2 implemented by 6/30/07. Version 3 implemented by 6/30/08.	Earned value indicates less than 10% variance in CPI, SPI, and BAC.	Current CPI: 1.03
2006	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Extent to which prototype users implement FPA	0 prototype users	5 prototype areas are using and testing FPA v. 2	TBD
2007	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Information Lifecycle Management are achieved	Life cycle cost of \$36 million. Version 2 implemented by 6/30/07. Version 3 implemented by 6/30/08.	Earned value indicates less than 10% variance in CPI, SPI, and BAC. Successful implementation of version 2 by 6/30/07.	TBD
2007	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Extent to which eligible customers use FPA	0 users	80% of all eligible users are using FPA v. 2	TBD
2007	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# of fire program areas able to be analyzed using FPA	3; initial response, wildland fire use, budget development and distribution	Increase to 6; add extend attack, large fires, prevention	TBD
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Extent to which agencies use similar models, assumptions, and software to analyze fire program budget requests.	Agencies use separate systems for fire program budget planning or have no systems at all	All agencies use the same models, assumptions, and software to analyze preparedness budget requests	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Information Lifecycle management are achieved.	Life cycle cost \$36 million. Version 2 implemented by 6/30/07. Version 3 implemented by 6/30/08	Earned value indicates less than 10% variance in CPI, SPI, and BAC. Successful implementation of v. 3 by 6/30/08	TBD
2008	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Extent to which eligible customers use FPA	0 users	100% of all eligible users are using FPA v 2. 60% of eligible users are using v. 3	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# of fire program areas able to be analyzed using FPA	3 initial response, wildland fire use, budget development and distribution	Increase to 8, add fuels and rehab.	TBD
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Extent to which agencies use similar models, assumptions, and software to analyze fire program budget requests	Agencies use separate systems for fire program budget planning or have no systems at all	All agencies use the same models, assumptions, and software to analyze preparedness budget requests	TBD
2009	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to information lifecycle management are achieved.	Life cycle cost of \$36 million.	Earned value indicates less than 10% variance in CPI, SPI, and BAC	TBD
2009	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Extent to which eligible customers use FPA	0 users	100% of all eligible users are using FPA v. 3	TBD
2009	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# of fire program areas able to be analyzed using FPA	3; initial response, wildland fire use, budget development and distribution	All fire program areas included in FPA analysis	TBD
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Extent to which agencies use similar models,	Agencies use separate system for	All agencies use the same models, assumptions, and	TBD

			assumptions, and software to analyze fire program budget requests	fire program budget planning or have no systems at all	software to analyze preparedness and fuels budget request	
2006	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	# of fire program areas able to be analyzed using FPA	3; Initial response, wildland fire use, budget development and distribution	Increase to 6; Add extended attack, large fires, and prevention.	Completed IR, WFU and Budget analysis on 135 of 138 Fire Planning Units in April 2006.
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Extent to which agencies use similar models, assumptions, and software to analyze fire program budget requests	Agencies use separate systems for fire program budget planning or have no systems at all.	All agencies use the same models, assumptions, and software to analyze preparedness budget requests	TBD

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

I. F. 1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

yes

I. F. 1. a. If "no", please explain why?

(long text - 2500 characters)

I. F. 2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

no

I. F. 2. a. If "yes", provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

(medium text - 500 characters)

I. F. 2. b. If "no" please explain why?

(long text - 2500 characters)

USDA is in the process of developing a Transition Strategy that should be in place for the next annual OMB assessment. This investment will likely be listed under its own name and be linked to USDA efforts in Disaster Management and Geospatial Presidential Initiatives.

I. F. 3. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table.

For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

FEA SRM Component - Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM. FEA Service Component Reused - A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission. Internal or External Reuse? - 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government. Funding Percentage - Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service. (Character Limitations: Agency Component Name - 250 Characters; Agency Component Description - 500 Characters)

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused - Component Name	FEA Service Component Reused - UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
FPA-2 Access Control Service	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	1
FPA-2 Rules Management Service	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management			No Reuse	1
FPA-2 Categorization	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Categorization			No Reuse	2

Service							
FPA-2 Data Classification Service	Back Offices Services	Data Management	Data Classification			No Reuse	3
FPA-2 Data Exchange Service	Back Offices Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	3
FPA-2 Data Integration Service	Back Offices Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	2
FPA-2 Decision Support Service	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	3
FPA-2 Forecasting Service	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Demand Forecasting / Mgmt			No Reuse	3
FPA-2 Authentication Service	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	1
FPA-2 Retrieval Service	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	2
FPA-2 Geospatial Service	Business Analytical Services	Visualization	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS			No Reuse	5
FPA-2 Mathematical Analysis Service	Business Analytical Services	Analysis and Statistics	Mathematical			No Reuse	10
FPA-2 Meta Data service	Back Offices Services	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	5
FPA-2 Modeling Service	Business Analytical Services	Knowledge Discovery	Modeling			No Reuse	20
FPA-2 Simulation Service	Business Analytical Services	Knowledge Discovery	Simulation			No Reuse	20
FPA-2 Reports Service	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	5

I. F. 4. To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component - Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications. Service Specification - In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate. (Character Limitations: Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name) - 250 characters)

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name)
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and	Hardware /	Servers / Computers	

	Infrastructure	Infrastructure		
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Categorization	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Categorization	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Categorization	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Categorization	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Categorization	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Categorization	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Categorization	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Data Classification	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Classification	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Classification	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Data Classification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Data Classification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Data Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Data Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Data Integration	Service Platform and	Hardware /	Servers / Computers	

	Infrastructure	Infrastructure		
Decision Support and Planning	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Web Browser	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and	Integration	Middleware	

	Integration			
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Web Browser	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Mathematical	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Mathematical	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Mathematical	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Mathematical	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Mathematical	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Mathematical	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Meta Data Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Modeling	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Modeling	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Modeling	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Modeling	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Modeling	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Modeling	Service Platform and	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	

	Infrastructure			
Modeling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Modeling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Modeling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Modeling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Modeling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Simulation	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Simulation	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Simulation	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Simulation	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Simulation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Simulation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Standardized / Canned	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Service Description / Interface	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Standardized / Canned	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	

	Infrastructure			
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	

I. F. 5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

yes

I. F. 5. a. If "yes", please describe.

(long text - 2500 characters)

The FPA project team has identified three key Presidential Initiatives to leverage: Disaster Management, Geospatial One-Stop, and the ESRI Smart Buy Initiative. The Disaster Management Initiative focuses on helping citizens and members of the emergency management community at the local, tribal, state, and Federal levels by improving public safety response through more effective and efficient interoperable data communications and to serve as a unified point of access to disaster preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery information (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/c-2-2-disaster.html>). The FPA project is aligned with this initiative. Information on FPA is available through the Web site, <http://www.disasterhelp.gov>. In May of 2005, OMB agreed with FPAs assertion that alignment with this initiative is in progress. The Geospatial One Stop Initiative provides Federal and state agencies with single a point of access to map-related data enabling the sharing of existing data to maximize geospatial investments to leverage resources and reduce redundancies (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/c-2-1-geo.html>). FPA-2 will include geospatial data. This data will be obtained from the US Geological Survey (USGS); no new geospatial data will be created as part of FPA-2. The ESRI Smart Buy initiative simplifies procurement of software and services for employees of the U.S. federal government (<http://www.esri.com/industries/federal/products/fgp.html>) Under FPA-PM, ESRI software was procured using the ESRI Smart Buy initiative. As a result, no new GIS software will be needed for FPA-2. Therefore, alignment with this initiative was completed under FPA-PM.

I. F. 6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

no

I. F. 6. a. If "yes", does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

I. F. 6. a. 1. If "yes", provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

(medium text - 500 characters)

PART II: PLANNING, ACQUISITION AND PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Part II should be completed only for investments which in FY2008 will be in "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments, i.e., selected one of these three choices in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

II. A. 1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?

yes

II. A. 1. a. If "yes", provide the date the analysis was completed?

2005-08-15

II. A. 1. b. If "no", what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

II. A. 1. c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:
(long text - 2500 characters)

II. A. 2. Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:
(Character Limitations: Alternative Analyzed - 500 characters; Description of Alternative - 500 Characters)

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Cost Estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits Estimate
Baseline	Status Quo	183893882	0
3	Staged development and implementation. The scope is the same as Alternative 2 plus Fuels, and Rehabilitation and Restoration Modules. Sequential and joint development of functional modules, using a single team and spiral software development. Lessons learned will be leveraged, as will reusable components and development patterns. Use of common open standards (e.g., XML).	113833356	70060526

II. A. 3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?
(medium text - 500 characters)

An evaluation of discounted financial returns as well as risk adjusted discounted financial returns has determined that Alternative 3 presents the most favorable risk adjusted outcome. Also, a review of quantifiable non-financial benefits has determined that Alternative 3 presents the most favorable outcome with regard to work process simplification and enhanced consistency in fire program analysis.

II. A. 4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?
(long text - 2500 characters)

Qualitative benefits were assessed in the following areas: accuracy, availability, compatibility, efficiency, maintainability, modularity, reliability, and security. A summary of the qualitative benefits of the selected alternative are as follows: 1) The selected alternative improves accuracy through reduced data entry. All FPA modules will be integrated to promote automated data exchange and analysis. Elimination of manual data transfers should improve data accuracy. 2) Alternative 3 will require the most time to implement. The schedule for implementation is FY11. However, all FPA functional modules will be fully integrated. No additional projects will be required to automate manual operations. 3) The functional modules will apply existing business rules and automate manual procedures, processes, and calculations. The modules will be consistent with interagency WFM policy; however, individual WFM agencies may currently use agency-specific processes. 4) Alternative 3 is expected to offer faster and more accurate processing of WFM planning and analysis versus Alternatives 1 & 2. Information exchanged between all FPA functional modules will be integrated through automated processes. A significant reduction in the number of work processes (primarily data translation and transfer) is expected to be achieved through this alternative. 5) Alternative 3 is expected to have the lowest and maintenance costs of the three alternatives. The comprehensive integration and use of services oriented messaging between functional modules provides the most maintainable configuration over the evaluation period. 6) This alternative will utilize modular software design following similar design and technical patterns as used in FPA-PM. All functional modules defined for phase two will be fully modular and integrated, utilizing services oriented design patterns. 7) Alternative 3 is expected to be the most reliable configuration of the alternatives. All FPA modules will be integrated eliminating the use of manual data transfers and integration. This alternative will utilize hardware and software components that are compliant with technical reference models issued by the Forest Service, USDA, DOI, and the FEA. 8) This alternative will provide information audit trail capability and a repeatable process for secure data integration across all of the FPA-2 functional modules. Alternative 3 is offers the optimal security configuration of all the FPA-2 alternatives.

Section B: Risk Management

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

II. B. 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

yes

II. B. 1. a. If "yes", what is the date of the plan?

2006-06-16

II. B. 1. b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

no

II. B. 1. c. If "yes", describe any significant changes:

(long text - 2500 characters)

II. B. 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

II. B. 2. a. If "yes", what is the planned completion date?

II. B. 2. b. If "no", what is the strategy for managing the risks?
(long text - 2500 characters)

II. B. 3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:
(long text - 2500 characters)

Life cycle cost estimates were developed with consideration of risk. Sufficient risk reserve was included in the LCC to account for overall project uncertainty, specifically in the out years where risk and uncertainty increase. Because of the nature of the out year budget planning and due to the budget constraints of the Forest Service, funding and schedule are generally fixed. As a result, risk adjustments have the effect of reducing scope.