

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 12/12/2007
2. Agency: Department of Justice
3. Bureau: Office Of Justice Programs
4. Name of this Capital Asset: OJP Community Partnership Grants Management System (CPGMS) Architecture and Technology Refresh
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 5.3. For all other, use agency ID system.) 011-21-04-00-01-3263-24
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2001 or earlier
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:

CPGMS is a web-based, data-driven application that provides end-to-end support for the application, approval and management of grants. CPGMS currently supports the core missions and grants processes of DOJ's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) and Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and anticipates consolidation of all DOJ grants programs by incorporating support for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants program. CPGMS expects to become the service provider for other Federal programs whose mission and culture is centered on community response through the creation of a consortium. Migrating existing CPGMS users to an external consortia lead would likely result in disruptions to established DOJ business processes, as well as entail considerable risk and migration-related costs. CPGMS capabilities include the interface with the Grants.gov portal to allow potential applicants to conduct searches and apply for DOJ grant opportunities using the Grants.gov Find and Apply capabilities. The current system is nearly seven years old, based upon antiquated technology, and costly to maintain and program. An architectural and technological refresh of CPGMS will improve system reliability, support enhanced services for CPGMS users and simplify system maintenance and development. Existing CPGMS grants processing and software services components will be adapted and implemented under the redesigned system architecture, which will use a modularized/componentized framework. OJP will begin to incorporate support for Service Oriented Architecture (SOA), Extensible Markup Language (XML), and Uniform Modeling Language (UML) into CPGMS, helping OJP information technology staff adapt the system to meet changing user requirements. Other improvements to the CPGMS system will include implementation of self-service account management and enhancement of the system's high-availability network architecture to improve reliability and service resilience. This investment will be coordinated with OJP's Enterprise Architecture/Operational Improvements initiative and the conversion to Financial Management Information System 2 (FMIS2)/Unified Financial Management System (UFMS).
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 4/27/2007
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name Whitlock, Bruce W
Phone Number (202) 353-1551
Email Bruce.W.Whitlock@usdoj.gov
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? No
 - a. Will this investment include electronic assets Yes

(including computers)?

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) No

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

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

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

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? Yes

If "yes," check all that apply:

Human Capital
Budget Performance Integration
Financial Performance
Expanded E-Government

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

CPGMS is aligned with the Expanded E-Government initiative through its connector with the Grants.gov portal to allow potential applicants to search and apply for grant opportunities. Supports Financial Performance through integration with DOJ FMIS2/UFMS. Supports Budget Performance Integration with multiple budget, reconciliation, payment and reporting support functions. Supports Human Capital by improving portability of staff skills. It is also the source for DOJ input to FFATA.

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

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? No

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 3

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

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

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) No

19. Is this a financial management system? Yes

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFIA compliance area? Yes

1. If "yes," which compliance area: Section 2, Section 4

2. If "no," what does it address?

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

Community Partnership Grants Management System (CPGMS)

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	8
Software	14
Services	78
Other	0

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? Yes

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

Name Pruden II, George E
 Phone Number 202-616-3627
 Title Senior Counsel
 E-mail george.e.pruden@usdoj.gov

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

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	16.329711	0.593785	0	1.8					
Acquisition:	33.841143	3.11274	2	0.2					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	50.170854	3.706525	2	2.0					
Operations & Maintenance:	32.845543	3.408158	3.37315	4.038					
TOTAL:	83.016397	7.114683	5.37315	6.038					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	13.724932	0.81	0.95	0.985					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	4	5	6	5					

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? No

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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: FY 2007 spending data has been updated to reflect actual cost data provided through the EVMS used to track/manage CPGMS performance. FY 2008 estimates have been changed to reflect estimates for CPGMS projects and planning packages that will be in progress and/or completed in FY 2008, as projected through the EVMS. All changes to spending data for FY 2007 and FY 2008 are adjustments within base within the FY 2008 President's budget request.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Exhibit 300: OJP Community Partnership Grants Management System (CPGMS) Architecture and Technology Refresh (Revision 3) - Redacted

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
Task Order 2004F_055	Time & Materials	Yes	4/2/2004	4/2/2004	3/31/2008	3.24	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Jackson, Eldred	202-514-0696 / Eldred.Jackson@usdoj.gov	N/A	Yes
2006TO097 on Contract GS-06F-0291Z	Time & Materials	Yes	9/8/2006	9/25/2006			No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	German, Ray	202-307-0613 / Ray.German@usdoj.gov	N/A	Yes
DJJ-05-C-1118/DO5	Time & Materials	Yes	5/9/2005	5/9/2005			No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Newsom, Gregory L	202-307-1962 / Gregory.L.Newsom@usdoj.gov	N/A	Yes

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

The only contract that does not contain an EVM requirement will expire in March 2008. However, even though this contract does not contain specific language requiring EVM, the contractor does provide monthly EVM data. In July 2007, after reviewing 20 artifacts and meeting with OJP staff and contractors, JMD OCIO certified that CPGMS is fully ANSI compliant. Any new contract awarded will be performance based and require EVM.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why: All CPGMS development and maintenance contracts contain requirements for Section 508 compliance to ensure that forms, system screens, web pages, and similar requirements meet applicable Section 508 standards.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? Yes

a. If "yes," what is the date? 2/18/2004

b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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 (indicators) 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 the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2004		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Number of grants solicitations/notifications posted in CPGMS for customer Web access	Web posting of all CPGMS grants solicitations required beginning in FY 2003	Post all FY 2004 grants solicitations in CPGMS for customer access on the Web	173 grants solicitations posted on the Web in FY 2004
2004		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	Number of grants applications submitted electronically for processing on CPGMS	Web/electronic submission of all CPGMS grants applications required beginning in FY 2003	All FY 2004 grants applications submitted electronically for processing in CPGMS	14,430 grants applications submitted electronically for processing in CPGMS in FY 2004
2004		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Number of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - number of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2004 grants through CPGMS	4,684 FY 2004 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2004		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Total dollar amount of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - amount of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2004 grants through CPGMS	\$6,305,229,000 in FY 2004 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2004		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Extent to which CPGMS Help	Baseline not established for	Baseline not established for	96.2 percent of CPGMS Help

Exhibit 300: OJP Community Partnership Grants Management System (CPGMS) Architecture and Technology Refresh (Revision 3)
- Redacted

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					Desk calls can be resolved/closed without referral to Tier 2 or 3 engineering support	FY 2004	FY 2004	Desk calls resolved by initial Tier 1 support action
2004		Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of CPGMS Help Desk support for system users	Baseline not established	Baseline not established	543 CPGMS Help Desk calls per month (average)
2005		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Number of grants solicitations/notes posted in CPGMS for customer Web access	Web posting of all CPGMS grants solicitations required beginning in FY 2003	Post all FY 2005 grants solicitations in CPGMS for customer access on the Web	225 grants solicitations posted on the Web in FY 2005
2005		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	Number of grants applications submitted electronically for processing on CPGMS	Web/electronic submission of all CPGMS grants applications required beginning in FY 2003	All FY 2005 grants applications submitted electronically for processing in CPGMS	18,066 grants applications submitted electronically for processing in CPGMS in FY 2005
2005		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Number of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - number of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2005 grants through CPGMS	6063 FY 2005 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2005		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Total dollar amount of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - amount of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2005 grants through CPGMS	\$6,136,983,000 in FY 2005 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2005		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Extent to which CPGMS Help Desk calls can be resolved/closed without referral to Tier 2 or 3 engineering support	Baseline not applicable - Ability of Tier 1 to close calls dependent upon multiple unpredictable factors	Resolve all calls at Tier 1 -- refer to Tier 2 only when complexity or other factors necessitate	99 percent of CPGMS Help Desk calls resolved by initial Tier 1 support actions
2005		Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of CPGMS Help Desk support for system users	543 calls per month in 2004 (average)	Maintain staffing/proficiency levels of CPGMS Help Desk support for timely and effective response	1149 CPGMS Help Desk calls per month (average)
2006		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Number of competitive discretionary CPGMS grants synopses posted on Grants.gov for customer access	Baseline not established for posting grants synopses on Grants.gov	Post 75% of FY 2006 CPGMS competitive discretionary grants synopses on Grants.gov for customer access	96 competitive discretionary grants synopses posted on Grants.gov in FY 2006 (100%)
2006		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Number of competitive discretionary grants applications submitted electronically for processing on CPGMS	Baseline for electronic submission of CPGMS competitive discretionary grants applications through Grants.gov connector not established	75% of FY 2006 competitive discretionary grants applications submitted electronically for processing in CPGMS	CPGMS received 5,765 electronic grants applications through the Grants.gov connector in FY 2006 (100%)

Exhibit 300: OJP Community Partnership Grants Management System (CPGMS) Architecture and Technology Refresh (Revision 3)
- Redacted

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Number of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - number of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2006 grants through CPGMS	4569 FY 2006 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2006		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Total dollar amount of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - amount of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2006 grants through CPGMS	\$4,478,904,558 in FY 2006 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2006		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Extent to which CPGMS Help Desk calls can be resolved/closed without referral to Tier 2 or 3 engineering support	Baseline not applicable - Ability of Tier 1 to close calls dependent upon multiple unpredictable factors	Resolve all calls at Tier 1 -- refer to Tier 2 only when complexity or other factors necessitate	92.4 percent of CPGMS Help Desk calls resolved by initial Tier 1 support actions
2006		Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of CPGMS Help Desk support for system users	1149 calls per month in 2005 (average)	Maintain staffing/proficiency levels of CPGMS Help Desk support for timely and effective response	1427 CPGMS Help Desk calls per month (average)
2007		Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Complaints				
2007		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Number of competitive discretionary CPGMS grants synopses posted on Grants.gov for customer access	Posting of all CPGMS competitive discretionary grants synopses on Grants.gov required beginning in FY 2005	Maintain 100% posting of CPGMS competitive discretionary grants synopses on Grants.gov for customer access	132 competitive discretionary grants synopses posted on Grants.gov through June 2007 (100%)
2007		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Number of competitive discretionary grants applications submitted electronically for processing on CPGMS	Electronic submission of all CPGMS competitive discretionary grants applications required beginning in FY 2005	All FY 2007 applications for competitive discretionary grants submitted electronically through Grants.gov for processing in CPGMS	CPGMS received 8,331 electronic grants applications through the Grants.gov connector through June 2007
2007		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Number of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - number of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2007 grants through CPGMS	1,145 FY 2007 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal governments and community orgs. through June 2007 (processed/awarded through CPGMS)
2007		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Total dollar amount of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - amount of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2007 grants through CPGMS	\$1,048,940,731 in FY 2007 grants awarded to State, Local, and Tribal government and community orgs through June 2007 (processed/awarded through CPGMS).

Exhibit 300: OJP Community Partnership Grants Management System (CPGMS) Architecture and Technology Refresh (Revision 3)
- Redacted

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Extent to which CPGMS Help Desk can be resolved/closed without referral to Tier 2 or 3 engineering support.	Baseline not applicable - Ability of Tier 1 to close calls dependent upon multiple unpredictable factors.	Resolve all calls at Tier 1 -- refer to Tier 2 only when complexity or other factors necessitate.	96.5 percent of CPGMS Help Desk calls resolved by initial Tier 1 support actions
2007		Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of CPGMS Help Desk support for system users	2266 calls per month in 2006 (average)	Maintain staffing/proficiency levels of CPGMS Help Desk support for timely and effective response	1882 calls per month through June 2007 (average)
2008		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Number of competitive discretionary CPGMS grants synopses posted on Grants.gov for customer access	Posting of all CPGMS competitive discretionary grants synopses on Grants.gov required beginning in FY 2005	Maintain 100% posting of CPGMS competitive discretionary grants synopses on Grants.gov for customer access	TBD
2008		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Number of competitive discretionary grants applications submitted electronically for processing on CPGMS	Electronic submission of all CPGMS competitive discretionary grants applications through Grants.gov	All FY 2008 applications for competitive discretionary grants submitted electronically through Grants.gov for processing in CPGMS	TBD
2008		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Number of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - number of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2008 grants through CPGMS	TBD
2008		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Total dollar amount of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - amount of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2008 grants through CPGMS	TBD
2008		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Extent to which CPGMS Help Desk calls can be resolved/closed without referral to Tier 2 or 3 engineering support	Baseline not applicable - Ability of Tier 1 to close calls dependent upon multiple unpredictable factors	Resolve all calls at Tier 1 -- refer to Tier 2 only when complexity or other factors necessitate	TBD
2008		Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of CPGMS Help Desk support for system users	Not yet available	Maintain staffing/proficiency levels of CPGMS Help Desk support for timely and effective response	TBD
2009		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Number of competitive discretionary CPGMS grants posted on Grants.gov for customer access.	Posting of all CPGMS competitive discretionary grants synopses required beginning in FY 2005	Maintain 100% posting of CPGMS competitive discretionary grant synopses on Grants.gov for customer access.	TBD
2009		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	Number of competitive discretionary grants applications submitted electronically for processing on CPGMS	Electronic submission of all CPGMS competitive discretionary grants applications through Grants.gov	All FY 2008 applications for competitive discretionary grants submitted electronically through Grants.gov for processing in CPGMS	TBD

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2009		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Number of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - number of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2009 grants through CPGMS.	TBD
2009		Mission and Business Results	Law Enforcement	Citizen Protection	Total dollar amount of grants awards (processed/awarded through CPGMS)	Baseline not applicable - amount of awards dependent on multiple factors	Process/award all FY 2009 grants through CPGMS	TBD
2009		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Extent to which CPGMS Help Desk calls can be resolved/closed without referral to Tier 2 or 3 engineering support	Baseline not applicable - Ability of Tier 1 to close calls dependent upon multiple unpredictable factors	Resolve all calls at Tier 1 -- refer to Tier 2 only when complexity or other factors necessitate	TBD
2009		Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Availability of CPGMS Help Desk support for system users	Not yet available	Maintain staffing/proficiency levels of CPGMS Help Desk support for timely and effective response	tbd

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. Yes

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
CPGMS Architecture and Technology Refresh	Contractor and Government	12/31/2010	9/30/2010

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, NIST 800-26, Other, N/A)	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
CPGMS	Contractor and Government		Yes	2/27/2006	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	1/8/2007	3/22/2007

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

CPGMS is operated at the OJP headquarters building located at 810 7th Street, NW, Washington DC 20531 by contractors under government oversight. Contractors provide development and operations support for the CPGMS, including the implementation of security procedures and standards required by law and Federal, DOJ, and OJP policy and procedures. The contractors' security procedures are monitored through procedural controls, weekly status reports and monthly status reports, which are verified by the PM and COTR for each contract. Critical security activities are monitored and verified on an on-going basis by Federal security staff. CPGMS also incorporates role-based access controls and audit features which mitigate the risk of unauthorized access or modification of data. The audit logs are verified and reviewed by Federal security staff, as well as the COTRs and PMs. The security requirements are binding on the CPGMS support contractors through the required security and privacy clauses in their contracts. Background investigations are conducted on contractors, and they are required to read and accept Rules of Behavior and sign non-disclosure statements when brought on-board. Security clearance for the contractors is in accordance with DOJ and OJP policies and procedures such as DOJ Order 2610.2A.

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
CPGMS	No	Yes	http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/GMS_PIA_01292007.pdf OJP is working with NARA archivist to update schedule.	Yes	http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.fedreg/053200&id=1&size=2&collection=fedreg&index=fedreg/053 FR vol 53 no 20 pp 40526-40527

Details for Text Options:

Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. OJP Grants Management System

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. Justice Program Coordination

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:

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.egov.gov>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Grants Management	Allows Program Managers to examine grant records to validate the business process.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Auditing			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Enables OJP staff to identify resources necessary to support OJP programs for which solicitations will be created and posted on Grants.gov	Back Office Services	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Resource Planning and Allocation			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Enables OJP Staff to create solicitations and sub-grants for advertising on E-Gov and CPGMS.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Allows OJP to evaluate program performance for improvement of enterprise processes.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Allows OJP to monitor program performance to evaluate success of grant programs for strategic decisions and actions.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Governance / Policy Management			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Allows OJP to manage the award process from application submission to grant award and award notification. And grant monitoring to include grant adjustments, financial monitoring and close-out.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Allows grantees to seek assistance to register, complete application submissions, submit Progress	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Help			No Reuse	0

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:								
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.egov.gov .								
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	Reports and grant adjustments, and correspond with Grant Managers.							
Grants Management	Allows grantees to register their names and accounts in CPGMS.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Reservations / Registration			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Allows external users to request access to CPGMS, create a profile record, make adjustments to their applications, and exchange correspondence. Also allows grantees to initiate grant adjustments electronically.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service			No Reuse	0
Grants Management	Provides the capability for authorized users to search and retrieve grants data based on user-specified criteria.	Support Services	Search	Query			No Reuse	0

- a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.
- b. 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.
- c. '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.
- d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
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 (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Program / Project Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Enterprise Java Beans, JavaScript, J2EE
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Enterprise Java Beans, JavaScript, J2EE
Governance / Policy Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Enterprise Java Beans, JavaScript, J2EE
Strategic Planning and Mgmt	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Enterprise Java Beans, JavaScript, J2EE
Resource Planning and Allocation	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Enterprise Java Beans, JavaScript, J2EE
Query	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Enterprise Java Beans, JavaScript, J2EE
Self-Service	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	HTML
Reservations / Registration	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	HTML
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer 5.0
Reservations / Registration	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer 5.0

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
 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 (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Reservations / Registration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Active Directory Service (ADS)
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Program / Project Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PL/SQL
Governance / Policy Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PL/SQL
Business Rule Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PL/SQL
Strategic Planning and Mgmt	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PL/SQL
Resource Planning and Allocation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PL/SQL
Query	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	PL/SQL
Auditing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle 9.2.0.6
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle 9.2.0.6
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10G Release 1
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10G Release 1
Strategic Planning and Mgmt	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10G Release 1
Governance / Policy Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10G Release 1
Resource Planning and Allocation	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10G Release 1
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle 10G Release 1

a. 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

b. 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.

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

CPGMS maintains compliance with all applicable data and technical specifications to enable connection with Grants.gov to fully utilize its Find and Apply functionalities. CPGMS relies on the Grants.gov storefront to post grant notices and applications to take advantage of its Find features, and to receive completed grant applications submitted to CPGMS through the Apply features. CPGMS also leverages the electronic credentials/signature capability available through Grants.gov.

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? Yes
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 7/13/2007
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * Costs in millions			
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Refresh	The CPGMS will be adapted and implemented under the re-architected and modularized framework. The CPGMS will be designed on the framework of SOA supporting XML and UML to modularize customer functionality and software services components. The technical design will also feature a high-availability network architecture to improve reliability and service resilience, and prevent component failure from denying service to CPGMS customers. which does happen under the current architecture.	34	58

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

'Refresh', is the preferred alternative. It was selected because it represents the highest ROI, and significant qualitative benefits derived. 'Refresh' is centered on transition to a reengineered CPGMS, which would be based on the existing CPGMS core components' functionality. 'Refresh' allows for a smooth and efficient migration of existing CPGMS users and prospective new users across the government. 'Refresh' offers the best opportunity for continuing successful support for existing CPGMS users and programs, while bringing together the major DOJ grants programs under the Community Partnership Grants Management Consortium. 'Refresh' would reduce the number of existing DOJ grants systems, while consolidating all CPGMS components at the Consortium's service center currently operated by OJP/DOJ. These improvements will result in cost reductions/avoidance for CPGMS Consortium members. The 'Refresh' option coincides with the upcoming schedule of end-of-service life for the hardware and operating system for the CPGMS servers presently in use. While the cost factor for replacing servers is relatively low, rearchitecture of the application offers the opportunity to migrate to high efficiency hardware that was not available at the time the application was designed. In addition to improving the performance, flexibility, reliability and maintainability of the CPGMS system, the technology refresh option is essential for OJP to comply with The Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005, 42 U.S.C.A. 3712h(e).

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Currently, the CPGMS, whose members have a natural affinity based on missions and programs, has multiple areas of common interest that are best served through the continuing support for CPGMS. Another commonality is that many of the grants programs of CPGMS members are focused on grants to communities for a variety of services, yet their grants business processes vary considerably. CPGMS has the adaptability to accommodate the varying grants processes of its users. However, one interest for CPGMS members outweighs all others in importance. Historically, DOJ CPGMS users were able to respond rapidly and effectively to natural disasters and public emergencies through grants awarded to public safety and first responder programs of the affected States and local jurisdictions and agencies. This response was possible through the synergy and focus of agency management and grants staff, IT staff, and the integrated support of the CPGMS. The environment and focus to successfully deal with the urgency of future challenges would remain intact through the CPGMS investment. The Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 established the Office of Audit, Assessment and Management (OAAM) within the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). 42 U.S.C. sec. 3712h. Pursuant to Act, the director of OAAM, in consultation with the OJP CIO, is required to establish and maintain a modern, automated system for managing all information relating to the grants made by the Department. 42 U.S.C. sec. 3721h(e). The refresh of CPGMS is to comply with this statutory mandate. Currently, OJP provides the system support for the Office of Violence Against Women's grants.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?

- a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this

investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment.

b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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.

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? Yes
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? 7/11/2007
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:
 The Risk Management Plan was substantially revised to reflect this new initiative.
- 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:
 Risks are assessed during the development of the CPGMS life cycle cost estimates, project plan/schedule, and cost estimates for each CPGMS task/module, including transition activities. For each CPGMS task, the risk assessment helps identify a best-case (slight probability of risks occurring) and worst-case scenario (high probability of risks occurring). Schedule and cost estimates are adjusted to reflect the low to moderate probability (and impact) of the overall CPGMS risk assessment, resulting in the risk-adjusted scenario (most likely) which is reflected in CPGMS life cycle/project plans and cost estimates. Risks associated with CPGMS Refresh have been reassessed and reflected in associated tasks, schedules, and cost estimates.

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

- 1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? Yes
- 2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) No
 - a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?
 - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:
 - c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:
- 3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? No
 - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate 'O' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
1	GMS V 1.0	9/28/2001	\$33.016	9/28/2001	9/28/2001	\$33.016	\$33.016	0	\$0	100%
2	Workflow Communications	9/29/2003	\$0.194	12/31/2003	12/31/2003	\$0.114	\$0.114	0	\$0	100%
3	Peer Review	8/11/2003	\$0.251	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$0.4	\$0.422	0	\$-0.022	100%
4	Grant Monitoring	10/10/2003	\$0.348	12/31/2003	12/31/2003	\$0.139	\$0.139	0	\$0	100%
5	Application Survey	8/9/2003	\$0.01	8/9/2003	7/15/2003	\$0.01	\$0.012	25	\$-0.002	100%
6	OVC Sub-Grant	9/29/2003	\$0.198	12/31/2003	12/31/2003	\$0.224	\$0.224	0	\$0	100%
8	Enterprise Portal/ Grants.gov Connector	12/31/2003	\$0.7	12/31/2005	12/31/2005	\$0.195	\$0.203	0	\$-0.008	100%
10	Grants Closeout/ GANs Phase I	10/11/2003	\$0.5	10/11/2003	5/21/2007	\$0.5	\$0.5	-1318	\$0	100%
11	Admin Modules II	2/28/2004	\$0.2	1/30/2005	1/30/2005	\$0.2	\$0.14	0	\$0.06	100%
12	GMS V 2.0	9/30/2002	\$11.8	9/30/2002	9/30/2002	\$11.8	\$11.8	0	\$0	100%
13	GMS Enterprise Architecture	12/31/2003	\$0.785	3/31/2005	3/31/2005	\$1.127	\$1.127	0	\$0	100%
14	ANA Enhancements	12/1/2005	\$0.193	12/1/2005	11/18/2006	\$0.193	\$0.193	-352	\$0	100%
15	GANS	5/22/2006	\$0.516	10/20/2006	12/22/2006	\$0.733	\$0.737	-63	\$-0.004	100%
16	Closeouts	3/30/2007	\$0.808	11/28/2007		\$1.085	\$1.241		\$-0.3947	78%
17	Section 205 Progress Reports	11/8/2006	\$0.586	11/8/2006	11/8/2006	\$0.57	\$0.574	0	\$-0.004	100%
18	Grant Monitoring Phase I	6/29/2007	\$0.886	9/6/2007	8/3/2007	\$1.591	\$1.437	34	\$0.154	100%
19	VOCA Performance Reports	3/31/2007	\$0.346	12/31/2007		\$0.604	\$0		\$0	0%
20	OBMS Performance Measures	8/31/2007	\$0.2	8/31/2007		\$0.2	\$0		\$0	0%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost (\$M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost (\$M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
21	GMS Closeouts	8/31/2007	\$0.2	8/31/2007	5/19/2007	\$0.2	\$0.2	104	\$0	100%
22	Standard Budget Form	3/31/2007	\$0.175	10/1/2007		\$0.175	\$0		\$0	0%
23	GMS V 3.0	9/30/2003	\$14.62	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	\$15.137	\$15.137	0	\$0	100%
24	CPGMS/FMIS 2 Interface	6/30/2007	\$0.35	10/31/2007		\$0.35	\$0		\$0	0%
25	Grants.gov Full Forms Set	8/31/2007	\$0.5	2/1/2008		\$0.5	\$0		\$0	0%
26	COPS Planning, Gap Analysis	9/28/2007	\$0.15	9/28/2007	10/21/2006	\$0.15	\$0.15	342	\$0	100%
29	GMS Enhancements	2/27/2004	\$10	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	\$3.682	\$3.682	0	\$0	100%
30	GMS E-Grants Portal	9/30/2005	\$15	9/30/2005	7/5/2005	\$15	\$15	87	\$0	100%
31	ANA	9/4/2003	\$0.36	12/31/2003	12/31/2003	\$0.385	\$0.385	0	\$0	100%
33	DHS/ODP	7/10/2003	\$0.066	7/10/2003	7/10/2003	\$0.069	\$0.069	0	\$0	100%
34	SF269	11/23/2007	\$1.085	11/23/2007		\$1.085	\$0.399		\$0.00245	37%
35	Peer Review II	3/14/2008	\$0.194	3/14/2008		\$0.194	\$0.212		\$-0.02188	98%
Project Totals										