

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

Numeric Evaluation	Supports the President’s Management Agenda (AI)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly supports the PMA, including the E-Gov initiatives and/or LoBs. • Is a LOB or E-Gov PMO • This is a collaborative investment that includes industry, multiple agencies, State, local, or tribal governments, uses e-business technologies, and is governed by citizen needs. If appropriate, this investment is fully aligned with one or more of the President's E-Gov initiatives.
4	<p>Supports the PMA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a LOB, E-Gov Shared Service Provider or Government-wide Initiative? • Is listed on the agencies Competitive Sourcing Plan, Human Capital Plan, or in some way is provably linked to the agency’s PMA plans. • Directly supports one of the other PMA components
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is not related to any of the PMA’s and therefore it is acceptable for it not be directly supporting any of the PMA’s. • This is not a collaborative investment though it could be and much work remains to strengthen the ties to the President's Management Agenda. If appropriate, this investment supports one or more of the President's E-Gov initiatives but alignment is not demonstrated.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support the PMA, and should not necessarily – but, could better exemplify principles of “good E-government” – for example, could support information sharing, direct services to the citizen, interagency efforts, etc. • This is not a collaborative investment and it is difficult to ascertain support for the AI.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support the PMA, but should. (e.g. It is a grants systems, but is not a part of the grants LoB or Grants.gov E-Gov initiative).

Numeric Evaluation	Project Management (PM)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q17 answer = #1, “Project Manager (PM) has been validated as qualified for this investment” <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit 300 is strong throughout • Project is very strong and has resources in place to manage it.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q17 answer = #1, “Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment” • Project has few weak points in the area of PM and agency is working to strengthen PM.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Q17 answer = #2, “Project manager qualification is under review for this investment”

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	<p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q17 answer = #4, “Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started”] <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment is spending funds in the current fiscal year. • Much work remains in order for PM to manage the risks of this project.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q17 answer = #3, “Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements” <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency is spending funds in the current fiscal year for this investment. • There is some understanding of PM for this project but understanding is rudimentary.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q17 answer = #5, “No Project manager has yet been assigned to this investment” <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency is spending funds in the current fiscal year for this investment. • Conflicting or inconsistent information; requires further investigation or clarification. • There is no evidence of Project Management.

Numeric Evaluation	Acquisition Strategy (AS)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition plan exists, AND; • Risk mitigated through good mix of contract types, AND: • All contracts competitively awarded, AND; • All contracts performance based, AND; • All contracts require EVM, AND; • Required security clauses are in the contracts, and; • Contracting Officer has proper certification or competencies, AND; • All contracts contain 508 clause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong Acquisition Strategy mitigating risk to the Federal government, accommodates Section 508 as needed, and uses contracts and statements of work (SOWs) that are performance based.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition plan exists, • Majority of current contracts are competitively awarded and performance based. • All future contracts are planned to be awarded, or will be, or adequately justified non-competitive award

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk mitigated through good mix of contract types. • Strong Acquisition Strategy mitigating risk to the Federal government, accommodates Section 508 as needed, uses contracts and SOWs that are performance based. Acquisition strategy has very few weak points.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition plan exists, AND; • All future contracts are planned to be competitively awarded, or will be, or adequately justified non-competitive award • Acquisition strategy does not appear to successfully mitigate risk to the Federal government, e.g., over-reliance on cost-plus and/or time and materials contract types, accommodates Section 508 as needed, much work remains to solidify and quantify the Acquisition Strategy, and contracts and SOWs do not appear to be performance based.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No acquisition plan and no indication of one being developed OR • Contract(s) not competitively awarded, or not performance based, and inadequate justification for foregoing competition • Contracts are not performance based, and investment relies heavily on time and materials or cost plus type contracting vehicles. • Acquisition strategy does not appear to successfully mitigate risk to the Federal government, does not accommodate Section 508, does not appear to use performance based contracts and SOWs, and there is no clear understanding of effective acquisition strategy.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting or inconsistent information; requires further investigation or clarification. • There is no evidence of an Acquisition Strategy.

Numeric Evaluation	Performance Information (PI)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance measures/metrics exist for every year the project is in development and/or any relevant ongoing maintenance timeframe (e.g., there are metrics for every year of the investment). • Achievement of incremental performance improvement is demonstrated by project meeting prior year performance targets. • The investment discusses the agency’s mission, strategic goals, and performance measures. • The investment discusses associated and appropriate PART ratings and how the investment is addressing indicated improvement plan elements. • The business case includes a discussion of the alignment between the

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	<p>indicated improvement plan elements and the agency’s strategic goals and performance measures.</p>
<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance measures/metrics are provided for at least BY 2009, BY+1(2010), and BY+2(2011) (only applies to multi-year investments, as indicated in Section B Table 1 spending table). • Performance measures/metrics are quantitative or qualitative, and clearly capture investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. Performance measures/metrics clearly support agency mission and strategic goals, and are aligned with associated and appropriate PART improvement plan elements. For example: • Measure/metric target is a % reduction in average processing time for a customer service. • Measure/metric target is a program success metric that shows success toward the agency mission, such as reducing the number of incidences of a specific event from X baseline down to X-1 target. • Measure/metric target is achievement of a specific agency goal that has been set by legislative mandate or executive order. • Performance measures/metrics provided are appropriate to show investment success or failure. • For Steady State (SS) investments, sustaining the same level of performance from year to year is acceptable as defined in the program area. • For Development/Modernization/Enhancement (DME) investments, performance measures should (within a reasonable timeframe during the project lifecycle) show improvement. • The business case includes a discussion on the agency’s mission and strategic goals, and demonstrates performance measures are provided. Some work remains to strengthen the performance management.
<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance measures/metrics are provided for at least BY 2009. • Performance measures/metrics provided are appropriate to show investment completion, but are not quantitative or qualitative. For example: • Measure/metric states an information system will be rolled out for public use on a specific date. Quantitative or qualitative benefits of implementing the system are not provided. • Measure/metric states a meeting will be held, or results will be communicated at a specific date, but the benefits of this output are not provided. • Performance measures/metrics do not clearly support agency mission and strategic goals. • ‘Strategic Goal(s) Supported’ column is blank, or • Data provided for performance measures/metrics to agency mission does not make sense. • Performance goals exist but they are more focused towards

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	efficiency measures and the linkage to the agency’s mission and strategic goals is weak.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some performance measures/metrics are provided, but are not provided for BY 2009. • Limited performance information is provided; however, performance measures are incomplete or not measurable. For example: • Performance. Measures provided are not descriptive enough to be measured • Performance. Measures lack a Target • Exception: For investments in the Planning (i.e. Concept) phase, “TBD” or blank is acceptable for Target. These investments are identified as “Planning” in Section A. Question 6. at the beginning of the Exhibit 300. • Performance goals are in their initial stages and are not appropriate for the type of investment. Much work remains to strengthen the performance management.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No performance measures/metrics are provided. • There is no evidence of performance management for this investment.

Numeric Evaluation	Security (SE)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All responses are complete and there does not appear to be inconsistencies in the information provided in the exhibit AND • Agency has received an IG assessment of “excellent” in their annual FISMA reports due to OMB on October 1, 2007 (or a subsequent update from the agency IG or agency head) for the quality of their C&A process. • And meets the evaluation criteria to merit a “4”.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A C&A date, less than 3-years old (as of two weeks prior to the September 10th submission date), for ALL operational systems that are part of the investment. C&A needs to be based on FIPS impact level and NIST guidance (800-37, FIPS 199, FIPS 200, 800-53) with very few exceptions. • A planned C&A date (before the operational date) for ALL systems in planning that are part of the investment. • Security controls tested within the past year (365 days) for ALL operational systems. • Contingency plan testing within the past year (365 days) for ALL operational system. (Note: NIST disagrees with this for low-impact systems.) • For all contractor task orders, security is included in the contract. • IT security costs and percentages are indicated.

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If “Mixed Lifecycle,” then the planning table should show the new or changing segments. Some systems may be listed in both the planning and the operational tables.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not meeting one condition for a 4 (particularly those bolded). • Minor instances of conflicting or inconsistent information within the business case; requires further investigation or clarification
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not meeting two or more conditions for a 4 (particularly those bolded). <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant conflicting or inconsistent information within the business case; requires further investigation or clarification.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of security information missing or significantly inconsistent. <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting or inconsistent information within the business case or elsewhere; requires further investigation or clarification.

Numeric Evaluation	Privacy (PR)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All responses are complete and there does not appear to be inconsistencies in the information provided in the exhibit <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency has received an IG assessment of “excellent” in their annual FISMA reports due to OMB on October 1, 2007 (or a subsequent update from the agency IG or agency head) for the quality of their PIA process. <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the evaluation criteria to merit a “4” or “3” (depending on whether a PIA or SORN is applicable.)
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency identifies the system as operational AND as required to have a SORN or PIA or both, the agency includes working link(s) to the system of records notice (SORN) published in the Federal Register or to the PIA (which covers the system identified) posted on the privacy page of the agency’s web site. • The agency identifies the system as required to have a SORN or PIA or both but the system is in planning and the agency notes the documents are not yet required to be complete (i.e., when the system is operational).
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency identifies the system as not requiring a SORN or PIA and offers one of the following explanations: • Acceptable reasons why a SORN is not required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not a system of records under the Privacy Act ○ System of records, but does not maintain any records about U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable reasons why a PIA is not required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the system does not have information in identifiable form • the system has information in identifiable form, but it is not about the public (i.e., has information only about federal employees and contractors in their employment capacity) • the system is a government-run public website where the user is given the option of contacting the site operator for the limited purpose of providing feedback (e.g., questions or comments) or obtaining additional information; • the system is a national security system as defined at 40 U.S.C. 11103 as exempted for the definition of information technology • all elements of a PIA are addressed in a matching agreement government by the computer matching provisions of the Privacy Act • all elements of a PIA are addressed in a interagency agreement permitting the merging of data for strictly statistical purposes and where the resulting data are protected from improper disclosure and use • the agency is developing an IT system for collecting non-identifiable information for a discrete purpose, not involving matching with or retrieval from other databases that generates information in identifiable form • the system is a legacy system to which no substantive changes have been made since 2002
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency identifies the system as operational and required to have a SORN and/or PIA but does not provide a working link to the appropriate document. Broken links or links to insufficient documentation do not receive credit. • The agency says a SORN or a PIA is not required, but does not provide an acceptable reason. • The agency provides some conflicting or inconsistent information (e.g., column (e) indicates a SORN is required but column (f) states the system is not a system of records).
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of privacy information missing or significantly inconsistent.

Numeric Evaluation	Enterprise Architecture (EA)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual OMB Agency EA Assessment is GREEN. • Evaluation for Section D. Performance Information is at evaluated as at least a “4”. • Meets all requirements for EA evaluation of a “4” (see below).

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual OMB Agency EA Assessment is GREEN. • Score for Section D. Performance Information is evaluated as receiving at least a "3". • Meets all requirements for EA Evaluation of a "3" (see below). Question 3. SRM Table: Table identifies service components for all relevant services included in the investment description and purpose. BY funding % do not need to sum to 100%, but should not exceed 100% total. • Question 4. TRM Table: Each service component listed in Table 3 has at least one specification linked to it in the TRM table.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual OMB Agency EA Assessment is YELLOW. (if this is true, then max. evaluation of a "3") • Questions 1. and 2.: Answers to both these questions are "Yes", and any "No" is adequately explained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acceptable explanations for "No" include: ○ Investment was identified after the latest EA submission, due to changing business/operating conditions, such as legislative mandate, executive order, etc. ○ Investment was identified as a result of EA analysis performed after the most recent agency EA was submitted to OMB. • Question 2: Investment can be identified in the agency EA Transition Strategy using the name entered in Question 2.a., or using the investment name or UPI code from Part I. Section A. • <u>Question 3. SRM Table:</u> Table is at least partially completed. • <u>Question 4. TRM Table:</u> Table is at least partially completed.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual OMB Agency EA Assessment is RED. (if this is true, then max. evaluation of a "2") • Questions 1. and 2.: Answer to one or both of these questions is "No", and no acceptable explanation is provided for why the investment is not included in the agency target EA or transition strategy (see criteria for a "3" above for acceptable explanations). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exception: Exhibit 300s for E-Gov initiatives, Lines of Business, and other crosscutting agency initiatives. These investments do not need to provide an explanation for a "No" answer. These initiatives are identified as such in Section A. Question 6 "E-Gov/LoB Oversight".
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section F of the Exhibit 300 is blank, or has insufficient information to be reviewed.

Numeric Evaluation	<p>Alternative Analysis (AA) *Note Alternative Analysis information is not required for Steady State investments</p>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Alternative Analysis includes three viable alternatives, alternatives were compared consistently, and reasons and benefits were provided for

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	the alternative chosen.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Alternative Analysis was conducted where at least 3 viable alternatives were considered in addition to the baseline. For a 5, it also must be a current analysis and have fully answered all the questions for this section including an articulation of the qualitative benefits. • The Alternative Analysis includes three viable alternatives, however work needs to continue to show alternatives comparison, and support must be provided for the chosen alternative.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Alternative Analysis includes fewer than three alternatives and overall analysis needs strengthening.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Alternative Analysis was conducted, however, it considered fewer than 3 viable alternatives and/or it is not clear why they selected the alternative they chose. (For instance, the agency chose the most costly alternative but did not explain why this was selected.) • Considered non-viable alternatives • The Alternative Analysis includes weak information and significant weaknesses exist.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Alternative Analysis was conducted. • Conflicting or inconsistent information; requires further investigation or clarification • There is no evidence that an Alternative Analysis was performed.

Numeric Evaluation	Risk Management (RM)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk assessment was performed and overall risks e.g. acquisition strategy, alternative analysis, project management, etc are well managed throughout the investment.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a current Risk Management plan for this investment (within approx the past 2 years).
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While a Risk Management plan was developed for the investment, it has not been updated for the project to reflect current risks of the project. • Risk management is very weak and does not seem to address or manage most of the risk associated with the investment.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Risk Management plan exists for the investment and there are not plans to develop a plan for the investment. (Even if the project is in the planning stage, there should be a risk management plan,.) • Other areas of the business case or project performance indicate a questionable or inadequate Risk Management strategy or execution.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting or inconsistent information; requires further investigation or clarification. • There is no evidence of a Risk Management plan or strategy.

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

Numeric Evaluation	Cost/Schedule/Performance (PB)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only agencies currently green for this element of the scorecard can receive a 5. If the investment is underway and requires EVM, it must be between 0 and 5% of cost/schedule and performance goals as of the submission date of the Exhibit 300. • If currently in full acquisition or mixed life cycle at the time the Exhibit 300 is submitted (not referring to the lifecycle status for the budget year), all investments awarded a 5 must have clear and sufficiently descriptive cost and schedule milestones appropriate for the size, scope and duration of the investment, <u>regardless</u> of whether EVM is required or not and current EVM variance performance.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency is currently green for this element of the scorecard, the investment is underway and requires EVM, and has performed between 6 and 10% of cost/schedule/performance goals as of the submission date of the Exhibit 300. <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency is currently yellow for this element of the scorecard, the investment is underway and requires EVM, and has performed between 0 and 10% of cost/schedule/performance goals as of the submission date of the Exhibit 300. • If the investment is currently in full acquisition or mixed life cycle at the time the Exhibit 300 is submitted (not referring to the lifecycle status for the budget year), all investments awarded a 4 must have clear and sufficiently descriptive cost and schedule milestones appropriate for the size, scope and duration of the investment, regardless of whether EVM is required or not and current EVM variance performance. • Operational analysis for a currently steady state system has been conducted within a year of the system going fully operational and the results are adequately discussed.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency is currently green or yellow for this element of the scorecard, the investment is underway and requires EVM, and has performed between 11% and 20% of cost/schedule/performance goals as of the submission date of the Exhibit 300. The exhibit addresses the variance, causes, and corrective actions. • If currently in full acquisition or mixed life cycle at the time the Exhibit 300 is submitted (not referring to the lifecycle status for the budget year), all investments awarded a 3 must have clear and sufficiently descriptive cost and schedule milestones appropriate for the size, scope and duration of the investment, regardless of whether EVM is required or not and current EVM variance performance. • Operational analysis for a currently steady state system has been conducted within a two years of the system going fully operational and the results are adequately discussed

Table 9-6: FY 2009 Exhibit 300 Evaluation Criteria

	<p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational analysis for a currently steady state system has been conducted within a one year of the system going fully operational, but the results are NOT adequately discussed • If the agency is yellow or green for this element on the scorecard and the investment is in the planning stages (is not yet underway as of FY2008 and not currently mixed life cycle) and has not performed against a baseline for cost and schedule.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency is currently yellow or green for this element of the scorecard, the investment is underway and requires EVM, and has performed between 21% and 30% of cost/schedule/performance goals as of the submission date of the Exhibit 300. The exhibit addresses the variance, causes, and corrective actions. • The agency is currently red for this element of the scorecard. In this situation, all investments in the portfolio will receive an evaluation of “2” for this element of the investment or lower if warranted. • The investments has cost/schedule/performance variance within 20%, but the cost and schedule milestones are not clear and sufficiently descriptive or appropriate for the size, scope and duration of the investment. • The investment is currently in full acquisition or mixed life cycle at the time the Exhibit 300 is submitted (not referring to the lifecycle status for the budget year), and does NOT have clear and sufficiently descriptive cost and schedule milestones appropriate for the size, scope and duration of the investment, regardless of whether EVM is required or not and current EVM variance performance. • Operational analysis for a currently steady state system has NOT been conducted within a two years of the system going fully operational <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational analysis has been performed within two years of the system going fully operational, but the results are not adequately discussed.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The investment has cost/schedule/performance variance beyond 30%. • The cost and schedule milestones are grossly inadequate, unclear, or inappropriate for the size, scope and duration of the investment, regardless of whether EVM is required or not and current EVM variance performance. • Conflicting or inconsistent information; requires further investigation or clarification