Expanding NARA Online Services (ENOS)

Budget year: FY2003
Agency: 393

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary
Part I: Summary Information And Justification
Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Dec 14, 2006**

2. Agency: **393**

3. Bureau: **00**

4. Name of this Capital Asset: **Expanding NARA Online Services (ENOS)**

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **393-00-01-04-01-0005-00**

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? **Mixed Life Cycle**

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2003**

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: **NARA's new Strategic Plan furthers our goals to provide more of our services online. To achieve this, NARA re-engineered specific services that automated the delivery of online services to our customers. We employ a BPR methodology that guides the implementation of each business transaction. This ensures that our solutions refresh existing transactions and related processes with new technology. The BPR implements these changes through flexible, customer-oriented business and technology solutions that are endorsed by our stakeholders. This effort is aligned to our GPEA Implementation Plan that lists 50 business transactions (conducted with the public and Government agencies) that could be offered on our Web site. NARA established ENOS (Expanding NARA Online Services) to manage this multi-year effort. ENOS has an E-Government Program to oversee NARA's annual GPEA commitments and to ensure the quality implementation of new automated Web-based services. NARA made significant progress through ENOS; by the end of FY 2006, we anticipate having more than 50% of our services available online. In FY 2006, for example, ENOS provided a service that allows customers to order and pay online for copies of Court Records (bankruptcy, civil, criminal, and Court of Appeals cases) held at the Federal Records Centers, Naturalizations held at our Regional Archive facilities, and WWI Draft Registration Cards held at NARA's Southeast Region in Atlanta. We implemented the online delivery of scanned records. We extended our Siebel Order Fulfillment Application capability to our regional facilities to improve order fulfillment and reporting reproduction orders made by the public. We will enhance our reference request service by allowing our customers to consult with an archivist online about NARA's**

holdings and to request an online quote for reproductions of our records. Through ENOS, NARA has fully implemented its E-Government program, designed and delivered new Web-based services to its customers primarily by using Siebel's Customer Relationship Management software. As we complete these initiatives ENOS will continue to improve the online service capability and investigate technology solutions that would enable the full automation and integration of these customer relationship applications.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**

    a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Aug 28, 2006**

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**

11. Contact information of Project Manager?

    Name**Thomas Kee**

    Phone Number**301-837-0971**

    E-mail**Thomas.kee@nara.gov**

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

    a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **yes**

    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? **[Not answered]**

        2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **[Not answered]**

        3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? **[Not answered]**

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**
    Expanded E-Government

    a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **ENOS (Expanding NARA Online Services) is NARA's E-Government Program to oversee our annual GPEA commitments and to ensure the quality implementation of new automated Web-based services. Through these online services, we educate the public about NARA's holdings and provide access to our country's history and heritage related to its Federal records. These programs enable seamless access and efficient operations support that delivers the greatest value to our customers.**

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.) **yes**

    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? **Records Services Program**

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

15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **Level 2**

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(2) Project manager qualification is under review for this investment**

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)? **no**

19. Is this a financial management system? **no**

    a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? **[Not answered]**

        1. If "yes," which compliance area: **[Not answered]**

        2. If "no," what does it address? **[Not answered]**

    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 **[Not answered]**

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following?

    Hardware **3**

    Software **27**

    Services **70**

    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 **Gary M Stern**

Phone Number **301.837.3026**

Title **Senior Official for Privacy Policy**

E-mail **garym.stern@nara.gov**

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? **no**

Section B: Summary of Spending

1.

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 2006**	**CY 2007**	**BY 2008**
Planning:	4.9	0.2	0.2	0.2
Acquisition:	8.2	1.685	0.9	0.9
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	13.1	1.885	1.1	1.1
Operations & Maintenance:	2.2	0.6	0.6	0.6
TOTAL:	15.3	2.485	1.7	1.7
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.				
Government FTE Costs	2.5	0.504	0.518	0.529
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	20	4	4	4

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

   a. If "yes", How many and in what year? **[Not answered]**

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **[Not answered]**

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	NAMA-03-F-0041
Type of Contract/Task Order	Time and Materials
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	May 27, 2003
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Jun 2, 2003
End date of Contract/Task Order	Jun 1, 2008
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	8.718
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	Laverne Fields
CO Contact information	301-837-3063 Laverne.Fields@nara.gov
Contracting Officer Certification Level	2
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes
Contract or Task Order Number	NAMA-03-F-0069

Type of Contract/Task Order	Time and Materials
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 30, 2003
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2003
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 29, 2007
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	8.978
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	no
Name of CO	Kathleen McGrath
CO Contact information	(301) 837-0307 Kathleen.McGrath@nara.gov
Contracting Officer Certification Level	2
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes
Contract or Task Order Number	NAMA-04-F-0059
Type of Contract/Task Order	Time and Materials
Has the contract been awarded	yes

If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Aug 5, 2004
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Aug 5, 2004
End date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 30, 2007
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	0.489
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	no
Competitively awarded?	yes
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	no
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	no
Name of CO	Kathleen McGrath
CO Contact information	(301) 837-0307 Kathleen.McGrath@nara.gov
Contracting Officer Certification Level	2
If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition?	yes

1. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why: **When the ENOS contracts were awarded, earned value was not a contract or project requirement. NARA will require EVM implementation in future ENOS contracts where appropriate.**

2. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**

   a. Explain why: **NARA specifies Section 508 compliance in all contracts, including small acquisitions to ensure that assistive technology, devices, and services are available to all NARA employees and members of the public with**

disabilities who use NARA Information Technology equipment in NARA facilities. Contractors are required to design, develop, implement, maintain and upgrade all technologies to demonstrate full compliance with all existing accessibility legislation

3. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **yes**

   a. If "yes," what is the date? **Apr 23, 2004**

   b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? **[Not answered]**

      1. If "no," briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table 1:					
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2005	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Percent of NARA archival holdings that are described in an online catalog	30% Archival, 30% Artifact, 5% Electronic	40% Archival, 40% Artifact, 10% Electronic	43% Archival, 43% Artifact, 31% Electronic
2005	Goal 2 (electronic records made accessible) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure	Percent increase in number of archival electronic holdings accessible online	71M Logical Data Record (LDR)	Increase by 20%	86M LDRs - Increased by 15%
2005	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Percent of NARA services available online	40%	Increase to 50%	50%
2005	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Percent of archival fixed fee reproduction orders completed in 35 working days or less	99%	Maintain 80%	97.2%
2005	Goal 3 (easy access to	Average cost to process	$29.35	Decrease	$27.31

	essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	an archival fixed fee reproduction order			
2005	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Cost to provide NARA services online per user session	$0.13	Decrease	$0.17
2006	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Percent of NARA archival holdings that are described in an online catalog	43% Archival, 43% Artifact, 31% Electronic	50% Archival, 50% Artifact, 20% Electronic	50.6% Archival, 56.8% Artifact, 42.8% Electronic
2006	Goal 2 (electronic records made accessible) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure	Percent increase in number of archival electronic holdings accessible online	85.8M LDRs	Increase by 20%	97.1%
2006	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Percent of NARA services available online	50%	Increase to 60%	51.7%
2006	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Percent of archival fixed fee reproduction orders completed in 35 working days or less	97.2	85%	96.7%
2006	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Average cost to process an archival fixed fee reproduction order	$27.31	Decrease	TBD
2006	Goal 3 (easy access to essential evidence) and Goal 5 (expanding IT infrastructure)	Cost to provide NARA services online per user session	$0.17	Decrease	TBD
2007	Goal 2: We will preserve and process records to ensure access by the public as soon as legally possible	Percent of NARA archival holdings that are described in an online catalog	50.6% Archival, 56.81% Artifact, 42.8%	55% Archival, 55% Artifact, 55%	TBD

			Electronic	Electronic	
2007	Goal 4: We will provide prompt easy and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime	Percent of archival holdings available online	TBD	TBD	TBD
2007	Goal 4: We will provide prompt easy and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime	Percent of fixed fee reproduction orders completed in 20 days or less	TBD	85%	TBD
2007	Goal 4: We will provide prompt easy and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime	Average cost to process an archival fixed fee reproduction order	TBD	Decrease	TBD
2008	Goal 2: We will preserve and process records to ensure access by the public as soon as legally possible	Percent of NARA archival holdings that are described in an online catalog	TBD	60% Archival, 60% Artifact, 60% Electronic	TBD
2008	Goal 4: We will provide prompt easy and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime	Number of NARA archival holdings that are available online	TBD	TBD	TBD
2008	Goal 4: We will provide prompt easy and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime	Percent of archival fixed fee reproduction orders completed in 20 working days or less	TBD	85%	TBD
2008	Goal 4: We will provide prompt easy and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime	Average cost to process an archival fixed fee reproduction order	TBD	Decrease	TBD

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
There are no performance goals.						

Section E: Security and Privacy

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: **yes**

    a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: **3**

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 - Security Table:			
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
ERA	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007
RCPOS	Government Only	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007
CMRS	Government Only	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:							
Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested

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

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

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? **no**

    a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. **[Not answered]**

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **[Not answered]**

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
Name of System	**Is this a new system?**	**Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?**	**Is the PIA available to the public?**	**Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?**	**Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?**
ENOS	no	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
ERA	yes	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	no	5. No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
RCPOS	yes	2. No.	2. No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	no	5. No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
OFAS	no	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.
CMRS	no	1. Yes.	1. Yes.	yes	3. No, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

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

   a. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**

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. **Expanding NARA Online Services (ENOS)**

   b. If "no," please explain why? **[Not answered]**

3. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :							
Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
ENOS	Online customer service to the public and other Government agencies	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	Internal	100

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:				
FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Browser Independent
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	Verizon UUNET
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	TCP/IP
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	Solaris
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Apache

Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Sun servers
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle
Self-Service	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Siebel
Self-Service	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Siebel
Self-Service	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	SSL
Self-Service	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	Great Plains
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	EMC

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? **no**

   a. If "yes," please describe. **[Not answered]**

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

   a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? **no**

      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). **[Not answered]**

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information
Section A: Alternatives Analysis

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? **yes**

   a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **Jun 9, 2003**

   b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? **[Not answered]**

   c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

	2. Alternatives Analysis Results:		
Alternative Analyzed	**Description of Alternative**	**Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate**	**Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate**
Baseline- Status Quo	status quo - NARA would continue to support customer ordering as a paper-based process, data sources were primarily the business unit's time and performance monthly statistics compilation by FY (e.g., volume of reproduction copies, time expended on reproduction copies, volume of written replies, time spent on written replies). No specific market research was performed beyond investigating best practices and standard capabilities for private and public sector online ordering services.	0	0
Alternative 1 _ Status Quo	The Office of the Federal Register will continue to process paper documents.	0	0
1 _Basic Online Ordering	Alt 1- involved implementing a Web-based order entry solution to assist customers in completing the forms. Data sources and benchmarks include International and State Archival Agencies; commercial and Federal online ordering sites; and evaluation by NARA's Business Process Re-engineering Guidance Team. Data included NARA staff and developer implementation costs; NARA staff and developer maintenance costs; legacy system administration costs; and potential cost avoidance opportunities.	0.658	0.185
2 _ Enhanced Online Ordering	Alt 2 - adds to the Basic Online Ordering capabilities by replacing OFAS Workflow and introducing new features such as automated correspondence management and adding additional order types. Data sources and benchmarks include International and State Archival Agencies; commercial and Federal online ordering sites; and evaluation by NARA's Business Process Re-engineering Guidance Team. Data included implementation costs; maintenance costs of legacy systems; and cost avoidance opportunities.	3.817	9.9

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **NARA commissioned a cost-benefit analysis of ENOS transactions related to online ordering. This assessed the value of automating specific customer transactions (i.e., fixed fee reproduction orders, microfilm orders, merchandise orders). Three alternatives were analyzed: 1. Status Quo - Continue to provide customer ordering as a paper-based process. 2. Basic Online Ordering - Implement a Web-based order entry solution, with form and field-level validations to assist customers in efficiently completing the online forms. 3. Enhanced Online Ordering - Build on the Basic Online Ordering capabilities by replacing its order processing system and introducing new features such as automated correspondence management and automation of additional order types. The first alternative was eliminated because of our requirement to comply with the Government Paperwork Elimination Act and the need to correct the problems associated with paper-based processing (e.g., interpreting customer handwriting, completing data entry). Alternatives 2 and 3 satisfied its GPEA and ENOS requirements to implement an online ordering capability and deliver benefits such as reduced cycle time, reduced error rates, and greater accessibility of ordering services to NARA's customers. As a new front-end system that would integrate with the existing OFAS Workflow system, Alternative 2 carried low business risk and could be implemented in less time. Alternative 3, as a full transformational solution, provided the greatest volume of benefits, such as significantly reducing cycle times for quote preparation and reproduction/merchandise order fulfillment; streamlining and adding new high-value enhancements to the order fulfillment process; and reducing labor expenditures by 20 percent or more. The high risk and far-reaching impacts of pursuing Alternative 3 compelled NARA to pursue Alternative 2 and we delivered initial online ordering capability to the public in October 2003**

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **One of ENOS goals was to automate NARA's manual, paper-based business transactions that are used to serve its customers. The following efficiencies have been achieved in the implementation of our FY 2002 through FY 2006 ENOS transactions and are anticipated in our FY 2008 investment. Fast, comprehensive and efficient customer service. Automation of manual tasks and processes that are completed by NARA and its customers. Simple, easy-to-use Web-based application interfaces. Increased access for customers to NARA services. Labor cost-avoidance through streamlined and automated internal NARA processes. Improved visibility and improved image with the general public, NARA partners, and Government agencies. Increased customer satisfaction and goodwill (from faster turnaround times, higher service quality, and greater service accessibility).**

Section B: Risk Management

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**

    a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **Aug 25, 2006**

    b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **no**

    c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **[Not answered]**

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **[Not answered]**

    a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **[Not answered]**

    b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **[Not answered]**

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **Investment risks were not accounted for in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule.**

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **no**

2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

    a. What is the Planned Value (PV)? **17.212**

    b. What is the Earned Value (EV)? **16.901**

    c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? **14.845**

    d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? **Contractor Only**

    e. "As of" date: **Jun 30, 2006**

3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)? **0.98**

4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? **0.31**

5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? **1.14**

6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)? **2.06**

7. 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? **[Not answered]**

    b. If "yes," explain the variance: **[Not answered]**

    c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken? **[Not answered]**

    d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"? **23.087**

8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year? **no**

Description of Milestone	**9. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:**							
	Initial Baseline		**Current Baseline**			**Current Baseline Variance**		
	Planned Completion Date	**Total Cost ($M) Estimated**	**Completion Date Planned/Actual**		**Total Cost ($M) Planned/Actual**	**Schedule/Cost (# days/$M)**		**Percent Complete**
1. PY-1 And Earlier	Sep 30, 2005	15.3	Sep 30, 2005	Sep 30, 2005	15.3	15.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	100
2. FY 2006 Release 5.0 Planning	Dec 31, 2005	0.2	Dec 31, 2005	Dec 31, 2005	0.2	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	100
3. FY 2006 Release 5.0 Acquisition	Sep 30, 2006	0.9	Sep 30, 2006	[Not answered]	1.685	0.76	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	85
4. FY 2007 Release 6.0 Planning	Dec 31, 2006	0.2	Dec 31, 2006	[Not answered]	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
5. FY 2007 Release 6.0 Acquisition	Sep 30, 2007	0.9	Sep 30, 2007	[Not answered]	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
6. FY 2008 Release 7.0 Planning	Dec 31, 2007	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
7. FY 2008 Release 7.0 Acquisition	Sep 30, 2008	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
8. FY 2009 Release 8.0 Planning	Dec 31, 2008	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
9. FY 2009	Sep 30, 2009	0.9	[Not	[Not	[Not	[Not	[Not	[Not	0

Release 8.0 Acquisition			answered]	answered]	answered]	answered]	answered]	answered]	
10. FY 2010 Release 9.0 Planning	Dec 31, 2009	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
11. FY 2010 Release 9.0 Acquisition	Sep 30, 2010	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
12. FY 2011 Release 10.0 Planning	Dec 31, 2010	0.2	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
13. FY 2011 Release 10.0 Acquisition	Sep 30, 2011	0.9	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
14. FY 2006 Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2006	0.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	80
15. FY 2007 Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2007	0.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
16. FY 2008 Operations and Maintenance	Sep 30, 2008	0.6	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0