

# BY09 Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

## Exhibit 300

### **PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION**

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

Submission Date Time:

09/10/2007

Submission Id: 4,788

#### **Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)**

The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments to help OMB to identify which agency and bureau is responsible for managing each capital asset, which OMB MAX budget account funds the project, the kind of the project, who to contact with questions about the information provided in the exhibit 300, and whether or not it is an IT or a non-IT capital asset.

(1) Date of Submission:	2007-09-10-04:00
(2) Agency:	422
(3) Bureau:	00
(4) Name of this Capital Asset: (250 Character Max)	Proposals, Reviews and Awards Management Integration System (PRAMIS)
(5) Unique ID (Unique Project Identifier):	422-00-04-00-01-0008-00
Format xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	
(6) What kind of investment will this be in FY2009?	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 a gap in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: (2500 Char Max)

PRAMIS is a system of systems that provides comprehensive services to manage the grants life cycle and supporting business processes of NSF, providing functional and technology upgrades that position NSF to take advantage of Federal-wide initiatives such as Grants.gov and the Grants Management Line of Business as well as provide effective solutions to current NSF grants management needs. There are three types of PRAMIS services: (1) Core Enterprise Services such as identity management, business intelligence, and workflow, which provide a common set of technical

capabilities that are shared across the enterprise. (2) E-Gov and Grants Management services, which provide Grants Life Cycle Management capabilities to NSF and other Federal grant-making agencies, in a manner that takes appropriate advantage of areas of specialization across the Grants lifecycle. Included in this category is NSF's state of the art integration with Grants.gov that allows NSF to capture the proposal data submitted via Grants.gov so that proposals can be processed electronically by the PRAMIS eJacket system. (3) Administrative Enterprise Services are those business services needed to manage all other business and administrative functions, whether offered by a line of business agency partner, or NSF-provided. These next generation information technology capabilities go far beyond automation of paper-based business processes. Instead, they provide lower cost of operations for both NSF and other agency partners, greater flexibility, increased capabilities, and faster deployments. Problems addressed by PRAMIS include: (1) Technology obsolescence x outdated technology platforms cannot meet user demands, drive up maintenance costs; (2) Stove-piped applications x delivering shared services and enhancements across legacy applications is overly difficult, puts undue burden on users, causes high operational costs. (3) Inflexible architecture - cannot accommodate effective business process improvements, measure against new performance goals, mine transaction data for problems and opportunities; (4) Cannot meet enterprise architecture goals x NSF needs to create eGovernment services that are flexible, meet public needs well, and can be shared across organizational boundaries, which will be enabled by this investment.

(9) Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	2007-08-20-04:00
(10) Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	yes

(11) Contact Information of Project Manager?

Name:	Maureen Miller
Phone Number:	(703) 292-4273
E-Mail:	mmiller@nsf.gov

(11a) What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?  
Senior/Expert-level

(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 (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?	Select...
[2] If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	Select...
[3] If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	Select...

(13) Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? yes

If "yes," select all that apply:

<b>President's Management Agenda (PMA) Initiatives</b>
Expanded E-Government

a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?

PRAMIS fully supports the Expanded Electronic Government goal of the PMA: (1) PRAMIS implemented both NSF's integration with Grants.gov, as well as (2) the Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) pilot application as a trial for NSF's role as consortium lead. In addition, PRAMIS implemented E-Authentication for (3) the FastLane system, as well as for the (4) GMLoB pilot task, as part of the vision for a interagency grants service.

(14) Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? no

(a) If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	Select...
(b) If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	
(c) If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	Select...

(15) Is this investment for information technology? (see section 53 for definition) yes

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

(16) What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council PM Guidance)?	Level 1
(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 identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB's Memorandum M-05-23)?	no
(19) Is this a financial management system?	no
(a) If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	Select...
[1] If "yes," which compliance area:	
[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:	
------------------	--

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

Hardware %:	Software %:	Services %:	Other %:	Total %
0	10	90	0	100

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

(22) Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

<b>Name:</b>	Leslie A. Jensen
<b>Phone Number:</b>	703-292-8060
<b>Title:</b>	NSF Privacy Act Officer
<b>E-Mail:</b>	ljensen@nsf.gov

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

(24) Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? no

**Section B: Summary of Funding (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.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
<b>All amounts represent Budget Authority (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</b>									
	<b>PY-1 &amp; Earlier (Spending Prior to 2007)</b>	<b>PY 2007</b>	<b>CY 2008</b>	<b>BY 2009</b>	<b>BY +1 2010</b>	<b>BY+2 2011</b>	<b>BY+3 2012</b>	<b>BY+4 2013 and beyond</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning	\$0.600	\$0.600	\$0.500	\$0.500					
Acquisition	\$4.500	\$3.205	\$2.105	\$9.500					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	\$5.100	\$3.805	\$2.605	\$10.000					
Operations & Maintenance	\$2.700	\$3.500	\$6.500	\$7.492					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$7.800</b>	<b>\$7.305</b>	<b>\$9.105</b>	<b>\$17.492</b>					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.100	\$0.900					
Number of FTE represented by cost	9	9	8	7					

**Note:** For the cross-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.

Due to budget constraints, spending for PRAMIS was less than approved in FY06. NSF mitigated the effects of this by addressing only the highest priority requirements based on external commitments, regulatory mandate, strategic value, and customer return on investment.

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

(1) Complete the table for all contracts and/or task orders in place or planned for this investment:

Contract or Task Order Number: NSFDACS0733650 Type of Contract/TO Used: Cost Plus Fixed Fee

Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

03/30/2007

Contract/TO Start Date:

04/01/2005

Contract/TO End Date:

04/30/2009

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$6.000 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Steven Strength

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 703-292-4567 / sstrength@nsf.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) Select...

(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:

Earned value is required for this contract.

(3) Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? yes

Section 508 Compliance Explanation:

Section 508 compliance is a checkpoint in NSF's software deployment process. 508 compliance is a contractual requirement for purchased business software, and every new application or module is tested for 508 compliance as well as true accessibility prior to deployment.

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

yes

(a) If "yes", what is the date?

01/20/2007

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

[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 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](http://www.egov.gov). The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area IT	Measurement Grouping IT	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2007	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	Improve the public's access to the results of NSF-funded research.	Prior to July of 2007, Award Search did not include any citations	Linkage to commercial database provides increase in number of linked citations.	Over 75,000 citations linked to awards and made available to the public
2007	Stewardship	Customer Results	Automation	Migrate/Implement e-Gov solution sets	Post all discretionary grants applications packages in Grants.gov	Post 100% of discretionary grants application packages on Grants.gov	NSF met the goal by posting 100% of discretionary grants application packages on Grants.gov.
2007	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Develop a cross-enterprise, high-value data repository, and move existing data to it. Provide effective tools for users to access and gain knowledge from that data.	NSF has disparate, limited data repositories, and very limited and outdated tools for accessing information.	Accepted requirements document for strategic information management of grants data.	Requirements document produced
2007	Stewardship	Technology	Improvement	Consolidate stove-piped grants administration applications, implementing the target NSF architecture.	NSF grants management spread over disparate, stove-piped, and outdated systems, causing high maintenance cost and difficulty in offering flexible, high-value services.	Consolidate multiple legacy grants admin applications into eJacket Pathfinder.	NSF Legacy grants applications PO Comment, Site Visit, and Context Statement consolidated into eJacket Pathfinder.
2008	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	Increased number of available citations through Public Access to Research Results	75,000 citations available from Award Search	100,000 citations available from Award Search	

2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	Integration	Implement enterprise single sign-on solution	NSF systems require duplicate login for every use with internally-managed credentials	A single sign-on solution is delivered, and at least two applications have migrated to it.	
2008	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Develop a cross-enterprise, high-value data repository, and move existing data to it. Provide effective tools for users to access and gain knowledge from that data.	NSF has disparate, limited data repositories, and very limited and outdated tools for accessing information.	Pilot at least one common, enterprise data repository, and deliver an effective toolset to access that data.	
2008	Stewardship	Technology	Integration	Implement Oracle DB for Reviewer Management	No enterprise platform for Reviewer Management activities	Enterprise platform delivers new Reviewer Management services	
2009	Stewardship	Customer Results	Automation	Improve NSF Program Officers' ability to identify, recruit, and assign reviewers.	No electronic capability at NSF for identification, recruitment, assignment.	Electronic capability established	
2009	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Maintain repository of available reviewers	No existing repository	Repository established	
2009	Stewardship	Technology	Integration	Deliver flexible, high-value Reviewer Management services to provide better integration with grants and financial systems	No enterprise Reviewer Management services	At least 2 new Reviewer Management services integrated with grants and financial capabilities	
2009	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	Increase ability of PIs to link publication info to specific awards	Add new functionality to Public Access to Research Results module	Increased capability available	

**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: **yes**

(a) If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: 5.0

(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:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
eJacket	Contractor and Government	06/30/2009	06/30/2009

(4) Operational Systems - Security:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated system	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact Level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has the C&A been completed using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards we used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed Security Control Testing	Date Contingency Plan Tested
eJacket	Contractor and Government	Moderate	yes	07/29/03	FIPS 200 / NIST	06/20/06	02/16/06

					800-53		
--	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--

(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? no

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

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

(a) If "yes," specify the amount, a general description of the weakness, and 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?

NSF uses a range of methods to review the security of operations through contract requirements, project management oversight and review, certification and accreditation processes, IG independent reviews, proactive testing of controls through penetration testing and vulnerability scans to ensure services are adequately secure and meet the requirements of FISMA, OMB policy, NIST guidelines and NSF policy. The system is operated on-site by a team of contractors and NSF personnel with system administrators tightly controlling access to the systems. Only administrators with current need have access to the system, and strict code migration, quality control, and configuration management procedures prevent deployment of hostile or vulnerable software on the systems. Contractors are trained in the same security measures as NSF employees. All NSF employees and contract staff are required to complete an on-line security training class each year, including the rules of behavior. Background checks are done routinely as a part of the NSF contracting process, and IT security requirements are stated in the contract's statement of work. Contractor security procedures are monitored, verified, and validated by the agency in the same way as for government employees. Once on board, contractors are allowed access to the NSF systems based on their specific job requirements. Audit logs are also implemented to monitor operating system changes - these audit logs are reviewed regularly by the system administrators. Additionally, roles and responsibilities are separated to the extent possible to allow for checks and balances in system management and multiple levels of oversight.

(8) Planning and Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name Of System	(b) Is this a new system?	(c) Is there at least one PIA which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
eJacket	no	yes	<a href="http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pia0502.pdf">http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pia0502.pdf</a>	yes	The SORN from 2004 ( <a href="http://frwebgate2.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate.cgi?WAISdocID=271959203626+4+0+0&amp;WAISection=retrieve">http://frwebgate2.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate.cgi?WAISdocID=271959203626+4+0+0&amp;WAISection=retrieve</a> ) is the most current because the existing Privacy Act system of records was not substantially revised in FY 06.

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

- (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.	This investment is identified as PRAMIS in the EA Transition Strategy, and is the primary vehicle for implementing NSF's EA Transition via eJacket, Authentication, Authorization, Enterprise Reporting, Workflow, Rules Engine, BI Engine, Data Warehouse, Business Services, etc.
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.
  - Grants Management

(4) Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content manager relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance re: components, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov> .

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEASRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal External Reuse (c)	Funding Percentage (d)
				Reused Service Component Name	Reused Service Component UPI		
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Data Warehouse	Select...		No Reuse	5
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Meta Data Management	Select...		No Reuse	2
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation	Select...		No Reuse	3
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Data	Loading and Archiving	Select...		No Reuse	3

		Management					
eJacket	Enterprise Reporting	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	Select...		No Reuse	2
eJacket	Grants.gov Integration	Development and Integration	Data Integration	Select...		No Reuse	15
eJacket		Development and Integration	Legacy Integration	Select...		No Reuse	2
eJacket	Rules Engine	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management	Select...		No Reuse	10
AAMS	eProcurement System	Supply Chain Management	Procurement	Select...		No Reuse	5
eJacket	eCorrespondence	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications	Select...		No Reuse	6
eJacket		Content Management	Content Review and Approval	Select...		No Reuse	6
eJacket		Records Management	Document Retirement	Select...		No Reuse	3
eJacket	eCorrespondence	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management	Select...		No Reuse	3
eJacket		Tracking and Workflow	Case Management	Select...		No Reuse	30
eJacket	Workflow	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking	Select...		No Reuse	5

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 this column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. 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	FEA Service Specification (b)
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Assistance Request	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Assistance Request	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Case Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Internal (within agency)
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Case Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Secure Sockets Layer (SSL)
Content Authoring	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Content Authoring	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Content Authoring	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Java Server Pages (JSP)
Content Review and Approval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Customer Analytics	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Customer Feedback	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Data Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)

Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Demand Forecasting / Mgmt	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Document Classification	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Document Retirement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Event / News Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Inbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Legacy Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Sybase Adaptive Server Enterprise (ASE)
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
Meta Data Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	Java Database Connectivity (JDBC)
Multi-Lingual Support	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Outbound Correspondence Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Personalization	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Process Tracking	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE)
Product Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)

Reservations / Registration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Reservations / Registration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Sales and Marketing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Self-Service	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Self-Service	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Subscriptions	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Subscriptions	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Sun Java Enterprise System (JES)
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Version Management, Defect Tracking, Issue Management, Change Management, Requirements Management and Traceability
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	Version Management, Defect Tracking, Issue Management, Change Management, Requirements Management and Traceability
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Functional Testing, Usability Testing (508 Testing), Performance Profiling, Load/Stress/Volume Testing, Security and Access Control Testing

- 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)? no

a. If “yes,” please describe.



**PART II: PLANNING, ACQUISITION AND PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

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.

**Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)**

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

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

a. If “yes,” provide the date the analysis was completed?

07/01/2004

b. If “no,” what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs Estimates	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits Estimate
Alt 1 for Grants.gov Integration: system-to-system with document management	A web service capability would connect to and transfer proposals from Grants.gov. A PDF copy of the filled-out application and file attachments would be extracted to document set. The document set would be transferred to a document management component for access by internal and external users to validate, review, and evaluate.	\$2.100	\$0.000
Alt 2 for Grants.gov Integration: system-to-person.	NSF staff or contractors would be assigned to download incoming proposals from the Grants.gov website. These people would validate the proposal contents, after which the package would be automatically loaded by a batch program into the NSF proposal database.	\$5.600	\$0.000
Alt 3 for Grants.gov Integration: system-to-system with database	A web service capability would transfer proposals from Grants.gov. XML content would be mapped to and loaded in the proposal database. PDF attachments would be associated these with an application using an existing method at NSF.	\$1.700	\$0.000

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

Grants.gov Integration: The overall value of alternative 3, the system-to-system with database approach, was considered higher. The lifecycle costs would ultimately be lower, and the qualitative aspects, such as speed and flexibility for the

future were better. NSF has experience and expertise in managing development projects of this nature, so the project risk was considered low. Participation in this program was mandatory, so the return on investment was simply the accomplishment of a required task in the manner with the best value to NSF.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Grants.gov Integration: Leverages existing investments in proposal management tools for a smooth and consistent user experience. Continued fast processing of proposals 100% automated processing. Reduced errors and rework for proposal validation.

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? no

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? Select...

b. If “yes,” please provide the following information:

Name Of Legacy System	Legacy UPI	Date Of 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?

09/01/2005

b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year’s submission to OMB?

no

c. If “yes,” describe any significant changes:

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

a. If “yes,” what is the planned completion date?

b. If “no,” what is the strategy for managing risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

Major work changes or extensions trigger an investment baseline review. These reviews ensure that cost and schedule estimates are risk-weighted, and that the project risk management plan is updated before proceeding. Detailed risks are tracked until resolved.

**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 plus or minus (+ -) 10%? no

a. If "yes," was it the CV, SV, or Both? Select...

b. If "yes," explain the variance:

c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?

no

8. a. If "yes" when was it approved by the agency head?

4. 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.

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Schedule Variance (# days)	Current Baseline Cost Variance (\$M)	Actual Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Costs (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned	Completion Date Actual	Total Costs (\$M) Planned	Total Costs (\$M) Actual			
Grants Administration and Oversight - eJacket Pathfinder (New Development)	10/23/04	\$2.583	10/23/04	10/23/04	\$2.583	\$1.868	0	-\$0.720	100.0
Guest Travel and Reimbursement System - Phase 1	9/4/04	\$0.605	9/4/04	9/4/04	\$0.605	\$1.045	0	\$0.440	100.0
Grants Administration and Oversight - eJacket Pathfinder (Maintenance)	9/30/04	\$1.262	9/30/04	9/30/04	\$1.262	\$0.502	0	-\$0.760	100.0
e-Travel Business Case	9/1/05	\$0.200	9/1/04	9/30/04	\$0.200	\$0.200	29	\$0.000	100.0
eGov Initiatives - Grants.gov Integration Phase 1	10/29/04	\$0.858	10/29/04	10/29/04	\$0.858	\$0.426	0	-\$0.430	100.0
PRAMIS Program Management - Common Solutions	9/30/06	\$1.753	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.600	\$0.560	0	-\$0.040	100.0
Grants Administration and Oversight - Phase 2	10/31/05	\$2.267	10/31/05	10/31/05	\$2.267	\$1.169	0	\$1.098	100.0
Strategic Information Assets Management - Phase 1	10/31/05	\$0.657	10/31/05	10/31/05	\$0.657	\$0.455	0	\$0.202	100.0
eGov Initiatives - Grants.gov Integration Phase 2	9/30/05	\$2.215	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$2.215	\$1.249	0	\$0.966	100.0
eGov Initiatives - Pilots for Grants Management Line of Business	10/1/05	\$0.027	8/5/06	8/12/06	\$0.300	\$0.390	7	\$0.090	100.0
Identity Management x eAuthentication Pilot	7/1/04	\$0.187	7/1/04	9/30/04	\$0.187	\$0.190	15	-\$0.120	100.0
Identity Management x FastLane eAuthentication Production	9/30/05	\$0.600	9/30/05	10/15/05	\$0.600	\$0.480	15	\$0.120	100.0
Identity Management x Corporate Directory Phase 1	10/31/05	\$1.136	4/30/06	5/5/06	\$0.350	\$0.383	5	\$0.030	100.0
Infrastructure Upgrades	9/30/04	\$1.468	9/30/04	9/30/04	\$1.468	\$1.238	0	-\$0.230	100.0
PIMS Upgrade - Phase 1	9/30/04	\$0.184	9/30/04	9/30/04	\$0.184	\$0.211	0	\$0.030	100.0
Guest Travel and Reimbursement System - Phase 2	9/30/05	\$0.466	9/30/05	5/31/05	\$0.466	\$0.477	-122	\$0.010	100.0
Facilities Tracking x Phase 1	9/30/05	\$0.361	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$0.361	\$0.329	0	\$0.032	100.0
PIMS Upgrade - Phase 2	1/31/06	\$0.853	1/31/06	1/31/06	\$0.853	\$0.071	0	\$0.782	100.0
Purchasing and Property - Requirements Phase	9/30/04	\$0.100	9/30/04	9/30/04	\$0.100	\$0.100	0	\$0.000	100.0
Purchasing and Property - Alt. Analysis Phase	9/30/05	\$0.200	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$0.200	\$0.048	0	-\$0.150	100.0
Project Reports - Requirements Phase	9/30/05	\$0.034	9/30/05	10/30/05	\$0.069	\$0.070	30	\$0.001	100.0
Maintenance FY2005	9/30/05	\$1.050	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$1.050	\$1.050	0	\$0.000	100.0
PRAMIS Program Management - Planning Common Solutions 2	9/30/06	\$0.600	9/30/06	9/30/05	\$0.333	\$0.276	0	-\$0.057	100.0

Grants Administration and Oversight - Phase 3	9/30/06	\$2.600	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$3.250	\$2.760	0	-\$0.480	100.0
Strategic Information Management - Phase 2	9/30/06	\$1.000	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.250	\$0.252	0	\$0.010	100.0
eGov Initiatives	9/30/06	\$1.200	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.290	\$0.390	0	\$0.090	100.0
Identity Management - Corporate Directory Phase 2	9/30/06	\$0.800	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.660	\$0.520	0	-\$0.150	100.0
Facilities Tracking x Phase 2	9/30/06	\$0.200	12/31/06	12/31/06	\$0.152	\$0.152	0	\$0.000	100.0
Project Reports - Development Phase	9/30/06	\$0.700	12/31/06	12/31/06	\$1.490	\$1.490	0	\$0.000	100.0
Develop an inventory of current sources and contractual obligations for information security products and services.	12/31/05	\$0.001	12/31/05		\$0.001	\$0.001	0	\$0.000	0.0
Develop a business case for NSF becoming a GMLoB Consortium Lead (i.e., service provider for other Federal grant-making agencies).	9/30/06	\$0.243	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.243	\$0.243	0	\$0.000	100.0
Maintenance FY2006	9/30/06	\$3.100	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$1.110	\$1.050	0	-\$0.050	100.0
PRAMIS Program Management - Planning Common Solutions 3	9/30/07	\$0.600	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.500	\$0.500	0	\$0.000	100.0
Grants Administration and Oversight - Phase 4	9/30/07	\$1.500	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$2.148	\$2.096	0	\$0.052	0.0
Strategic Information Assets Management - Phase 3	9/30/07	\$0.500	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.000	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
eGov Initiatives	9/30/07	\$0.800	9/30/07		\$0.800	\$0.800	0	\$0.000	100.0
Identity Management - Corporate Directory Phase 3	9/30/07	\$0.600	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.266	\$0.292	90	\$0.026	0.75
Reviewer / Customer Management - Phase 1	9/30/07	\$0.200	9/30/07	4/30/07	\$0.115	\$0.162	0	\$0.047	100.0
Develop migration plan for acquiring information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business.	9/30/06	\$0.001	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.001	\$0.001	0	\$0.001	100.0
Maintenance FY2007	9/30/07	\$4.100	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$3.500	\$3.500	0	\$0.000	100.0
PRAMIS Program Management - Common Solutions Planning 4	9/30/08	\$0.500	9/30/08		\$0.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Grants Administration and Oversight - Phase 5	9/30/08	\$6.000	9/30/08		\$2.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
eGov Initiatives	9/30/08	\$2.000	9/30/08		\$1.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Identity Management - Corporate Directory Phase 3	9/30/08	\$0.500	9/30/08		\$1.400	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Reviewer / Customer Management - Phase 2	9/30/08	\$0.500	9/30/08		\$3.000	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2008	9/30/08	\$4.500	9/30/08		\$6.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2009	9/30/09	\$9.400	9/30/09		\$7.492	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0

Implement plan to migrate from current information security acquisition processes to the procurement of information security products and services from Centers of Excellence established under the Information Systems Security Line of Business.	9/30/10	\$0.001	9/30/10		\$0.001	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2010	9/30/10	\$9.400	9/30/10		\$9.400	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2011	9/30/11	\$10.200	9/30/11		\$10.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2012	9/30/12	\$11.000	9/30/12		\$11.000	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2013	9/30/13	\$11.400	9/30/13		\$11.400	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2014	9/30/14	\$12.900	9/30/14		\$12.900	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2015	9/30/15	\$14.000	9/30/15		\$14.000	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0
Maintenance FY2016	9/30/16	\$14.900	9/30/16		\$14.900	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0.0

Total Planned Costs: \$138.937

Total Actual Costs: \$26.997