Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

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

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission:	
2. Agency:	General Services Administration
3. Bureau:	Office Of Governmentwide Policy
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Regulatory Information Service Center (ROCIS II)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	023-30-01-06-01-1060-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2001 or earlier

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

OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) and GSA's Regulatory Information Service Center (RISC) are developing and operating a new information system, the RISC/OIRA Consolidated Information System (ROCIS), to support and integrate three different but related functions. One module of ROCIS replaced and improved upon the system that was used to compile and publish the semiannual Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions from 1999 to 2003. Two additional modules of ROCIS replaced two mainframe systems at the Executive Office of the President Data Center, created during the 1980's, that OIRA had used to manage reviews of regulations under Executive Order 12866 and of information collections under the Paperwork Reduction Act. Both of these review processes previously relied upon paper submissions by agencies to OIRA. ROCIS converts these two key Executive oversight processes from paper to Internet-based, electronic processes, eliminating large quantities of paperwork. It also provides public access to regulatory information previously unavailable to the public. The old systems were closed down when the corresponding new systems became available for use.

ROCIS supports the President's Management Initiative for Expanded Electronic Government. It is a collaborative project that includes multiple agencies, using e-business technologies. ROCIS improves on the functionality of OIRA's old mainframe systems by providing electronic submission of documents from Federal agencies; electronic processing of documents within OIRA and RISC; electronic document management, workflow management, record-keeping and archiving; a single comprehensive database of regulation data (merging of data for EO review and Unified Agenda processing); linkage between regulations and information collections; accessibility to persons with disabilities as required by Section 508; expanded availability of economic data on the benefits and costs of regulations; greater transparency of OIRA's business processes; and interoperability with other Federal agency data systems, including linkage to the governmentwide electronic commenting system for rulemaking (the e-Rulemaking Initiative), which serves all Federal regulatory agencies and the public.

Planned DME includes completing some enhancements to ROCIS that were deferred in order to meet OIRA's schedule needs, plus modernization of some components to keep the system running efficiently and ensure security.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	7/23/2007
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?	
Name	
Phone Number	
Email	
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	No

a. Will this investment include electronic assets (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?	
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Expanded E-Government
a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)	ROCIS supports the PMA Initiative for Expanded Electronic Government. It is a collaborative project that includes multiple agencies, using e-business technologies. ROCIS converts two OMB review processes from paper to electronic and provides the public with greater access to information about those processes. RISC has worked cooperatively with OIRA throughout the project. RISC has consulted with user agencies as appropriate, including having user agencies assist in the testing of the system.
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?	
c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 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 or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	No
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	No
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 FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware

Software

Services

Other

21. If this project produces information dissemination	Yes

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?

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

Name

Phone Number

Title

E-mail

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

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

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

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	2.996	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	6.462	0.6	0.4	0.3					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	9.458	0.6	0.4	0.3					
Operations & Maintenance:	0.4	0.793	0.873	1					
TOTAL:	9.858	1.393	1.273	1.3					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	1.95	0.28	0.255	0.175					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	21	3	2	2					

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

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

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

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

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

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

Contracts/Task Orders Table: * Costs in millions

Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N)

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:

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

a. Explain why:

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

a. If "yes," what is the date?

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

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

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2006	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Mission and Business Results	General Government (Cross-Agency)	Executive Functions	% of agencies submitting regulatory reviews electronically	0, as of 9/30/2004	At least 90% of agencies, as of 9/30/2006	Over 95% of regulatory reviews formally requested in FY 2006 were submitted electronically
2006	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average OIRA regulatory review time	58 days for FY 2005	Improve by 3%	55 days for FY 2006
2006	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	% of time system is operationally available excluding scheduled maintenance	95%	Improve to 98%	99%
2007	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction as indicated by survey of Unified Agenda module users	Inconsistent and spotty results from outdated surveys of agency users of Unified Agenda module. Will use 2007 data for baseline in future years	Establish usable baseline for the Unified Agenda module	OGP customer survey conducted in June and July 2007. OIRA stakeholders rated 100% favorable overall effectiveness. Agency users rated 100%

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
								favorable (71%) or neutral (29%)
2007	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Mission and Business Results	General Government (Cross-Agency)	Executive Functions	% of agencies submitting regulatory reviews electronically	0, as of 9/30/2004	At least 95% of agencies, as of 9/30/2007	100% of regulatory reviews formally requested in quarters 1-3 of FY 2007 were submitted electronically
2007	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Mission and Business Results	General Government (Cross-Agency)	Executive Functions	% of agencies submitting information collection reviews electronically	0, as of 9/30/2005	At least 90% of agencies, as of 9/30/2007	98% of information collection reviews in quarters 1-3 of FY 2007 were submitted electronically
2007	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average OIRA regulatory review time	58 days for FY 2005	Improve by 5%	56 days for CY 2006. 63 days for quarters 1-3 of FY 2007. 56 days for 3rd quarter FY 2007
2007	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average OIRA information collection review time	Average Review Time = 70 Days, as of 9/30/2003	Improve by 3%	Not Yet Available
2007	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	% of time system is operationally available excluding scheduled maintenance	95%	Maintain at least 98%	98%
2008	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction as indicated by survey of regulatory review module users	OGP customer survey conducted in June and July 2007. OIRA stakeholders rated 100% favorable overall effectiveness. Agency users rated 100% favorable (71%) or neutral (29%)	Establish usable baseline for the regulatory review module	TBD
2008	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Mission and Business Results	General Government (Cross-Agency)	Executive Functions	% of agencies submitting regulatory reviews and information collection reviews electronically	0, as of 9/30/2005	At least 95% of agencies, as of 9/30/2007	TBD
2008	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average OIRA regulatory review time	58 days for FY 2005	Maintain improved performance	TBD

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.						level	
2008	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average OIRA information collection review time	70 Days, as of 9/30/2003	Maintain improved performance level	TBD
2008	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	% of time system is operationally available	95%	Maintain at least 98%	TBD
2009	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Customer satisfaction as indicated by survey of information collection review module users	OGP customer survey conducted in June and July 2007. OIRA stakeholders rated 100% favorable overall effectiveness. Agency users rated 100% favorable (71%) or neutral (29%)	Establish usable baseline for the information collection review module	TBD
2009	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Mission and Business Results	General Government (Cross-Agency)	Executive Functions	% of agencies submitting regulatory reviews and information collection reviews electronically	0, as of 9/30/2004	At least 95% of agencies, as of 9/30/2008	TBD
2009	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Average OIRA regulatory and information collection review time	Reg reviews-58 days for FY 2005; Info coll reviews-70 days, as of 9/30/2003	Maintain improved performance level	TBD
2009	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	% of time system is operationally available	95%	Maintain at least 98%	TBD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. Yes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:					
(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
ROCIS	No	No	A PIA is not required at	No	No because the system is

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
			this time because the system doesn't collect personally identifiable information on the public.		not a Privacy Act System of Records.

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

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

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

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

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

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

a. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. — Governmentwide Compliance Oversight (Statutory and Executive over review requirements)

b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture? — No

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

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	6
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the organization of data from separate data sources into a single source using middleware or application integration and the modification of system data models to capture new information within a single system.	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Data Integration			No Reuse	6
Unified Regulatory	Supports the use of dynamic	Business Analytical	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	4

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	reports on an as needed basis.	Services						
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports.	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	4
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Controls the process for updates or modifications to agency existing documents.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Change Management			No Reuse	2
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports multiple users working on related tasks.	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Workgroup / Groupware			No Reuse	6
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Provides an electronic interface to customer assistance.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Help			No Reuse	2
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the plan for performing work or services to meet the needs of an organization's customers.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Scheduling			No Reuse	2
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Allows for collecting, analyzing and handling comments and feedback from an organization's customers.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer Feedback			No Reuse	2
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the identification of specific content within a larger set of content for collection and summarization.	Digital Asset Services	Content Management	Tagging and Aggregation			No Reuse	4
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the changing of files from one type of format to another.	Digital Asset Services	Document Management	Document Conversion			No Reuse	2
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Allows access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders.	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	6
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB	Supports the use of documents and data in a	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	4

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders.							
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the categorization of documents and artifacts, both electronic and physical.	Digital Asset Services	Records Management	Document Classification			No Reuse	2
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Allows the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	6
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the grouping and archiving of files and records on a server.	Support Services	Collaboration	Document Library			No Reuse	4
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports retrieval of records that satisfy specific query selection criteria.	Support Services	Search	Query			No Reuse	6
Unified Regulatory Agenda / OMB Review of Regulations / OMB Review of Information Collections	Supports the granting of abilities to users or groups of users of a computer, application or network.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	6

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE) 1.4.2
Data Integration	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Web Services, eXtensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	XML for Analysis, SOAP, ReportMill 8.0
Query	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	Java Server Pages (JSP), Structure Query Language (SQL)
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	Java Server Pages (JSP) 1.0

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Online Help	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE) 1.4.2, HTML 4.0
Document Classification	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Uniform Resource Locator (URL), Java Database Connectivity (JDBC) 2.0
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Internet Explorer 5.0 and NetScape 6.5
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) 3.0
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	Internal, Cisco Firewall 506E
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	Section 508
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	eXtensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0
Customer Feedback	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Hyper Text Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS) 1.1
Process Tracking	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	Business Process Management, Business Process Execution Language (BPEL) 2.0
Ad Hoc	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	Application Program Interface (API) / Protocol, Business Objects Crystal Report 10
Tagging and Aggregation	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	eXtensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0
Document Conversion	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	XML Schema
Document Library	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle 9i / Documentum 5.2
Document Library	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	Network-Attached Storage (NAS), Sun Storage Array
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Oracle Application Server 10g
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Random Access Memory (RAM)
Document Library	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	Redundant Array of Independent Disks (RAID) 5
Workgroup / Groupware	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Sun Fire V240, V440, V880 Enterprise Server
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Version Management Concurrent Versions System (CVS) 1.11.22
Scheduling	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition (J2EE) 1.4.2

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.

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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

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

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?	7/20/2007
b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

2. Alternative Analysis Results: * Costs in millions
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate

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

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

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

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment.

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

List of Legacy Investment or Systems

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

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?	8/3/2007
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			