

**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: Federal Acquisition Service
- 4. Name of this Capital Asset: E-Authentication (e-Gov)
- 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 023-10-01-14-01-0250-24
- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Multi-Agency Collaboration
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2003

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

Originally launched in 2002 as part of the President's Management Agenda, the E Authentication Solution helps Federal agencies mitigate the security and privacy risks associated with e-government and control the costs to government of authenticating large numbers of users. The E-Authentication Solution provides a standardized means for citizens, businesses, and other governments to securely identify themselves when accessing U.S. Federal Government online applications. It also allows agencies to accept trusted credentials (e.g., Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) certificates; user IDs/passwords) issued by other agencies and commercial organizations.

As described in the Alternatives Analysis section, the Initiative had selected a federated identity model that is in line with commercial best practices. The U.S. E-Authentication Identity Federation (E-Authentication Federation) was built and successfully launched in October 2005. The E-Authentication Federation is the set of Government agency application owners and identity credential service providers (CSPs) that have adopted E-Authentication's set of agreements, standards and technologies, making identity portable across domains.

Specific benefits provided to agencies through E-Authentication Federation membership are as follows:

- Members' shared expectations and understanding are codified and clearly communicated through Federation and Government-wide policy.
- The Federation addresses key policy guidance from OMB and NIST to ensure consistency across agencies.
- The Federation provides a consistent implementation of standardized levels of assurance.
- The Federation helps improve the user experience while ensuring a high level of security and privacy.
- The Federation provides proven technology standards that have gained wide acceptance in the commercial sector.

The E-Authentication Solution eliminates duplicative efforts among agencies through a cost-effective, proven, reusable component; greatly reduces security and privacy risks inherent in online business; ensures policy-compliance for agencies; and reduces costs for maintenance and management of identity management facilities due to a shared infrastructure. In addition, agencies spend less time and money on accounts and credentials, and can reallocate resources to mission-critical functions. The benefits for agency customers include a standardized authentication experience and the need to manage fewer credentials.

- 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 Yes

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?

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? No

2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? No

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?) The E-Authentication Initiative expands e-Government by enabling agencies to offer services online that require authentication, using a cost-effective solution that is secure as well as convenient and easy for their customers to use, resulting in lower government costs and an improvement in the taxpayer experience.

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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part).) Yes

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Yes

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? GSA Integration Technology Services Portfolio

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

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

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

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (4) Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started

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) Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? No

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

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 products for the public, are these products published to the N/A

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? No

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.

<b>Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)</b>									
<i>(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)</i>									
	<b>PY-1 and earlier</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 and beyond</b>	<b>Total</b>
Planning:	28.441	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	0.22165	0	0.1	0.104					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	28.66265	0	0.1	0.104					
Operations & Maintenance:	45.93618	0	6.84756	17.85282					
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>74.59883</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6.94756</b>	<b>17.95682</b>					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	3.01928	0	1.01788	1.04873					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	24	4	8	8					

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? Yes

a. If "yes," How many and in what year? FY08 - 4

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.

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

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](http://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
2005		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability of assurance level service for Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4	None	80% of targets for Level 1/2 (8); 80% of Level 3/4 targets (14)	87% Level 1/2 CSPs available (7/8); 114% Level 3/4 CSPs available (16/14)
2005		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	# of certified CSPs	None	20 CSPs or 80% of target (25)	115% - 23 either on the PMO's trust list and/or have joined the Federation
2005		Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	% of agency systems implemented on time per committed date	None	90% of schedule commitments per agency MOUs	7% - 1 application of the 14 scheduled for FY05 implementation
2005		Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	# of different credentials required to do business with the government online	One per system	# of systems that reuse credentials, measured against an annual target (12)	8% - 1 system (E-Offer) in production; 11 additional systems that were scheduled to "go live" by the end of FY05 did not do so until early FY06
2005		Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Number of PKI cross-certifications with the FBCA	8 PKI cross-certifications with the FBCA	4 additional	75% - 3 additional
2005		Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% availability of hosted CAM validation service	99.95% availability of hosted CAM	100%	99.99%
2005		Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% availability of portal	99.999% availability of portal	90%	100%
2006		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability of assurance level service for levels 1,2,3 and 4	87% Level 1/2 CSPs available (7/8); 114% Level 3/4 CSPs	90% of targets for Level 1/2 (10) and for Level 3/4 targets	Currently, (as of 6/30/06), 70% of Level 1/2 CSPs available

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
						available (16/14)	(14)	(7/10); 114% Level 3/4 CSPs available (16/14)
2006		Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	# of credentials issued by vertical Federation CSPs plus # of credentials available on demand via traditional Federation CSPs	None	90% of target (41M)	Currently 38% - 15.4M as of 6/30/06 (Fidelity 14M, ORC 250K, OPM's Employee Express 980K, USDA 165K, and ACES 10K)
2006		Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	% of agency systems implemented on time per committed date	None	90% of schedule commitments per agency MOUs	Currently (as of 6/30/06) 42% - 13 of the 31 committed under MOUs to go live by 9/30/06
2006		Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	# of different credentials required to do business with the government online	8%- 1 system (E-Offer) in production; 11 additional systems that were scheduled to "go live" by the end of FY05 did not do so until early FY06	# of systems that accept 3rd party credentials, measured against an annual target (25)	Currently 52% - 13 as of 6/30/06
2006		Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	% of agency system owners that indicate that the E-Authentication service meets their authentication requirements (per a customer survey)	The results of a survey conducted upon completion of the first E-Authentication Education Day (held Feb. 3, 2004): 85% of attendees indicated that the E-Authentication service appears to meet their E-Authentication requirements	90% satisfaction	61% of the respondents to a January 2006 Customer Satisfaction Survey rated the technology as satisfactory or better; 71% rated their experience with PMO-approved vendors as satisfactory; 62% rated overall quality of implementation as satisfactory
2006		Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	Number of PKI cross-certifications with the FBCA	12 PKI cross-certifications with the FBCA	2 additional	100% - 2 as of 6/30/06
2006		Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% availability of validation service	99.95% availability	100%	99.729% as of 6/30/06
2006		Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% availability of portal	99.999% availability of portal	100%	99.5%
2007		Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Percent of SAML-based relying parties connected to on-demand CSP(s)	50%	100%	The appropriateness of this indicator needs to be re-evaluated on fee-for-service business model activities.
2007		Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	% of agency authentication applications that are implemented on time per negotiated project schedule	None	90% of schedule commitments per negotiated project schedule	The appropriateness of this indicator needs to be re-evaluated on fee-for-service business model activities.
2007		Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percent transaction growth, average SAML-based transactions per month	CY06 (Through May 06, average is 1,287)	100%	23,935 per month, as of 30 June 2007.
2007		Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Efficiency	Establishment of marketplace of E-	ACES/Shared Service Providers certs	Availability of SAML 2.0 products; PDVAL	The appropriateness of this indicator

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					Authentication-approved products and services	available	products	needs to be re-evaluated on fee-for-service business model activities.
2007		Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security	% of agency system owners that indicate that the E-Authentication service meets their authentication requirements (per a customer survey)	65% satisfaction	75% satisfaction	Survey to be conducted by FAS CIO during Q4 FY07.
2007		Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% availability of validation service	99.95% availability	99.99%	100%, as of 30 June 2007.
2007		Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	% availability of portal	99.5% availability of portal	99.99%	99.95%, as of 30 June 2007.
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	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	# transactions processed using E-Authentication service	TBD end FY07 (# cumulative transactions over fiscal year)	Available Q3 FY07	TBD
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	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	% applications accepting policy-compliant credentials from E-Authentication approved CSPs	10.5% (cumulative %)	Available Q3 FY07	
2008	2.Superior Workplaces:Deliver and maintain productive workplaces consisting of office space, furnishings, technology, supplies, and related services.	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	% satisfied agency customers	60% (total % satisfied)	Available Q1 FY08	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	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	% agencies using E-Authentication	77% (cumulative %)	Available Q3 FY07	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	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	% applications accepting policy-compliant credentials	TBD (cumulative %)	Available Q1 FY08	TBD
2008	4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	% applications accepting ONLY policy-compliant credentials	TBD end FY07 (cumulative %)	Available Q1 FY08	TBD

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	effective Federal policies and administrative operations.							
2008	3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions.	Technology	Financial (Technology)	Overall Costs	Cost avoidance/savings from use of E-Authentication's Authentication Service Component (ASC)	TBD end Q2 FY08 (cumulative \$)	Available Q3 FY08ff	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	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	# transactions processed using E-Authentication service	TBD end FY07 (# cumulative transactions over fiscal year)	TBD	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	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	% applications accepting policy-compliant credentials from E-Authentication approved CSPs	10.5% (cumulative %)	TBD	TBD
2009	2.Superior Workplaces:Deliver and maintain productive workplaces consisting of office space, furnishings, technology, supplies, and related services.	Customer Results	Service Quality	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	% satisfied agency customers	60% (total % satisfied)	TBD	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	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	% agencies using E-Authentication	77% (cumulative %)	TBD	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	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	% applications accepting policy-compliant credentials	TBD (cumulative %)	TBD	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	Management and Innovation	Participation	% applications accepting ONLY policy-compliant credentials	TBD end FY07 (cumulative %)	TBD	TBD
2009	3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate,	Technology	Financial (Technology)	Overall Costs	Cost avoidance/savings from use of E-	TBD end Q2 FY08 (cumulative \$)	TBD	TBD

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions.				Authentication's Authentication Service Component (ASC)			

**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?

<b>8. Planning &amp; Operational Systems - Privacy Table:</b>					
<b>(a) Name of System</b>	<b>(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)</b>	<b>(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)</b>	<b>(d) Internet Link or Explanation</b>	<b>(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)</b>	<b>(f) Internet Link or Explanation</b>
E-Authentication	No	Yes	PIA on file and not required to post on agency web site because not collecting information on the public.	No	No because the system is not a Privacy Act System of Records.
<b>Details for Text Options:</b> 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. E-Authentication

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.

<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b>								
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 <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
<b>Agency Component Name</b>	<b>Agency Component Description</b>	<b>FEA SRM Service Domain</b>	<b>FEA SRM Service Type</b>	<b>FEA SRM Component (a)</b>	<b>Service Component Reused Name (b)</b>	<b>Service Component Reused UPI (b)</b>	<b>Internal or External Reuse? (c)</b>	<b>BY Funding Percentage (d)</b>
Authentication Service Component (ASC)	Those capabilities that support obtaining information about parties attempting to log on to a system for security purposes, and the validation of those users.	Support Services	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			External	100

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

- 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)
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Computer Associates - eTrust SiteMinder 6.0.202.708
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Entegry - AssureAccess v3.0.8
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Entrust - GetAccess v7.0 SP 2 Patch 3
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Hewlett-Packard - Select Access v5.2
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	IBM - Tivoli Federated Identity Manager v6.0.1
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	IBM - WebSphere DataPower XML Security Gateway XS40 v6.0
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Novell - SAML Extension 1.0.1 for iChain
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Oracle - Identity Management CoreID Federation 2.5
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Ping Identity Corporation - PingFederate 4.0.1.3
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	RSA Security - Federated Identity Manager v2.5LA
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Sun Microsystems - JES Access Manager 2Q2004
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	Trustgenix - IdentityBridge 2.1
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Same 12 vendors listed for Component Framework/Security/Certificates/Digital Signatures
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	Same 12 vendors listed for Component Framework/Security/Certificates/Digital Signatures
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	Same 12 vendors listed for Component Framework/Security/Certificates/Digital Signatures
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Same 12 vendors listed for Component Framework/Security/Certificates/Digital Signatures
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	Same 12 vendors listed for Component Framework/Security/Certificates/Digital Signatures
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	FAS CIO providing hosting services for E-Authentication portal
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	Same 12 vendors listed for Component Framework/Security/Certificates/Digital Signatures

- a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications
- b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

**Exhibit 300: Part IV: Planning For "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY**

**Section A: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (All Capital Assets)**

Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business(LOB) Initiative, or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The "Multi-Agency Collaboration" choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as "Multi-Agency Collaboration" will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300. Multi-agency Collaborations, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.

**1. Stakeholder Table:**

As a joint exhibit 300, please identify all the agency stakeholders (all participating agencies, this should not be limited to agencies with financial commitment). All agency stakeholders should be listed regardless of approval. If the partner agency has approved this joint exhibit 300 please provide the date of approval.

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Joint Exhibit Approval Date
---------------------	----------------	-----------------------------

**2. Partner Capital Assets within this Investment:**

Provide the partnering strategies you are implementing with the participating agencies and organizations. Identify all partner agency capital assets supporting the common solution (section 300.7); Managing Partner capital assets should also be included in this joint exhibit 300. These capital assets should be included in the Summary of Spending table of Part I, Section B. All partner agency migration investments (section 53.4) should also be included in this table. Funding contributions/fee-for-service transfers should not be included in this table. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53)

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner Agency Asset Title	Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY)
---------------------	----------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------

**3. Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):**

For jointly funded initiative activities, provide in the "Partner Funding Strategies Table": the name(s) of partner agencies; the UPI of the partner agency investments; and the partner agency contributions for CY and BY. Please indicate partner contribution amounts (in-kind contributions should also be included in this amount) and fee-for-service amounts. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53. For non-IT fee-for-service amounts the Partner exhibit 53 UPI can be left blank) (IT migration investments should not be included in this table)

Partner Agency Name	Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY)	CY Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
---------------------	----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-----------------	--------------------

An Alternatives Analysis for multi-agency collaborations should also be obtained. At least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline (i.e., the status quo), should be included in the joint exhibit 300. 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.

4. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? Yes
- a. If "yes," what is the date of the analysis? 5/31/2006
  - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
  - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

**5. Alternatives 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
----------------------	----------------------------	--	---

6. Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance process and why was it chosen?

7. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

**8. Federal Quantitative Benefits: (\$millions):**

What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
--	-----------------------	----------------	---	---

9. 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:

**8b. 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? 5/19/2006
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No
  - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:
  
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?

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

You should also periodically be measuring the performance of operational assets against the baseline established during the planning or full acquisition phase (i.e., operational analysis), and be properly operating and maintaining the asset to maximize its useful life. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements.

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.

Answer the following questions about the status of this investment. Include information on all appropriate capital assets supporting this investment except for assets in which the performance information is reported in a separate exhibit 300.

1. Are you using EVM to manage this investment? Yes
  - a. If "yes," does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748? Yes
  - b. If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:
  
  - c. If "N/A," please provide date operational analysis was conducted and a brief summary of the results:

#### Questions #2 are NOT applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M

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:

#### Questions #3-4 are applicable to ALL capital assets

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? Yes
  - a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? 7/10/2007

Exhibit 300: E-Authentication (e-Gov) (Revision 10)

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	Agency Responsible for Activity
		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				