

Exhibit 300 FY2008

FY2008 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.

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments.

I. A. 1. Date of Submission:

2006-09-01

I. A. 2. Agency:

005

I. A. 3. Bureau:

96

I. A. 4. Name of this Capital Asset:

(short text - 250 characters)

Resource Ordering and Status System

I. A. 5. Unique ID: (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)

005-96-01-11-01-0040-00-104-010

I. A. 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?

(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)

Operations and Maintenance

I. A. 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?

FY2001 or earlier

I. A. 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:

(long text - 2500 characters)

Background and Overview The ROSS Project was initiated in response to serious disasters in 1994, which involved loss of life and property. These disasters precipitated a series of investigations by the interagency community, OSHA, BLM, and FS, Interagency management reviews, and Interagency prescribed actions. In part, the findings cited shortcomings of fire and other incident dispatch systems, insufficient resource status documentation, and the inability to mobilize appropriate resources in a timely manner. Reviews conducted in the mid to late 1990s pointed out weaknesses in the dispatch system due to lack of resource status and availability information. In the 12/95 Federal Wildland Fire Policy Memorandum signed by Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman and Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt, the Federal Wildland fire management agencies were directed as a matter of high priority to implement the principles, policies and recommendations of the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and Program Report. This memorandum directed the agencies to correct the deficiencies in the dispatch process. The ROSS Project is a result of this action. The ROSS project addresses the issues documented in the reports by implementing an interagency resource status and ordering system throughout the nation. Today, more than 400 dispatch offices use ROSS nationwide. ROSS is used by agencies within the National Wildfire Coordinating Group or NWCG. The ROSS project was reviewed and approved by USDAs e-Board on August 6, 2004. The USDA e-Board reviewed and approved ROSS again in August of 2005. The project is considered to be in the Control Phase of CPIC. ROSS Operations and Maintenance (O&M) for FY 2006 through FY 2010 are included in the Summary of Spending table above. During the summer of 2005, the USDA OCIO recommended that ROSS move to the Evaluate Phase. In response to this recommendation, ROSS Evaluate Phase activities began in FY 2006. This is expected to include a Post Implementation Review and an Operational Analysis Review for ROSS, which will be initiated in the fall of 2006.

I. A. 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?

yes

I. A. 9. a. If "yes", what was the date of this approval?

2006-09-06

I. A. 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

yes

I. A. 11. Contact information of Project Manager?

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

no

I. A. 12. a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?

yes

I. A. 12. b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)

no

I. A. 12. b. 1. If "yes", is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

I. A. 12. b. 2. If "yes", will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

I. A. 12. b. 3. If "yes", is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

I. A. 13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?

yes

I. A. 13. a. If "yes", check all that apply:

Human Capital

Financial Performance

Expanded E-Government

I. A. 13. b. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s).

(medium text - 500 characters)

ROSS can efficiently and easily generate needs, availability, and location information for incident resources. ROSS automates a manual process, providing a common user interface to a single centralized database, thereby reducing dependencies on multiple information sources and saving money. ROSS is interagency, used by federal, state and inter-tribal agencies.

I. A. 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.)

no

I. A. 14. a. If "yes", does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?

I. A. 14. b. If "yes", what is the name of the PARTed Program?

(short text - 250 characters)

I. A. 14. c. If "yes", what PART rating did it receive?

I. A. 15. Is this investment for information technology? (see section 53 for definition)

yes

I. A. 16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?

Level 1 - Projects with low-to-moderate complexity and risk. Example: Bureau-level project such as a stand-alone information system that has low- to-moderate complexity and risk. Level 2 - Projects with high complexity and/or risk which are critical to the mission of the organization. Examples: Projects that are part of a portfolio of projects/systems that impact each other and/or impact mission activities. Department-wide projects that impact cross-organizational missions, such as an agency-wide system integration that includes large scale Enterprise Resource Planning (e.g., the DoD Business Mgmt Modernization Program). Level 3 - Projects that have high complexity, and/or risk, and have government-wide impact. Examples: Government-wide initiative (E-GOV, President's Management Agenda). High interest projects with Congress, GAO, OMB, or the general public. Cross-cutting initiative (Homeland Security).

Level 3

I. A. 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per OMB's PM Guidance):

(1) - The project manager assigned for this investment has been validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (2) - The project manager assigned for this investment is in the process of being validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (3) - The project manager assigned for this investment is not validated as qualified in accordance with OMB PM Guidance.; (4) - The qualifications for the project manager named have not been evaluated.; (5) - No project manager is currently assigned for this investment.; (6) - N/A -- This is not an IT investment.

(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

I. A. 18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?

no

I. A. 19. Is this a financial management system?

no

I. A. 19. a. If "yes", does this investment address a FFIA compliance area?

I. A. 19. a. 1. If "yes" which compliance area?

(short text - 250 characters)

I. A. 19. a. 2. If "no", what does it address?

(medium text - 500 characters)

I. A. 19. 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

(long text - 2500 characters)

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

I. A. 20. a. Hardware

1

I. A. 20. b. Software

2

I. A. 20. c. Services

97

I. A. 20. d. Other

0

I. A. 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

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

I. A. 22. a. Name

(short text - 250 characters)

Nancy DeLong

I. A. 22. b. Phone Number

I. A. 22. c. Title

(short text - 250 characters)

Deputy Project Manager

I. A. 22. d. Email

(short text - 250 characters)

Nancy_Delong@nps.gov

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

yes

Section B: Summary of Funding

I. B. 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.

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

	PY-1 Spending Prior to 2006	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008					
Planning	4.43	0	0	0					
Acquisition	23.27	0.26	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	27.70	0.26	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance	11.17	5.837	4.643	5.654					
TOTAL	38.87	6.097	4.643	5.654					
Government FTE Costs	0	0	0	0					
Number of FTE represented by cost	0	0	0	0					

I. B. 2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

no

I. B. 2. a. If "yes", How many and in what year?

(medium text - 500 characters)

(long text - 2500 characters)

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

(Character Limitations: Contract or Task Order Number - 250 Characters; Type of Contract/Task Order - 250 Characters; Name of CO - 250 Characters; CO Contact Information - 250 Characters)

[illegible]

(long text - 2500 characters)

n/a

(medium text - 500 characters)

yes

2006-08-31

I. C. 4. b. If "no", will an acquisition plan be developed?

I. C. 4. b. 1. If "no", briefly explain why:
(medium text - 500 characters)

Section D: Performance Information

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 Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

I. D. 1. Table 1

(Character Limitations: Strategic Goal(s) Supported - 250 Characters; Performance Measure - 250 Characters; Actual/baseline (from Previous Year) - 250 Characters; Planned Performance Metric (Target) - 250 Characters; Performance Metric Results (Actual) - 250 Characters; Measurement Indicator - 250 Characters; Baseline - 250 Characters; Planned Improvement to the Baseline - 250 Characters; Actual Results - 250 Characters)

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2003	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement a system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource status information.	Administration and Resource Status component training nearly complete. Use of the system for actual operations is evident.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	Between 2001 and 2003: 30 sessions held, 400 students trained. 350 offices using the system.
2003	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement an automated system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource ordering information.	Resource Ordering component training continues. Use of the system for actual operations is evident.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	Between 2001 and 2003: 94 sessions held. 1354 students trained. 350 offices using the system.
2004	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement a system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource status information.	Between 2001 and 2003: 30 sessions held, 400 students trained. 350 offices using the system.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	In 2004: 4 sessions held. 90 students trained. 350 offices using the system.
2004	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement an automated system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource ordering information.	Between 2001 and 2003: 94 sessions held. 1354 students trained. 350 offices using the system.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	2004: 27 sessions held. 380 students trained. 350 offices using the system.
2005	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement a system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource status information.	In 2004: 4 sessions held. 90 students trained. 350 offices using the system.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	2005: 9 sessions held. 101 students trained. 400 offices using the system.
2005	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement an automated system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource ordering information.	2004: 27 sessions held. 380 students trained. 350 offices using the system.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	2005: 27 sessions held. 519 students trained. 400 offices using the system.
2006	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement a system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource status information.	2005: 9 sessions held. 101 students trained. 400 offices using the system.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	2006 (as of 8/14/2006). 2 sessions held. 71 students trained. 400 offices using the system
2006	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement an automated system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing	2005: 27 sessions held. 519 students trained. 400 offices using the system.	Number of training sessions held. Number of students trained. Number of dispatch offices using the system.	2006 (as of 8/14/2006). 24 sessions held. 517 students trained. 400 offices using the

		of resource ordering information.			system
2007	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement a system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource status information.	N/A	Availability of interactive "On-Demand" training for all users. Note: Classroom training will cease at the end of 2006 due to the completion of ROSS implementation.	TBD
2007	USDA FS (2004) Goal 1	Implement an automated system in all wildland dispatch offices that automates the manual processes associated with the collecting and sharing of resource ordering information.	N/A	Availability of interactive "On-Demand" training for all users. Note: Classroom training will cease at the end of 2006 due to the completion of ROSS implementation.	TBD

I. D. 2. Table 2

Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Disaster Management are achieved	The ROSS dispatch component has been completed in all Geographic Areas except AK and CA. Use of the system for documentation, collection, consolidation, dissemination, and sharing of Resource Mobilization information is evident.	During 2005, the planned improvement is to complete implementation of the ROSS Dispatch module in Alaska.	ROSS has been successfully implemented in Alaska, both at the Federal level (the Geographic Area Coordination Center or GACC) and at the Local Dispatch office level. Implementation of ROSS in California at both the Federal level (GACC) and Local D
2005	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of ROSS users satisfied with system support	Extent to which ROSS users are satisfied with system support	Customers participating in ROSS Help Desk surveys answer "agree," "strongly agree," "neutral" or "not applicable" for more than 85% of the questions.	Through the fourth quarter of 2005, all of the questions scored between 89% and 100% indicating that survey respondents answered answer "agree," "strongly agree," "neutral" or "not applicable" to the survey questions.
2005	Customer Results	Response Time	Extent to which ROSS implementation improves dispatch, status documentation, and resource mobilization	Availability of dispatch, status, and resource mobilization information	Information available on a real-time basis	100% of the information is available on a real-time basis.
2005	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Extent to which ROSS implementation eliminates the need for the National Interagency Coordination Center (NICC) to keep a separate database of orders for year end reporting.	Separate database required to support year end reporting; the data accuracy is very limited because the data are based on manual processes	No separate database is required and improved accuracy in year-end reporting.	As of September of 2005, a separate database is no longer required and the accuracy of year end reporting has increased.
2005	Technology	Reliability	% of unscheduled/ unplanned system down time of ROSS infrastructure	Number of hours of unscheduled/ unplanned downtime during fire season	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	As of August 25, 2005, for the 12-month period prior, ROSS Database Servers, Application Servers, Report & GIS Servers, and Edge Servers (used for routers for the DMS and Web services) were all available between 96.79% and 100% of the time.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Disaster Management are achieved	Implementation of the ROSS Dispatch component has been completed in all Geographic Areas except California.	Complete implementation of the ROSS Dispatch module in all Geographic Areas.	California implementation is 100% complete. Both of the two interagency GACCs and approximately 118 Local Dispatch offices have implemented ROSS.
2006	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of ROSS users satisfied with system support	More than 85% of ROSS users are satisfied with system support	Customers participating in ROSS Help Desk surveys answer "agree," "strongly	Through the third quarter of 2006, all of the questions scored between 93% and 100% indicating that survey respondents

					agree," "neutral" or "not applicable" for more than 87% of the questions.	answered answer "agree," "strongly agree," "neutral" or "not applicable" to the survey questions.
2006	Customer Results	Response Time	Extent to which ROSS implementation improves dispatch, status documentation, and resource mobilization	100% of information is available on a real-time basis.	Information available on a real-time basis	100% of the information is available on a real-time basis.
2006	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Extent to which ROSS implementation eliminates the need for the National Interagency Coordination Center (NICC) to keep a separate database of orders for year end reporting.	Separate database required to support year end reporting; the data accuracy is very limited because the data are based on manual processes	No separate database is required and improved accuracy in year-end reporting.	Separate database no longer required; accuracy of year end reporting has increased.
2006	Technology	Reliability	% of unscheduled/unplanned system down time of ROSS infrastructure	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	Production infrastructure available more than 95% of the time	As of August 14, 2006, for the 12-month period prior, ROSS production Database Servers, Application Servers, and Report & GIS Servers were all available more than 96% of the time.
2007	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Disaster Management are achieved	Implementation of the ROSS Dispatch component has been completed in all Geographic Areas including California. Use of the system for documentation, collection, consolidation, dissemination, and sharing of Resource Mobilization information is evident	Full implementation of ROSS throughout the dispatch community.	TBD
2007	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of ROSS users satisfied with system support	More than 87% of ROSS users are satisfied with system support	Customers participating in ROSS Help Desk surveys answer "agree," "strongly agree" or "neutral" for more than 89% of the questions.	TBD
2007	Customer Results	Response Time	Extent to which ROSS implementation improves dispatch, status documentation, and resource mobilization	Availability of dispatch, status, and resource mobilization information	Information available on a real-time basis	TBD
2007	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Extent to which ROSS implementation eliminates the need for the National Interagency Coordination Center (NICC) to keep a separate database of orders for year end reporting.	Separate database required to support year end reporting; the data accuracy is very limited because the data are based on manual processes	No separate database is required and improved accuracy in year-end reporting.	TBD
2007	Technology	Reliability	% of unscheduled/unplanned system down time of ROSS infrastructure	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	Production infrastructure available more than 95% of the time.	TBD
2008	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Disaster Management are achieved	Implementation of the ROSS Dispatch component has been completed in all Geographic Areas including California. Use of the system is evident.	Full implementation of ROSS throughout the dispatch community.	TBD
2008	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of ROSS users satisfied with system support	More than 89% of ROSS users are satisfied with system support	Customers participating in ROSS Help Desk surveys answer "agree," "strongly agree" or "neutral" for	TBD

					more than 90% of the questions.	
2008	Customer Results	Response Time	Extent to which ROSS implementation improves dispatch, status documentation, and resource mobilization	Availability of dispatch, status, and resource mobilization information	Information available on a real-time basis	TBD
2008	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Extent to which ROSS implementation eliminates the need for the National Interagency Coordination Center (NICC) to keep a separate database of orders for year end reporting.	Separate database required to support year end reporting; the data accuracy is very limited because the data are based on manual processes	No separate database is required and improved accuracy in year-end reporting.	TBD
2008	Technology	Reliability	% of unscheduled/unplanned system down time of ROSS infrastructure	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	TBD
2009	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Disaster Management are achieved	Implementation of the ROSS Dispatch component has been completed in all Geographic Areas including California. Use of the system is evident.	Full implementation of ROSS throughout the dispatch community.	TBD
2009	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of ROSS users satisfied with system support	More than 90% of ROSS users are satisfied with system support	Customers participating in ROSS Help Desk surveys answer "agree," "strongly agree" or "neutral" for more than 90% of the questions.	TBD
2009	Customer Results	Response Time	Extent to which ROSS implementation improves dispatch, status documentation, and resource mobilization	Availability of dispatch, status, and resource mobilization information	Information available on a real-time basis	TBD
2009	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Extent to which ROSS implementation eliminates the need for the National Interagency Coordination Center (NICC) to keep a separate database of orders for year end reporting.	Separate database required to support year end reporting; the data accuracy is very limited because the data are based on manual processes	No separate database is required and improved accuracy in year-end reporting.	TBD
2009	Technology	Reliability	% of unscheduled/unplanned system down time of ROSS infrastructure	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	TBD
2010	Mission and Business Results	Disaster Preparedness and Planning	Extent to which outcomes related to Disaster Management are achieved	Implementation of the ROSS Dispatch component has been completed in all Geographic Areas including California. Use of the system for documentation, collection, consolidation, dissemination, and sharing of Resource Mobilization information is evident	Continued implementation of ROSS throughout the dispatch community.	TBD
2010	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	% of ROSS users satisfied with system support	More than 90% of ROSS users are satisfied with system support	Customers participating in ROSS Help Desk surveys answer "agree," "strongly agree" or "neutral" for more than 90% of the questions.	TBD
2010	Customer Results	Response Time	Extent to which ROSS implementation improves dispatch,	Availability of dispatch, status, and resource mobilization information	Information available on a real-time basis	TBD

			status documentation, and resource mobilization			
2010	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Extent to which ROSS implementation eliminates the need for the National Interagency Coordination Center (NICC) to keep a separate database of orders for year end reporting.	Separate database required to support year end reporting; the data accuracy is very limited because the data are based on manual processes	No separate database is required and improved accuracy in year-end reporting.	TBD
2010	Technology	Reliability	% of unscheduled/unplanned system down time of ROSS infrastructure	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	Production infrastructure available 95% of the time or more	TBD

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

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.

I. F. 1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

yes

I. F. 1. a. If "no", please explain why?

(long text - 2500 characters)

I. F. 2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

no

I. F. 2. a. If "yes", provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

(medium text - 500 characters)

I. F. 2. b. If "no" please explain why?

(long text - 2500 characters)

USDA is in the process of developing a transition strategy that should be in place for the calendar year 2007 annual OMB assessment. This investment will likely be listed under its own name and be linked to USDA efforts in Disaster Management.

I. F. 3. 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.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

FEA SRM Component - Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM. FEA Service Component Reused - 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. Internal or External Reuse? - '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. Funding Percentage - Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service. (Character Limitations: Agency Component Name - 250 Characters; Agency Component Description - 500 Characters)

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused - Component Name	FEA Service Component Reused - UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
ROSS Ad Hoc Service	Ad Hoc reports service	Reporting	Ad Hoc	Brand Management		No Reuse	7
ROSS Notification	Service to provide alerts	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications			No Reuse	1

Service							
ROSS Business Rule Service	Service to manage business rules	Management of Processes	Business Rule Management			No Reuse	13
ROSS Catalog Service	Service to manage catalog data	Supply Chain Management	Catalog Management			No Reuse	10
ROSS Account Service	Service to manage customer accounts	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management			No Reuse	3
ROSS Exchange Service	Data exchange service	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	6
ROSS Data Service	Service to manage data marts	Data Management	Data Mart			No Reuse	3
ROSS Authentication Service	Service to manage user authentication	Security Management	Identification and Authentication			No Reuse	2
ROSS Retrieval Service	Service to retrieve data	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	5
ROSS Sharing Service	Service to retrieve data	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	5
ROSS Meta Data Service	Service to manage meta data	Data Management	Meta Data Management			No Reuse	2
ROSS Help Service	Online help service	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Help			No Reuse	2
ROSS Tutorial Service	Online tutorial service	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Tutorials			No Reuse	2
ROSS Ordering Service	Service to manage ordering data	Supply Chain Management	Ordering / Purchasing			No Reuse	8
ROSS Query Service	Query service	Search	Query			No Reuse	4
ROSS Distribution Service	Service to manage software distribution	Systems Management	Software Distribution			No Reuse	2
ROSS Reports Service	Service to manage standard reports	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	8

I. F. 4. 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 - 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. Service Specification - 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. (Character Limitations: Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name) - 250 characters)

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name)
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Ad Hoc	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Ad Hoc	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Ad Hoc	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Ad Hoc	Service Platform and	Hardware /	Servers / Computers	

	Infrastructure	Infrastructure		
Ad Hoc	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Business Rule Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	
Catalog Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Catalog Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Catalog Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Catalog Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Catalog Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Catalog Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Catalog Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Catalog Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Customer / Account Management	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Data Exchange	Service Access and	Service Transport	Supporting Network	

	Delivery		Services	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Data Mart	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
Data Mart	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Mart	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Data Mart	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Information Retrieval	Service Interface and	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	

	Integration			
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Information Retrieval	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Information Sharing	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Meta Data Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Meta Data Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Online Help	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Online Help	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Online Help	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Online Tutorials	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Online Tutorials	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Ordering / Purchasing	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Ordering / Purchasing	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Ordering / Purchasing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Ordering / Purchasing	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	

Ordering / Purchasing	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Ordering / Purchasing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Ordering / Purchasing	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
Ordering / Purchasing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Query	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Query	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Query	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Software Distribution	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Standardized / Canned	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	

I. F. 5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

yes

I. F. 5. a. If "yes", please describe.

(long text - 2500 characters)

The ROSS project is integrated with the Disaster Management Initiative information on ROSS can be obtained through the Web portal, <http://www.disasterhelp.gov>. In May of 2005, OMB agreed that the alignment is complete for ROSS and the Disaster Management Initiative. ROSS has been adopted as the National Automated Resource Management System (ARMS) standard by the Department of Homeland Security/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). ARMS is a mandated system that must meet the stated requirements of the National Incident Management System (NIMS). ROSS is the only Government Off the Shelf software to be evaluated for ARMS adoption by FEMA. A wide range of commercial products were considered, but ROSS is the only product which meets the FEMA ARMS requirements.

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

no

I. F. 6. a. If "yes", does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

I. F. 6. a. 1. If "yes", provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

(medium text - 500 characters)

PART III: FOR "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE" INVESTMENTS ONLY (STEADY-STATE)

Part III should be completed only for investments which will be in "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in FY 2008, i.e., selected the "Operations and Maintenance" choice in response to Question 6 in Part I, section A above.

Section A: Risk Management

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 investments life-cycle. Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

III. A. 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

yes

III. A. 1. a. If "yes", what is the date of the plan?

2006-06-16

III. A. 1. b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

no

III. A. 1. c. If "yes", describe any significant changes:

(medium text - 500 characters)

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

III. A. 2. a. If "yes", what is the planned completion date?

III. A. 2. b. If "no", what is the strategy for managing the risks?

(long text - 2500 characters)