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:	9/10/2007
2. Agency:	Department of Energy
3. Bureau:	Departmental Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	CF Integrated Management Navigation System (I-MANAGE)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	019-60-01-01-01-1028-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY2009, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2009 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2001 or earlier

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

The acquisition and implementation of the two final I-MANAGE systems (STRIPES and SBS) in FY 2008 and FY 2009, will unify several disparate systems into one architecture which can share common data, thus eliminating redundancies and discrepancies by completing the replacement of multiple, stand-alone corporate business management systems maintained by DOE program offices with a single integrated DOE umbrella system.

A fully implemented I-MANAGE program will support the accomplishment of the Department's Strategic theme "Management Excellence" by standardizing and integrating administrative processes throughout DOE. The Integrated Management Navigation System (I-MANAGE) Program was launched in 2003. I-MANAGE is the Department's risk adjusted solution for managing enterprise-wide systems initiatives to achieve improved financial and business efficiencies, integrate budget and performance, improve decision making, enhance security posture, and expand electronic government in support of the President's Management Agenda. The I-MANAGE Program incorporates enterprise-wide projects from three collaborating headquarters organizations, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Human Capital Resources, and the Office of Management. The major project investments of I-MANAGE consist of: Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS), I-MANAGE Data Warehouse (IDW), Corporate Human Resources Information System (CHRIS), Standard Budget System (SBS), and Strategic Integrated Procurement Enterprise System (STRIPES). SBS and STRIPES are in the acquisition phase. STARS and IDW are mixed lifecycle, and CHRIS is steady state. Operational Analyses were done on CHRIS, STARS, and IDW.

The primary BRM LoBs are: Defense and National Security, Environmental Management, Energy, General Science and Innovation, Service Coverage, Customer Benefit, Security and Privacy, Cycle Time and Timeliness, Quality, Financial, Management and Innovation, Information and Data, and Reliability and Availability.

The program is in lock-step with the Department's current Enterprise Architecture Program and is aligning with the emerging segmented architecture. The IPT participates in government-wide standards groups that enable E-Gov solutions. "Records Retention Schedule for I-MANAGE", FY 2007, documents the official Departmental records contained in I-MANAGE. A completely implemented I-MANAGE program will position DOE to migrate to the HR, FM, GM, and Budget LoBs in FY 2009

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	8/27/2007
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Project Manager?	
Name	Huffer, Warren
Phone Number	(301) 903-3761
Email	warren.huffer@hq.doe.gov
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	TBD
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable	Yes

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:	Human Capital Budget Performance Integration Financial Performance 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?)	I-MANAGE supports the PMA and the e-Gov initiatives by improving the quality, timeliness and integration of financial, managerial, human resource, budgetary, procurement, and business information by standardizing and fully integrating the systems while eliminating redundancies throughout the Department. It leverages the DOE segmented architecture while collaborating with other agencies in the FM, HR, GM, and Budget LoBs and the e-Gov IAE initiative.
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
a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	
c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 3
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	Yes
19. Is this a financial management system?	Yes
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	Yes
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	Federal financial Management system requirements, Federal accounting standards & Standard general ledger at the transaction level
2. If "no," what does it address?	Not applicable.

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

Standard Accounting and Report System (STARS) I-MANAGE Data Warehouse (IDW) Standard Budget System (SBS)

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2009 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	4
Software	19

Services	77
Other	0

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? — No

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

Name	Lopez, Abel
Phone Number	202-586-5955
Title	Privacy Act Officer
E-mail	abel.lopez@hq.doe.gov

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

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? — Yes

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	107.096	14.333	16.697	12.58					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	107.096	14.333	16.697	12.58					
Operations & Maintenance:	44.89	9.576	8.026	11.463					
TOTAL:	151.986	23.909	24.723	24.043					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	19.605	3.523	3.622	3.723					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	26	26	26	26					

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

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

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

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

While the total budget request for the I-MANAGE program has not changed between FY 2008 and FY 2009, the focus of spending has shifted between the individual projects. FY 2009 funding will provide for continued acquisition, development and implementation of the Strategic Integrated Procurement Enterprise System and Standard Budget System. The Standard Accounting and Reporting System primary focus will be on continued interface development with STRIPES and SBS, while I-MANAGE Data Warehouse will continue the expansion of data sources.

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: CF Integrated Management Navigation System (I-MANAGE) (Revision 7)

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)
ME01106 (M Squared)	T&M	Yes	6/1/2005	6/1/2005	5/31/2008	2.5	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
IM00102 (EES)	T&M	Yes	11/18/2005	5/1/2006	3/30/2012	0.672	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
IM00103 (EES)	T&M	Yes	11/18/2005	5/1/2006	3/30/2012	5.298	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
IM00146 (Oracle)	FFP	Yes	2/14/2006	2/14/2006	2/13/2008	0.702	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
CF40001 (Appsential)	T&M	Yes	3/1/2006	3/1/2006	8/31/2008	3.45	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
CF40002 (Information Inc.)	T&M	Yes	3/1/2006	3/1/2006	2/28/2008	0.898	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
NT41820 (ProLogic)	CPAF	Yes	6/16/2004	9/30/2004	9/30/2009	4	No	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Knudsen, James	(304) 285-4530 / James.Knudsen@NETL.doe.gov	Level 3	
FM90075 (IBM)	T&M/FFP	Yes	9/5/2000	9/5/2000	9/30/2010	112.718	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
CF40004	T&M	Yes	6/1/2007	6/1/2007	8/31/2008	3.45	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Thornton,	202-287-	Level 3	

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)
													Patrick	1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov		

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:

Consistent with the I-MANAGE Acquisition Strategy, the IBM contract (FM90075) is the predominant acquisition phase contract with nearly 90 percent of the investments' total dollar value. The IBM EVMS was certified ANSI/EIA Standard 748 compliant in February 2005 by the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

While none of the remaining contracts explicitly require EVM, the I-MANAGE Project Management Office has incorporated both contractor and Federal FTE cost, schedule and performance metrics into the Department's comprehensive monthly and quarterly review process for the I-MANAGE program.

Additionally, where applicable, an Operational Analysis has been conducted. Currently, both STARS and IDW (both mixed lifecycle projects) and CHRIS (100% Steady State) satisfy the requirements for conducting Operational Analysis.

Finally, all current and future contracts are written according to both Federal Government FAR policy and Departmental policy as stated in DOE Order 413. In line with these policies, I-MANAGE leadership maintains a strict policy of contract oversight in an effort to ensure contractual obligations are met. This is also done in an effort to mitigate the risks associated with utilizing several non performance based contract vehicles.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
a. Explain why:	Although Section 508 compliance language is not written directly into the main contract, it is written in at the tasking level. Thus the contract ultimately ensures compliance. Also, Section 508 compliance language is not written into contracts where application/software work is not in the scope. The vast majority of I-MANAGE contracts do not include application/software work.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date?	8/17/2007
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

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

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

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Complaints	Number of help desk calls per 100 users per year for STARS and IDW	4 calls per 100 users	3.9 calls per 100 users	Accomplished. The number of help desk calls per 100 users has been lowered to 1.70.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	% of STARS & IDW help desk calls handled on 1st call	32% Tier 1	34% Tier 1	Accomplished. 44% of Tier 1 calls have been resoled on 1st call.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Increasing the number of trained IDW Discoverer Plus	70% of users trained	85% of users trained	Accomplished. 87 additional staff trained to use IDW out of

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
	fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.				users.			94 Discoverer Plus users added.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth	# of IDW reports run per month	350 reports run	400 reports run	Accomplished. Over 4600 reports on average are now being run each month. Peak number of reports run during one month was over 6500.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration	# of IDW Users	1250 users	1500 users	On Track. As of Q3 there are 1474 users of IDW.
2007	GOAL 5.3 Human Capital– Attract, acquire, develop and retain a diverse highly qualified and motivated workforce to support the Department's mission and avoid any potential skill gaps that could develop from an aging workforce.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Service Efficiency	Average time for HR and TR workflow transactions	17 days for HR workflow transaction and 11 days for TR workflow transaction	16 days for HR workflow transaction and 10 days for TR workflow transaction	On Track. HR workflow transaction time is 20 days and TR workflow transaction time is 17 days.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Response Time	Average Time to respond to and close help desk tickets Tier 1	8 hours	7 hours	Accomplished. 2 hours 44 minutes is average time to respond and close a Tier 1 help desk ticket.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Funds Control	General Ledger Authorities	Current general Ledger Authorities	Tighten General Ledger Authorities by 3 edits	Accomplished. No priority edit changes on General Ledger Authority were requested by the user community.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Mission and Business Results	Financial Management	Payments	Prompt Payments	95% of invoices paid on time for non credit card invoices.	95% of invoices paid on time for non credit card invoices.	Accomplished. Latest statistics are over 98% of invoices paid on time.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time	The amount of time required to run IDWs Extraction Transformation and Load routines (ETL)	9 Hours	4 Hours	Accomplished. The Extraction Transformation and Load routines times have been reduced to 4 hours.
2007	GOAL 5.3	Processes and	Productivity and	Productivity	CHRIS data	Current error	Meet or exceed	Accomplished.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
	Human Capital– Attract, acquire, develop and retain a diverse highly qualified and motivated workforce to support the Department's mission and avoid any potential skill gaps that could develop from an aging workforce.	Activities	Efficiency		reliability	rate	OPM target of 98.5% accuracy	Data accuracy rate is averaging 99.3%.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Effectiveness	User Satisfaction	% of customers satisfied with ease of use and overall system performance of the I-MANAGE systems STARS and IDW.	46% user satisfaction	48% user satisfaction	Accomplished. The satisfaction rate exceeded the 48% goal as calculated from interviews conducted by the Program Manager.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Avg Time to run a standard IDW report	1 Minute	30 Seconds	Accomplished. The average time to run a standard IDW report has been reduced to 30 seconds.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Normal hours of operation (Business Hours)	8AM-8PM Mon-Fri	6AM-9PM Mon-Fri	Accomplished. Hours of operation have been expanded to 6AM-9PM.
2007	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	% of system uptime durring normal business hours	95%	98%	Accomplished. Uptime is averaging over 99%.
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	New Customers and Market Penetration				

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	GOAL 2.1 Nuclear Deterrent – Transform the Nation's nuclear deterrent and supporting infrastructure to be more responsive to the threats of the 21st Century.	Mission and Business Results	Defense and National Security	Strategic National and Theater Defense				
2008	GOAL 1.3 Energy Infrastructure – Create a more flexible, secure, reliable, efficient, and higher capacity U.S. energy infrastructure by improving energy services throughout the economy and enabling the use of diverse sources.	Mission and Business Results	Energy	Energy Supply				
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup – Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Remediation				
2008	GOAL 3.2 Foundations of Science – Deliver the scientific facilities, train the next generation of scientist and engineers, and provide the laboratory capabilities and infrastructure required for U.S. scientific primacy.	Mission and Business Results	General Science and Innovation	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Costs				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Financial Management				

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
	strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.							
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Planning				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Information and Data	Data Standardization or Tagging				
2008	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction				

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Customer Results	Service Coverage	Frequency and Depth				
2009	GOAL 2.1 Nuclear Deterrent – Transform the Nation's nuclear deterrent and supporting infrastructure to be more responsive to the threats of the 21st Century.	Mission and Business Results	Defense and National Security	Strategic National and Theater Defense				
2009	GOAL 1.3 Energy Infrastructure – Create a more flexible, secure, reliable, efficient, and higher capacity U.S. energy infrastructure by improving energy services throughout the economy and enabling the use of diverse sources.	Mission and Business Results	Energy	Energy Supply				
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup – Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Environmental Remediation				
2009	GOAL 3.2 Foundations of Science – Deliver the scientific facilities, train the next generation of scientist and engineers, and provide the laboratory capabilities and infrastructure required for U.S. scientific primacy.	Mission and Business Results	General Science and Innovation	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Resource Time	Cycle Time				

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
	strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.							
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Costs				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Financial Management				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Planning				
2009	GOAL 5.3 Human Capital– Attract, acquire, develop and retain a diverse highly qualified and motivated workforce to support the Department's mission and avoid any potential skill gaps that could develop from an aging workforce.	Processes and Activities	Financial (Processes and Activities)	Planning				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Innovation and Improvement				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Quality	Errors				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated	Processes and Activities	Security and Privacy	Security				

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.							
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Information and Data	Data Standardization or Tagging				
2009	GOAL 5.5 Resources – Develop and institutionalize a fully, integrated resources management strategy that meets DOE's mission needs.	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability				

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:

    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.

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)
I-MANAGE Data Warehouse (IDW) - This also appears in table 4 as enhancements are being made to the existing system.			
Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS) - This also appears in			

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)
table 4 as enhancements are being made to the existing system.			
Standard Budget System (SBS)			
Strategic Integrated Procurment Enterprise System (STRIPES)			

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
Corporate Human Resource Information System (CHRIS)							
I-MANAGE Data Warehouse (IDW)							
Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS)							

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

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

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

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

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

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
Corporate Human Resource Information System (CHRIS)					
I-MANAGE Data Warehouse (IDW)					
Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS)					
Standard Budget System (SBS)					
Strategic Integrated Procurement Enterprise Systems (STRIPES)					

Details for Text Options:

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

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

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

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

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

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

    a. If "no," please explain why?

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

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

CF Integrated Management Navigation System (I-MANAGE) - referenced on page 36 of the Department's "Enterprise Architecture 2007 Transition Plan." It is also identified in the emerging Business Support Services (BSS) segment architecture.

    b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?   Yes

    a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture as Business Support Services (BSS)
provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Data Mart	Defines the set of capabilities that support a subset of a data warehouse for a single department or function within an organization.	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Mart			No Reuse	
Billing and Accounting	Defines the set of capabilities that support the charging, collection and reporting of an organization's accounts.	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Billing and Accounting	Payroll	007-97-01-11-02-0572-00	External	
Career Development and Retention	Defines the set of capabilities that support the monitoring of performance as well as the professional growth, advancement, and retention of an organization's employees.	Back Office Services	Human Resources	Career Development and Retention	Recruiting	019-60-01-17-03-0017-00	Internal	
Personnel Administration	Defines the set of capabilities that support the matching between an organization's employees and potential opportunities as well as the modification, addition and general upkeep of an organization's employee-specific information.	Back Office Services	Human Resources	Personnel Administration	Workforce Directory / Locator	019-60-01-01-02-3000-00	Internal	

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Budget Execution	Defines the set of capabilities that supports the execution of the Departments budget.	Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	
Procurement	Defines the set of capabilities that support the ordering and purchasing of products and services.	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Procurement			No Reuse	

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)
Billing and Accounting	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Performance Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Career Development and Retention	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Data Mart	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Personnel Administration	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Procurement	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
Billing and Accounting	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Performance Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Career Development and Retention	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Data Mart	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Procurement	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Personnel Administration	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
Billing and Accounting	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Career Development and Retention	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Data Mart	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Personnel Administration	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Procurement	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Billing and Accounting	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Career Development and Retention	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Data Mart	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Personnel Administration	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	

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)
Procurement	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Billing and Accounting	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Data Mart	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Career Development and Retention	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Personnel Administration	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Procurement	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	
Billing and Accounting	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)	
Data Mart	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)	
Career Development and Retention	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)	
Personnel Administration	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)	
Procurement	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Virtual Private Network (VPN)	
Billing and Accounting	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Performance Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Career Development and Retention	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Data Mart	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Personnel Administration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Procurement	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Billing and Accounting	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Career Development and Retention	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Personnel Administration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Procurement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Billing and Accounting	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Career Development and Retention	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Personnel Administration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Procurement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Billing and Accounting	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Career Development and Retention	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Data Mart	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Personnel Administration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Procurement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	

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.

Central Contractor Registration, Excluded Parties Listing System, Electronic Subcontracting Reporting Service, Federal Agency Registration, Federal Business Opportunities, Federal Technical Data Solution, Federal Procurement Data-System Next Generation, Online Representations and Certifications Application, Wage Determinations Online, USAJOBS.gov, Grants.gov, and GoLearn.gov

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

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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

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

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

　　a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?　　8/7/2007

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

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

2. Alternative Analysis Results:			* Costs in millions
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:			
Alternative Analyzed	**Description of Alternative**	**Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate**	**Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate**
Alt I:			
Alt II:			
Alt III:			
Baseline			

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

After a thorough re-evaluation of the original alternatives, the decision to select Hybrid Best in Class as the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's solution has not changed. This selection best positions the department to support the mission, maintain the goal of closing identified gaps that exist in the current environment, leverage DOEs enterprise architecture (and its Business Support Services segment), provide the functional flexibility to address current and future federal government functions, align with federal Lines of Business, and provide sound financial metrics (return on investment of 1.0 (PV Cost Savings + PV Benefits-PV Investment)/PV Investment), benefits of $49M and a net present value of $44M). Finally, this alternative not only costs the least, it has the lowest risk.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Hybrid Best in Class will replace multiple, stand-alone corporate business management systems maintained by DOE program offices with a core DOE integrated umbrella system. This enables DOE to adopt a common set of data requirements and business processes. Using a common set of data requirements across the Department will enhance process integration; reduce the quantity of administrative transaction processing; adopt an agency-wide budget planning, formulation and distribution system to integrate budget and performance; to improve financial management and expand electronic government; facilitate performance based budgeting; provide for more consistent, accurate and timely data; promote inter-program comparability; improve overall process efficiency; improve timeliness and quality of decisions; and reduce process cycle time, costs and other resource requirements.

A new fully integrated solution replaces the disparate legacy systems and their outdated technology while supporting e-gov and increasing compliance with existing regulations and improving chances to more easily meet new requirements successfully. Integration allows for increases in efficiency and better decision making, at all levels, by providing pertinent information in a usable form. Resource-intensive manual approval processes will be eliminated by automating workflow, alerts; offering user defined digital signatures (less paper). Escalating automated controls within the workflow management module provide notifications when processes are not completed in a timely manner. Likewise, flexibilities are realized in processes to initiate, manage and monitor HR, financial, and procurement actions all while eliminating duplicative/redundant systems and services. This new integrated investment along with the accompanying new processes, procedures, and capabilities will restore financial management integrity all while supporting the PMA initiatives identified earlier.

The strengths, weaknesses, effeciencies, etc. of each alternative are described in the "Department Of Energy I-MANAGE Cost Benefit Analysis" dated August 2007.

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

　　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.　　Legacy Investment

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

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
ACQ Grants Database		9/30/2008
Award Closeout - NETL		9/30/2008
Closeout Database - Savannah River		9/30/2008
Contract Document Imaging System (CDIS)		9/30/2009
Contract Management Division Virtual Deskbook		9/30/2008
ConWrite		9/30/2009
DOE/C-Web		9/30/2008
EEO Clearance Tracking System		9/30/2008
FARMASTER		9/30/2008
Federal Acquisition Regulations Automated (FARA) - HQ		9/30/2008
Federal Acquisition Regulations Automated (FARA) - NETL		9/30/2008
Federal Information Tracking System (FITS)		9/30/2008
FileNet		9/30/2008
Industry Interactive Procurement System (IIPS)	019-60-01-17-02-3007-00	9/30/2008
Invoice and Deliverable Tracking System (IDTS)		9/30/2008
Invoice Tracking System (ITS)		9/30/2008
Jetform		9/30/2008
Knowledge Net		9/30/2008
PRISMA Forms		9/30/2008
Procurement and Assistance Tracking System (PATS)	019-60-01-17-02-3007-00	9/30/2008
Procurement Award Data System (PADS)	019-60-01-17-02-3007-00	9/30/2009
Procurement Desktop		9/30/2008
Procurement Request Authorization Tracking System (PRATS)	019-60-01-17-02-3007-00	9/30/2008
PROMIS		9/30/2009
Record Management Tracking System		9/30/2008
Report Tracking System (RTS)		9/30/2008
Simplified Purchasing System (SPS)		9/30/2008
WinSAGA		9/30/2008
Workload Database		9/30/2008

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?   Yes

    a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?   8/31/2007

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

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

I-MANAGE has an approved comprehensive risk management plan that is consistent with both government and industry Risk Management best practices for a mixed lifecycle investment since the early stages of the I-MANAGE program. While the fundamental processes (identification of risks, evaluation of the probability, impacts of identified risks, and mitigation strategy preparation) have not changed, the PMO is increasing its active oversight role in risk management. What has changed significantly from last year's submission is the risk register, an attachment to the Plan. The changes reflect the fact that CHRIS has gone fully steady state, STARS and IDW, the two mixed lifecycle I-MANAGE projects, continue to plan for integration of the additional I-MANAGE projects, and the constant adjustment of funding to STRIPES and SBS as they progress through the acquisition phase. Additionally, in an effort to minimize risk within their projects, STRIPES and SBS project managers continue to leverage the risks previously identified by the more mature projects STARS, IDW and CHRIS. Along those lines, lessons learned during the Post Implementation Reviews of those projects have been incorporated into STRIPES and SBS project plans. Finally, I-MANAGE is not only in lock-step with the Department's enterprise architecture program, it is emerging as the new Business Support Services segment within the Department.

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

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

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

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

Included in the alternatives analysis is a risk/cost adjustment for each of the three alternatives based on their respective level of risk. A thorough and comprehensive risk review was conducted by a team of project managers and both functional and technical experts. The multi step risk analysis process was repeated for each alternative. First, the team conducted multiple brainstorming sessions where risks were identified and placed within OMBs 19 categories and qualitatively ranked. Second, the risks were quantitatively evaluated for probability and impact. Third, mitigation strategies for all medium through high risks were developed. Finally, the risks identified in step 3 were costed out using an expected value calculation. The expected value calculation is: (Annual Hours * Hourly rate * # of FTEs * Impact Probability). These costs for the selected alternative (Hybrid Best in Class) to mitigate the identified risks are included in the summary of spending table, the alternatives analysis and embedded in the project schedules. For example, the program level risk of not utilizing all performance based contract vehicles, i.e. T and M contracts, was identified early in the lifecycle. Appropriate steps have been taken to manage this risk.

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

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748?   Yes

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)   No

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

    b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

    c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?   No

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

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
0	I-MANAGE Program Management	9/30/2013	$9.902	9/30/2013	9/30/2007	$9.902	$1.988126	2192	$-0.219629	17.86%
0.01	Project Management FY 2006	9/30/2006	$2.25	9/30/2006		$2.25				0%
0.02	FY07 Prog Mgmt (Ent Arch, Security, Risk, Acq Strat, External Rpting)	9/30/2007	$1.671	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$1.671	$1.847765	0	$-0.176765	100%
1.1	System Design	1/1/2002	$3.842	1/1/2002	1/31/2002	$3.842	$3.842	-30	$0	100%
1.2	Phoenix System Implementation (closed)	3/1/2003	$7.325	3/1/2003	3/30/2003	$7.325	$7.325	-29	$0	100%
1.3	STARS Revised System Design	9/30/2003	$1.733	9/30/2003	9/30/2003	$1.733	$1.725	0	$0.008	100%
1.4	STARS Revised System Implementation	12/31/2004	$8.769	12/31/2004	9/30/2005	$8.769	$14.933	-273	$-6.164	100%
1.5	Performance Metrics	4/30/2001	$0.073	4/30/2001	4/30/2001	$0.073	$0.073	0	$0	100%
1.6	Hardware/Software	10/31/2005	$9.883	10/31/2005	9/30/2005	$9.883	$9.778	31	$0.105	100%
1.7	Infrastructure Support	10/31/2005	$9.297	10/31/2005	9/30/2005	$9.297	$5.421	31	$3.876	100%
1.9	Training (modified)	10/1/2005	$1.434	10/1/2005	9/30/2005	$1.434	$2.07	1	$-0.636	100%
1.10	SGL Consult. (closed)	3/1/2003	$0.588	3/1/2003	3/30/2003	$0.588	$0.588	-29	$0	100%
1.11	Budget Formulation Consult (closed)	10/31/2002	$0.192	10/31/2002	4/30/2002	$0.192	$0.192	184	$0	100%
1.12	Standard Budget	12/31/2005	$3.078	12/31/2005	12/31/2005	$3.078	$0.49	0	$2.588	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	Implementation (on hold)									
1.13	Standard Budget Software (on hold)	11/30/2004	$2.5	11/30/2004	11/1/2004	$2.5		29		100%
1.14	I-MANAGE Program Management	12/31/2005	$2.571	12/31/2005	9/30/2005	$2.571	$2.654	92	$-0.083	100%
1.15	Deliverables	12/31/2001	$0.072	12/31/2001	12/31/2001	$0.072	$0.072	0	$0	100%
1.16	STARS Help Desk	10/1/2005	$0.901	10/1/2005	12/31/2005	$0.901	$0.444	-91	$0.457	100%
1.20	Project Management	9/30/2006	$0.2	9/30/2006	4/30/2006	$0.2	$0.342	153	$-0.142	100%
1.21	On-going Assessment	9/30/2006	$0.105	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.105		0		100%
1.22	On-going T&D	9/30/2006	$0.70614	9/30/2006	4/30/2006	$0.70614	$1.539	153	$-0.83286	100%
1.23	On-going IV&V	9/30/2006	$0.29643	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.29643		0		100%
1.24	On-going Implementation	9/30/2006	$0.16557	9/30/2006	4/30/2006	$0.16557	$0.11	153	$0.05557	100%
1.25	On-going Deployment	9/30/2006	$0.82771	9/30/2006	4/30/2006	$0.82771	$1.805	153	$-0.97729	100%
1.26	O&M	9/30/2006	$3.17	9/30/2006	4/30/2006	$3.17	$1.306	153	$1.864	100%
1.70	Project Management	9/30/2006	$0.466	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.466	$0.3738	0	$0.0922	100%
1.71	Functional Support	9/30/2006	$1.286	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$1.286	$1.1082	0	$0.12636	96%
1.72	Reconciliation	9/30/2006	$0.11	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.11	$0.1078	0	$-0.0055	93%
1.73	Interfaces and Reports Support	9/30/2006	$0.878	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.878	$1.0659	0	$-0.1879	100%
1.74	AHE Support	9/30/2006	$3.5	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$3.5		0		100%
1.75	Accounting and AR Operations Support	9/30/2006	$1.4	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$1.4	$0.8813	0	$0.3787	90%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
1.76	Application Upgrades	9/30/2006	$0	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0		0		100%
1.77	Interfaces, Reports, and Enhancements	9/30/2006	$0.403	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.403	$0.1194	0	$0.19494	78%
1.100	FY07 Application Upgrades	9/30/2007	$0	9/30/2007	10/1/2006	$0		364		0%
1.110	FY07 Interfaces/Reports Enhancements	9/30/2007	$2.08	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$2.08	$2.898699	0	$-0.818699	100%
1.180	FY07 Government FTE (Proj Mgmt)	9/30/2007	$0.281	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.281	$0.281	0	$0	100%
2.10	Pre-Planning	6/15/2006	$0.053731	6/15/2006	6/30/2006	$0.053731	$0.053735	-15	$-0.000004	100%
2.20	FY06 Software	9/30/2006	$0.06786	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.06786		0		0%
2.30	Project Management	9/30/2006	$0.07308	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.07308	$0.06541	0	$0.00767	100%
2.40	Requirements	9/30/2006	$0.240097	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.240097	$0.14671	0	$-0.000251	61%
2.50	Change Management	9/30/2006	$0.029232	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.029232	$0.01847	0	$0.010762	100%
2.100	Project Management	9/30/2007	$0.24	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.24	$0.295085	0	$-0.055085	100%
2.110	FY07 Software/Hardware	9/30/2007	$0.1	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.1		0		0%
2.120	Requirements	4/30/2007	$0.509	4/30/2007	3/31/2007	$0.509	$0.517266	30	$-0.008266	100%
2.130	SBS Market Survey / Alternatives Analysis	6/30/2007	$0.213	6/30/2007	6/30/2007	$0.213	$0.202437	0	$0.010563	100%
2.130.1	SBS Market Survey / Alternatives Analysis - Initial	3/31/2007	$0.004	3/31/2007	11/30/2006	$0.004	$0.004172	121	$-0.000172	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
2.130.2	SBS Market Survey / Alternatives Analysis - Formal	6/30/2007	$0.209	6/30/2007	6/30/2007	$0.209	$0.198265	0	$0.010735	100%
2.140	Budget Formulation Gap Analysis/SBS Acquisition	9/30/2007	$0.51	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.51	$0.410495	0	$-0.000455	80.4%
2.150	Change Management	9/30/2007	$0.126	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.126	$0.117222	0	$0.008778	100%
2.199	FY07 Government FTE (Proj Mgmt)	9/30/2007	$0.545	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.545	$0.545	0	$0	100%
3	CHRIS	9/30/2006	$11.72	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$11.72	$11.72	0	$0	100%
3.1	FY 2004 Dev Segment	9/30/2004	$1	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	$1	$1	0	$0	100%
3.2	FY 2004 O&M	9/30/2004	$2.5	9/30/2004	9/30/2004	$2.5	$2.5	0	$0	100%
3.3	FY 2005 Dev Segment	9/30/2005	$1.8	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	$1.8	$1.8	0	$0	100%
3.4	FY 2005 O&M	9/30/2005	$2.5	9/30/2005	9/30/2005	$2.5	$2.5	0	$0	100%
3.5	FY 2006 Dev Segment	9/30/2006	$1.75	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$1.75	$1.75	0	$0	100%
3.6	FY 2006 O&M	9/30/2006	$2.17	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$2.17	$2.17	0	$0	100%
4.1	Planning Phase	1/31/2004	$0.045	1/31/2004	7/31/2004	$0.045	$0.1163	-182	$-0.0713	100%
4.2	Requirements Phase	6/30/2004	$0.955	6/30/2004	12/31/2004	$0.955	$0.8495	-184	$0.1055	100%
4.10	5401 Startup & Requirements Re-Validation Phase	5/12/2006	$0.189828	5/12/2006	5/12/2006	$0.189828	$0.199218	0	$-0.00939	100%
4.20	5801 Project Management	5/12/2006	$0.084838	5/12/2006	5/12/2006	$0.084838	$0.084361	0	$0.000477	100%
4.30	5901 Change	5/12/2006	$0.053802	5/12/2006	5/12/2006	$0.053802	$0.054288	0	$-0.000486	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	Management									
4.40	5400 Package Selection & Enablement Phase - FY06	9/30/2006	$0.8881	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.8881	$0.782814	0	$0.105286	100%
4.50	5800 Project Management	9/29/2006	$0.262965	9/29/2006	9/29/2006	$0.262965	$0.262965	0	$0	100%
4.60	5900 Change Management	9/29/2006	$0.248385	9/29/2006	9/29/2006	$0.248385	$0.248385	0	$0	100%
4.97	FY06 Software Acq'n / Other	9/30/2006	$1.272082	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$1.272082		0		0%
4.100	5420 Package Selection & Enablement Phase - FY07	2/9/2007	$0.907	2/9/2007	2/9/2007	$0.907	$0.968012	0	$-0.061012	100%
4.110	5800 Project Management	2/9/2007	$0.210374	2/9/2007	2/9/2007	$0.210374	$0.210372	0	$0.000002	100%
4.120	5900 Change Management	2/9/2007	$0.198709	2/9/2007	2/9/2007	$0.198709	$0.198708	0	$0.000001	100%
4.130	5450 Configuration Phase	9/11/2007	$2.110479	9/11/2007	9/11/2007	$2.110479	$1.978807	0	$0.131672	100%
4.140	5820 Project Management	7/13/2007	$0.253326	7/13/2007	7/13/2007	$0.253326	$0.253325	0	$0.000001	100%
4.150	5920 Change Management	7/13/2007	$0.239105	7/13/2007	7/13/2007	$0.239105	$0.239105	0	$0	100%
4.160	5500 Testing Phase - FY07	9/30/2007	$0.995753	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.995753	$0.975668	0	$0.020085	100%
4.170	5840 Project Management	9/30/2007	$0.142898	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.142898	$0.142899	0	$-0.000001	100%
4.180	5940 Change Management	9/30/2007	$0.134848	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.134848	$0.134847	0	$0.000001	100%
4.197	FY07 Software Acq'n / Other	9/30/2007	$0.890508	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.890508	$0.863114	0	$0.027394	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
4.199	FY07 Government FTE (Proj Mgmt)	9/30/2007	$0.449	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.449	$0.449	0	$0	100%
5	eCMS	5/8/2006	$0.395	5/8/2006	5/8/2006	$0.395	$0.395	0	$-0.079	80%
5.1	Completed high level planning at the CD 0 level	3/31/2004	$0	3/31/2004		$0				
5.2	Deployment of e-DOCS	5/8/2006	$0.395	5/8/2006	5/8/2006	$0.395	$0.395	0	$-0.079	80%
6.1	System Design	9/1/2006	$1.55	9/1/2006	6/30/2004	$1.55	$0.949	793	$0.601	100%
6.2	System Development/Implementation	9/1/2006	$3.15	9/1/2006	9/1/2006	$3.15	$1.0606	0	$2.0894	100%
6.3	Infrastructure Support	9/1/2006	$1	9/1/2006	3/15/2006	$1	$0.95	170	$0.05	100%
6.4	Training	9/1/2006	$0.65	9/1/2006	4/30/2006	$0.65	$0.165	124	$0.485	100%
6.5	Acceptance Test	9/1/2006	$1	9/1/2006	12/1/2005	$1	$0.287	274	$0.713	100%
6.6	Deployment	9/1/2006	$0.9	9/1/2006	9/30/2005	$0.9	$1.858	336	$-0.958	100%
6.7	Project Management	9/30/2006	$0.063	9/30/2006	4/30/2006	$0.063	$0.063	153	$0	100%
6.8	Integration Testing	9/30/2006	$0.55	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.55		0		100%
6.9	O&M	9/30/2006	$0	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0		0		100%
6.10	Deployment	9/30/2006	$0.728	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.728	$0.7278	0	$0.0002	100%
6.34	Project Planning	9/30/2006	$0.387	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$0.387	$0.0645	0	$0.3225	100%
6.35	System Deployment Enhancements	9/30/2006	$1.2722	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$1.2722	$0.367	0	$0.9052	100%
6.36	Enhancements	9/30/2006	$1.5	9/30/2006	9/30/2006	$1.5	$0.154	0	$1.196	90%
6.100	6.07.7.1-3 FY07 Deployment Enhancements	9/30/2007	$0.6	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.6	$0.837503	0	$-0.237503	100%
6.110	6.07.1 FY07	9/30/2007	$0.03	9/30/2007	12/31/2006	$0.03	$0.036081	273	$-0.006081	100%

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

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

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
	Project Management									
6.120	6.07.4 FY07 Integration Testing	9/30/2007	$0.16	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.16	$0.112488	0	$0.047512	100%
6.130	6.07.5 FY07 System Security (C&A)	9/30/2007	$0.1	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.1	$0.145573	0	$-0.045573	100%
6.140	6.07.7.5 FY07 Development Transition	9/30/2007	$0.357	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.357	$0.582291	0	$-0.225291	100%
6.199	FY07 Government FTE (Proj Mgmt)	9/30/2007	$0.279	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.279	$0.279	0	$0	100%
8.10	FY07 Project Management	9/30/2007	$0.09765	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.09765	$0.09765	0	$0	100%
8.20	FY07 Configuration Management	9/30/2007	$0.09765	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.09765	$0.09765	0	$0	100%
8.30	FY07 Functional Support/Help Desk	9/30/2007	$4.741726	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$4.741726	$4.741726	0	$0	100%
8.40	FY07 Cyber Security C&A	9/30/2007	$0.16765	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$0.16765	$0.16765	0	$0	100%
8.50	FY07 Government FTE (Proj Mgmt)	9/30/2007	$1.827	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$1.827	$1.827	0	$0	100%
8.60	FY07 Application Hosting Environment (AHE) (Hw/Sw)	9/30/2007	$2.015324	9/30/2007	9/30/2007	$2.015324	$2.015324	0	$0	100%