

**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:   | Energy Programs               |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset:   | EE State Grant Administration |
| 5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)  | 019-20-04-00-01-1030-00       |
| 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.)   | Operations and Maintenance    |
| 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?  | FY2003                        |
| 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:   |                               |
| <p>The EE State Grants Administration application, evolved from a DOS application called the Systems Approach to Grants Administration (SAGA) in 1994 into a Windows-based, client-server application called WinSAGA in 1997. WinSAGA collects and manages grant data, interfaces with the DOE accounting system to commit and obligate federal funds, interfaces with the DOE procurement system to provide grant information, and collects and manages programmatic data associated with grants. These functions facilitate the management of financial resources and physical assets to ensure public confidence. WinSAGA allows DOE to administer all grants that are awarded by EERE. The application allows 88 State entities to electronically submit applications and state plans for State Energy Program (SEP) and Weatherization and Assistance Program (WAP) formula grants. States are also able to electronically submit financial status reports and programmatic reports for all grants awarded to States by EERE. DOE headquarters users perform monitoring and oversight tasks; EERE Project Management Center users from Golden Field Office and National Energy Technology Laboratory perform grants administration and monitoring, interface between WinSAGA and DOE's accounting system for grants; and State WAP and SEP office users electronically apply for formula grants through a Grants.gov interface, and submit programmatic and financial reports for all EERE grants. The application provides users access to current grant and programmatic records. This reduces data redundancy and paperwork and provides the universal, complementary data collection that is critical to showing the positive results of the programs. WinSAGA collects metric data to confirm the impact and cost-effectiveness of the Weatherization Program through the implementation of the Weatherization Plus Strategic Plan and issuing state grants to accomplish the program goal of weatherizing 1.25 million houses during the next 10 years; and aid in achieving greater energy savings by expanding the scope of the Weatherization Program to include a whole-house approach that incorporates advanced energy efficiency technologies. This investment was reviewed by the OCIO for consistency with DOE's E-Government strategy and Departmental enterprise architecture.</p> |                               |
| 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   | Long, Elnora                  |
| Phone Number   | 202 586 9700                  |
| Email  | elnora.long@ee.doe.gov        |
| a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?  | DAWIA-Level-1                 |
| 12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?  | No                            |
| a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?   | Yes                           |
| b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable   | No                            |

to non-IT assets only)

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: 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?) This investment supports the PMA goals of Financial Performance and Expanded Electronic Government by using electronic signatures and transactions with the corporate DOE STARS, improving financial performance and allowing funds to be available for use by State grantees in under one week. EERE, using WinSAGA, collaborates with 88 State entities that electronically apply for formula grants through Grants.gov, then request funds and provide grant performance data using WinSAGA.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)) Yes

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

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Weatherization Assistance

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

15. Is this investment for information technology? Yes

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

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 1

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) (1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) Yes

19. Is this a financial management system? No

a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? No

1. If "yes," which compliance area:

2. If "no," what does it address?

b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

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

Hardware	1
Software	1
Services	98
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? N/A

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

Name Lopez, Abel  
 Phone Number 202 586 5955  
 Title Freedom of Information & Privacy Acts 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? No

**Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)**

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY+1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	0	0	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	0	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	10.495427	1.5	1.2	0					
TOTAL:	10.495427	1.5	1.2	0					
<b>Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.</b>									
Government FTE Costs	0.561193	0.110565	0.116093	0					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	1	1	0					

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:  
 The summary of spending has changed due to closing regional offices, few installations and lower maintenance costs. Additional changes due to system shut down and transition to DOE grant management line of business solution.

**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: EE State Grant Administration (Revision 10)

Contracts/Task Orders Table:															* Costs in millions	
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer Certification Level (Level 1,2,3,N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)
NT00124	Procurement /Firm Fixed Price	Yes	1/15/2000	2/1/2000	1/31/2010	15.792	No	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	Mohn, Robert	412-386-4963 / rmohn@netl.doe.gov	Level 3	

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:

This investment is currently in steady state operations. EERE uses operational analysis to monitor the contractors cost, schedule, and performance.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? Yes

a. Explain why:

The clause regarding 508 compliance in this contract is not mandatory, but optional. At this time making WinSAGA 508 compliant would cause an undue burden on the agency. Since August 2002, it has been anticipated that WinSAGA will be replaced by other systems (first Grants.gov, and DOE Grants LOB solution - STRIPES). The scope and completion dates for those systems has changed, outside the control of this investment. Alternative methods to WinSAGA are available for persons with disabilities.

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

a. If "yes," what is the date? 7/1/1999

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

1. If "no," briefly explain why:

**Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)**

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

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

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	yearly average of closed hotline calls divided by new hotline calls.	90%	maintain at least 90%	100%
2005	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Mission and Business Results	Energy	Energy Conservation and Preparedness	Homes weatherized	99,918 homes weatherized in 2004.	92,500 homes to be weatherized in 2005, target determined by program budget.	95,790 homes weatherized in 2005.
2005	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Transactions per year	1000	maintain at least 1000	1220
2006	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	yearly average of closed hotline calls divided by new hotline calls.	90%	maintain at least 90%	97.6%
2006	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Mission and Business Results	Energy	Energy Conservation and Preparedness	Homes weatherized	95,790 homes weatherized in 2005.	97,300 homes to be weatherized in 2006, target determined by program budget.	97,450 homes weatherized in 2006 (preliminary - 2006 funds not yet fully costed by states).
2006	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Transactions per year	1000	maintain at least 1000	2293

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.							
2007	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time	yearly average of closed hotline calls divided by new hotline calls.	90%	maintain at least 90%	100.3% (as of 7/31/2007)
2007	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Mission and Business Results	Energy	Energy Conservation and Preparedness	Homes weatherized	97,450 homes weatherized in 2006 (preliminary).	64,084 homes to be weatherized in 2007, target determined by program budget.	3997 homes weatherized in 2007 (preliminary - 2007 funds not yet fully costed by states).
2007	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Transactions per year	1000	maintain at least 1000	590 (as of 7/31/2007)
2008	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Customer Results	Timeliness and Responsiveness	Delivery Time				
2008	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Mission and Business Results	Energy	Energy Conservation and Preparedness				
2008	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity				
2008	GOAL 1.4 Energy Productivity – Improve the energy efficiency of the U.S. economy.	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)

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
WinSAGA							

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
WinSAGA	No	No	No, because the system does not administer information in identifiable form about employees, contractors or members of the public.	No	No, because the system is not a system of records.

**Details for Text Options:**  
 Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.  
 Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.  
 Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

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

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

- 1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes
- a. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. EE State Grant Administration (section 2.2.3.5.1, page 87)

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

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

**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)
WinSAGA Data Exchange	Supports the interchange of information between WinSAGA client and server installations; includes verification that transmitted data was received unaltered	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Exchange			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Data Warehouse	Support the archiving and storage of large volumes of WinSAGA data	Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Warehouse			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Payment / Settlement	Support the process of accounts payable for EERE State grants	Back Office Services	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Ad Hoc Reporting	Supports the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis for WinSAGA users	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Standardized / Canned Reporting	Support the use of pre-conceived and pre-written WinSAGA reports	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Program / Project Management	Manage and control EERE state grants	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	
WinSAGA State Grant Find and Apply	Source for states to find and apply for grants through grants.gov.	Business Management Services	Supply Chain Management	Storefront / Shopping Cart	Storefront / Shopping Cart	019-60-01-99-03-1316-24	External	
WinSAGA Customer / Account Management	Support the retention and delivery of services to WinSAGA clients	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Partner Relationship Management	Provides a framework to promote the effective collaboration between EERE and its business partners and other third parties that support operations and service delivery to EERE's	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Partner Relationship Management			No Reuse	



Exhibit 300: EE State Grant Administration (Revision 10)

<b>4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:</b>								
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <a href="http://www.egov.gov">http://www.egov.gov</a> .								
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)
	customers.							
WinSAGA Information Retrieval	Allow access to data and information for use by EERE and its stakeholders	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Information Sharing	Support the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders	Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Process Tracking	Allow the monitoring of activities within the grant management cycle	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Forms Modification	Support the maintenance of electronic or physical grant forms, templates and their respective elements and fields	Support Services	Forms Management	Forms Modification			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Query	Supports retrieval of records that satisfy specific query selection criteria within WinSAGA	Support Services	Search	Query			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Access Control	Support the management of permissions for logging onto the WinSAGA application; includes WinSAGA user and role/privilege management	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control			No Reuse	
WinSAGA Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Support the identification and monitoring of activities within the WinSAGA application	Support Services	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis			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)
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
Ad Hoc	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Partner Relationship Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Payment / Settlement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Ad Hoc	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Digital Signature Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Forms Modification	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Identification and Authentication	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Partner Relationship Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	

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.

WinSAGA began leveraging Grants.gov in FY 2005 to utilize the "find and apply" functionality for the submission of grants by State applicants.

<b>Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)</b>
---

**Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)**

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

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? 7/20/2007
  - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? Yes
  - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

As part of the C&A renewal process, the Risk Assessment was updated to the current DOE EERE standard format.

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
  - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
  - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

**Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)**

1. Was operational analysis conducted? Yes
  - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed. 8/15/2006
  - b. If "yes," what were the results?

The spring of 2006, DOE closed it's six Regional Offices and consolidated them into the Project Management Center. The consolidation of the Regional Offices had a significant impact on the WinSAGA support effort. One area of greatest impact can be readily seen in reviewing the hotline history. Over the previous 5 years, there had been a trend of decreasing hotline calls each year. However for 2006, there was a significant spike, and the year ended with the highest number of hotline calls in the 8 year history of the application. The reasons for the increase in hotline calls can be contributed to: 1) a large change and expansion in the user community; 2) a new way of doing business, which distributes the workload among more users; 3) an increased need for ad hoc reports to manage the consolidation effort. With the new user-base, the Project Manager sent out a customer satisfaction survey. The purpose of the survey was to measure user satisfaction with the application, identify areas where additional education or training are required, and measure satisfaction with the application support.

Another interesting finding from the operational analysis is that with the increase in hotline support, the cost for the project was at 0% variance. An analysis of other indicators from the project status reports, revealed the reason that cost has remained within budget, is largely due to the fact that no minor enhancements had been completed during the previous months. In anticipation of the increased hotline support activity, the Project Manager requested that efforts for minor enhancements be redirected to the hotline support in order for the project to remain within budget.

- c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

- a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor Only

- 2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table:

Exhibit 300: EE State Grant Administration (Revision 10)

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table							
Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost(\$M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost(\$M)
01	WinSAGA Support (FY2001)	9/30/2001	\$1.73	9/30/2001	\$1.730000	0	\$0.000000
02	WinSAGA Support (FY2002)	9/30/2002	\$1.82	9/30/2002	\$1.820000	0	\$0.000000
03	WinSAGA Support (FY2003)	9/30/2003	\$1.79	9/30/2003	\$1.790000	0	\$0.000000
04	WinSAGA Support (FY2004)	9/30/2004	\$1.75697	9/30/2004	\$1.756970	0	\$0.000000
05	WinSAGA support (FY2005)	9/30/2005	\$1.77339	9/30/2005	\$1.77339	0	\$0
06	WinSAGA support (FY2006)	9/30/2006	\$1.625	9/30/2006	\$1.35416	0	\$0.27084
07	WinSAGA support (FY2007)	9/30/2007	\$1.5		\$1.25		\$0.25