

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: **09/10/2007**
- 2 Agency: **US Army Corps of Engineers**
- 3 Bureau: **00**
- 4 Name of this Capital Asset: **Project Management Information System II (P2)**
- 5 Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section [53](#). For all other, use agency ID system.) **202-00-01-02-01-1033-00**
- 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.)
- Planning
 - Full Acquisition
 - Operations and Maintenance
 - X Mixed Life Cycle**
 - Multi-Agency Collaboration
- 7 What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? **FY2004**
- 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 US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) established a Program Management Business Process (PMBP) Initiative in 2001. The Corps doctrine to support PMBP is found in Regulation No. ER 5-1-11, dated August 17, 2001, and establishes philosophy, policy, and guidance to accomplish all work performed by the Corps. The PMBP doctrine reflects the USACE corporate commitment to represent the interests of the United States and its citizens. In general, USACE operates as a single, public corporate entity serving the Army and the nation. All customers are entitled to the full depth and breadth of the Corps resources worldwide. USACE seeks to operate with business efficiency to meet the nation's needs as efficiently and effectively as possible. The heart of PMBP is project-focused teamwork that draws on the diverse resources of the Corps worldwide to assemble strong, multi-disciplined Project Delivery Teams (PDT) to best meet the customers' needs, and both national and public interests. P2 is an enterprise tool that enables effective management of projects in the USACE three core mission areas: Civil Works, Military, and Environmental, including support services. P2 provides structure and support that enhances our project management business processes maximizes decision support capability using a single database and utilizes the Internet to the maximum extent possible.

P2 allows the Corps to develop and track work through network analysis systems using the critical path method, manage resources to the individual, resource allocation/leveling, collect and calculate performance management data, and report all project and program data to the Project Delivery Teams (PDT's), which include the customer, and decision makers. P2 is server-based and comprised of a suite of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software packages, which allows the Corps to adapt to industry standards. The primary packages are from Primavera Systems (Project scheduler (NAS)), ORACLE (Collects and manages all data related to projects/programs), and Project Partners (middleware). The Primavera products include Project Manager (enterprise application) and Primavision (web-based enterprise application). The ORACLE products include: ORACLE Projects (enterprise project management application), Discoverer (reports), ORACLE Financial Analyzer (OFA) (allows for management of financial information by project attributes in multi dimensional tables), and ORACLE Tutor (links business processes, reference documents and navigation tools to P2). Project information (e.g. project attributes, planned values, costs) is maintained by Oracle Projects within an enterprise-level database resident on the Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS) Central Processing Center. CEEIS services provide a Common Operating Environment (Sun/Solaris) for the suite of Corps corporate business systems. The P2 system functionality has been configured in a way that keeps the focus on delivering the best tools to the PDT's, including Virtual Teams, to support project planning and execution while also supporting programmatic processes, and corporate data needs, at all levels of the organization as a by-product. P2 enables PDT's to initiate,

plan, budget, execute, control and close out work in accordance with our Project Management Business Process Manual.

P2 was deployed Corps wide during 2004. Some remaining functionality to be configured in P2 consists of the ability to resource and plan support services, ability to perform earned value consistent with ANSI/EIA Standard 748-A, and the ability to resource to the individual level as an option. This functionality was delayed to accelerate deployment. The missing functionality does not impact the use of the P2 tool by the majority of PDT's. The P2 O&M team has been focused on improving system speed, making minor field requested changes (adding resource type codes, adding activity ID codes, adding project templates, etc.), and fixing minor bugs. The completion of P2 implementation phase occurred during June 2005.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes No
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **06/30/2006**
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes No
11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name:
Phone Number:
E-mail:

- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager? **TBD**

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes No?

- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes No

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) Yes No

- 1 If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? Yes No
2 If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? Yes No
3 If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? Yes No

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

If "yes," check all that apply:

- √ Human Capital Budget
√ Performance Integration
√ Financial Performance
√ Expanded E-Government
√ Competitive Sourcing

Faith Based and Community
Real Property Asset Management
Eliminating Improper Payments
Privatization of Military Housing
Research & Development Investment Criteria
Housing & Urban Development Management & Performance
Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives
Right Sized" Overseas Presence Coordination of VA & DoD Programs and Systems

a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)

The Presidents Management Agenda (PMA), the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, the Chief Financial Officer's Act, and the Government Performance and Results Acts (GPRA) provided the legislative reasons for change. The PMBP program was in part a response to the Clinger-Cohen Act, which emphasized the need for Federal agencies to become more efficient and effective. The PMA provided new direction, strength and urgency to the PMBP Program and its initiatives. The PMA requires federal agencies to undergo business process re-engineering and standardization with public input.

Initially the PMBP program was the Corps' answer to the Clinger-Cohen Act in that it forced the Corps to standardize its corporate business processes. During assessments required under GPRA the Corps' learned, that the response to public criticism required drastic measures to our culture and our way of serving the nation. The PMBP Program's Business Process Initiative produced the first Business Process Manual in November 2002. The Business Process manual provides corporate business processes for the work of the Corps. It utilizes best practices and industry mixed with our unique customers requirements. They are supported with reference documents and mission specific processes. The P2 tool is seen as the enabler to ensure that the business processes are followed to a certain level of consistency across the Corps.

P2 is the IT solution that is designed to support the Corps in the management of these standardized business processes while affording project managers and project delivery teams' flexibility to better manage their work. Thus providing the capability to deliver services to our customers in a more timely and efficient manner.

The Corps 2012 Initiative stands up the organizational HQ structure that allows PMBP and P2 to be successful. In accordance with the PMA, a *flatter* organization has been implemented to reduce "red-tape" and the time it takes to get products and services to our customers.

Project Management Business Process (PMBP):

The fundamental USACE business process used to deliver quality projects reflect the USACE corporate commitment to provide "customer service" that is inclusive, seamless, flexible, effective, and efficient. It embodies communication, leadership, systematic and coordinated management, teamwork, partnering, effective balancing of competing demands, and primary accountability for the life cycle of a project. P2 is a suite of automated tools that, in the initial phase of its deployment, will support Corps project execution in military programs, civil works, environmental, research and development, and international services.

The Deployment and Implementation of P2 will collect the appropriate information that will aid in the Corps' ability to:

- Manage all work in the Corps in a similar fashion (projects) (GPRA, PMA)
- Link mission and strategic goals/objectives to projects (GPRA)
- Link budget to performance (GPRA, PMA)
- Link individual performance to Tapes goals and objectives (PMA)
- Manage project delivery, delivering service to customers in a more timely, efficient and effective manner (PMA)
- Adhere to congressional and upward reporting requirements (PMA)

PMBP satisfies the PMA's five government wide initiatives in the following ways:

Goal 1. Strategic Management of Human Capital – Be more efficient and effective. PMBP coupled with 2012 will enable the Corps to meet this goal by:

- reducing the number of organizational layers,
- reducing the time it takes to make decisions,
- increasing customer and stakeholder participation (become citizen-centered)
- increasing the number of employees who provide services to citizens
- increasing knowledge through our increased ability to communicate
- increasing performance incentives for individual employees, teams, and leadership

Goal 2. Competitive Sourcing – PMBP will aide the Corps to meet this goal by:

- simplifying and improving the processes
- better publicizing the activities subject to competition, and
- promoting competition

Goal 3. Improved Financial Performance – PMBP will aid the Corps to meet this goal by:

- Improving timeliness

- provide timely and accurate cost information
- accelerate end of period reporting
- Enhancing usefulness by effectively manage projects via Performance management techniques
- integrating financial and performance information supporting management of the operating budget

Goal 4. Expanded Electronic Government (eGovernment) – PMBP will aide the Corps to meet this goal by:

- reducing the cost and time of doing business with the Corps...all project information will be readily available to customers 24 hours a day
- providing customers and stakeholders with readier access to the Corps
- increasing access to Corps information for persons with disabilities via the PMBP web site
- having real time information available at all times will provide high quality customer service regardless of whether a person contacts the Corps by phone, in person or on the PMBP web site

Goal 5. Budget and Performance Integration – PMBP will aide the Corps to meet this goal by:

- providing a greater focus on performance
- producing performance-based budgets
- building more accurate baselines
- having more control and accountability over resources
- providing standard, integrated budgets, performance, and accounting information systems at the program level
- provide timely feedback to managers and customers/stakeholders at all levels

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.)

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Yes **No**

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

c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, Ineffective, Results not Demonstrated

15. Is this investment for information technology? **Yes** No

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 **Level 2** Level 3

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

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

(2) Project manager qualification is under review for this investment

(3) Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements

(4) Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started

(5) No Project manager has yet been assigned to this investment

18. Is this investment identified as “high risk” on the Q4-FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23) **Yes** No

19. Is this a financial management system? Yes **No**

a. If “yes,” does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? Yes No

If “yes,” which compliance area:

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 – **25%**

Software – **25%**

Services – **25%**

Other – **25%**

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? Yes No **N/A**

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

Name: Phone Number: Title: Records Management Program Manager

E-mail:

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? Yes **No**

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? Yes **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:	31.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	0	0	0	0	34.9
Acquisition :	0.6	3.2	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	5.9
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	32.5	4.2	3.1	1.0	0	0	0	0	40.8
Operations & Maintenance:	23.6	14.2	16.0	13.3					
TOTAL:	56.1	18.4	19.1	14.3					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	6.3	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	18.2
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	33

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

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE’s? Yes **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:

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.

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **Yes** No N/A

a. Explain why:

Ensuring compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act will be accomplished by the following measures: (1) Information systems, web developed applications and products that are new or have undergone changes since June 21, 2000 will not be allowed to be deployed unless they are made fully accessible to individuals with disabilities; (2) language has been and will be further strengthen in contracts involving information systems and web products to ensure they are made accessible; (3) Section 508 evaluation will be added to the Command Staff Inspection (CSI) site visits and to the Engineer Inspector General oversight review process; (4) the Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS), in concert with the Corps of Engineers Interest Center of Expertise (ICE), will conduct comprehensive reviews and assessments of all new and modified websites to ensure compliance; (5) Regional Chief Information Officers will conduct inspections on new and modified websites under their purview to ensure compliance; (6) a policy has been developed and disseminated to further reinforce this section; and, (7) the USACE Chief Information Officer has designated the ICE to assist in meeting Section 508 requirements and to furnish web operational and technical guidance, training (on a cost reimbursable basis) and help as needed. If Section 508 compliance imposes undue burden, USACE will provide information and data by an alternative means such as providing a method of contracting someone for the information being provided. These individuals will be held responsible to respond in a timely manner and to provide the information in an accessible format to the public and Federal government employees with disabilities.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **Yes** No

a. If "yes," what is the date? **The Business case and acquisition plan was approved in April 2002.**

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 Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Process – Practice Project Management across all levels. Once Corps, operating regionally and globally	Mission & Business Results	Program Monitoring	Extent to which intermediate outcomes related to Controls and Oversight are achieved	Enterprise-Wide Program Monitoring not available	100% of the enterprise projects and programs will be managed using P2.	100% of the enterprise active projects are managed using P2.
2007	Process – Practice Project Management across all levels. Once Corps, operating regionally and globally	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Users of P2 have greater access to information	Currently only certain people have access to project information	85% of organizations and commands will use P2 to access and share information	Security Issues are currently preventing us from providing customer access to our database
2007	Budget and Performance Integration	Processes & Activities	Innovation and Improvement	N/A	ER approved in Aug 2001 PMBP Business Processes were approved in Nov 2002.	ER will be reviewed and updated BPs will be expanded accordingly.	Revisions to ER 5-1-11 (USACE Business Process) were made on 01 Nov 2006 and issued 12 Jan 2007 to the FOAs.
2007	Expanded Electronic Government (eGovernment) - having real time information available at all times will provide high quality customer service regardless of whether a person contacts the Corps by phone, in person or on the PMBP web site	Technology	Reliability	System or application capacity, availability to user, and system or application failures. Extent to which the system is available 24/7.	Unscheduled downtime was occurring, resulting in later and later availability to users for reports from the database.	Outside of planned downtime for system maintenance, monitoring programs have been put in place to ensure the system reliability and availability to the end users.	The system availability has improved providing full day availability for reports. Unscheduled downtimes were minimal and scheduled downtimes were communicated to end-users in advance via email and web portal announcements.
2008	Budget and Performance Integration building more accurate baselines	Mission & Business Results	Program Monitoring	Extent to which intermediate outcomes related to controls and oversight are achieved.	Enterprise wide program monitoring is not available	Projects and Programs will be managed using PMBP and 100% Project Status will be monitored by Higher HQ.	To be Provided by Sep 2008. Use of Data Quality Metric are being implemented currently and thru FY08.
2008	Expanded Electronic Government (eGovernment) -	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Customer use data from P2 to help foresee issues and to	Customers report that information is not timely or at times accessible or	Customer Access and data will be improved with the introduction of	To be Provided by Sep 2008.

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	providing customers and stakeholders with readier access to the Corps			help avoid obstacles. Also related to level of satisfaction with data that they receive from P2	in customer friendly format. Customer have been requested to provide input to help resolve problems in advance.	additional mission areas specific (OFA) data cubes and refinements to existing data cubes.	
2008	Process – Practice Project Management across all levels. One Corp, operating regionally and globally	Processes & Activities	Innovation and Improvement	More than 50% of the Corps Business processes are modified for increased to efficiency and effectiveness	Revision to ER 5-1-11 were issued in 12 Jan 2007.	All business process will be assessed during FY08. Changes are expected as a results of revised ER 5-1-11. During FY08 30% of BPs will be modified. Changes can occur at anytime per the Corps configuration management decisions made.	To be provided by Sep 2008
2008	Communications Increased project information sharing	Technology	Information Management	Data or Information standardization, reliability and quality, and storage capacity	The quality of data is not reliable to support the Command in managing project, execution, reporting and decision making	Date is relied upon for managing and monitoring project execution; reporting; and decision making purposes at all levels of command.	To be provided in Sep 2008. Incorporation of improve data repository capability via Enterprise Data warehousing and data quality metrics during FY08.
2009	Process – Practice Project Management across all levels. Once Corps, operating regionally and globally	Mission & Business Results	Knowledge Dissemination	100% completion of revisions for improvements to the P2 system. (P2 version 3)	100% completion of revisions for improvements to the P2 system (P2 version 3)	100% completion of revisions for improvements to the P2 system. (P2 version 3)	To be provided by Sep 2009
2009	Process – Practice Project Management across all levels. Once Corps, operating regionally and globally	Customer Results – Service Quality	Customer Satisfaction	Customer use data from P2 to help foresee issues and to help avoid obstacles. Also related to level of satisfaction with data that they receive from P2	Customers report that information is not timely or at times accessible or in customer friendly format.	Customer Access and data will be improved with web based access to information and additional reporting capabilities. (P2 version 3)	To be Provided by Sep 2009.
2009	Process – Practice Project Management	Processes & Activities	Innovation and Improvement	100% completion of revisions for	100% completion of revisions for improvements to the	100% completion of revisions for improvements to	To be provided by Sep 2009

**Performance Information
Table**

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	across all levels. One Corp, operating regionally and globally		ment	improvements to the P2 system. (P2 version 3)	P2 system (P2 version 3)	the P2 system. (P2 version 3)	
2009	Communications Increased project information sharing	Technology	Information Management	Data or Information standardization, reliability and quality, and storage capacity	100% Implementation of Enterprise Data warehouse (EDW) and associated web based reporting capability via Business Object tools (Business Intelligence)	100% Implementation of Enterprise Data warehouse (EDW) and associated web based reporting capability via Business Object tools (Business Intelligence)	To be provided by Sep 2009

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 is planned, include the investment in both the “Systems in Planning” table (Table 3) and the “Operational Systems” table (Table 4). 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 supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system(s) to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system(s).

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

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

Yes No

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

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. **Yes** No

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s) – Security Table:			
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)
P2	Agency (USACE ITL)	Current	IATO dated 5/2/2007

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, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
P2	Agency (USACE ITL)	Low	Y	May	NIST	5/2007	5/2007

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? Yes **No**

a. If “yes,” have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency’s plan of action and milestone process? Yes No

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. **No**

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

Contractor security procedures are included in independent FISCAM audits by GAO. In addition, the USACE HQ provides assistance with contract language for generic and specific security requirements. The USACE Operations Order 99-001, dated 1 April 1999, required a review of all IT contracts to ensure background investigation requirements are appropriate and conducted in accordance with Army Regulation 380-67, paragraph 3-608.

Contractor security procedures are monitored, verified and validated by the Corps program manager and via the Corps corporate UPASS process. This requires both the Corps and contractor project managers’ approval and is limited to specific access to the required server and application modules per individual. Also, the permissions are limited to the length of the specific contract and are automatically deleted by an expiration date. Foreign nationals are not hired for work on the Program’s construction-related system. All information systems security personnel (government or contractor) are appointed in writing and have had security training and received appropriate, where required, certification. All personnel (government or contractor) who require access have had a personnel security background check and/or security investigation completed, consistent with the project’s sensitivity designation. Separation of duties is strictly enforced. All operations personnel (government or contractors) have secret level clearances.

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
P2	N	Y	PIA is at Army and is not to be posted for Public review due to the fact it contains Privacy information.	Y	PIA is at Army and is not to be posted for Public review due to the fact it contains Privacy information.

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: Links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites.

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

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

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

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? **Yes** No

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

Project Management Information System II (P2)

b. If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If "yes," provide the name of the segment architecture. **Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW)**

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 Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Online Help Component	Defines the set of capabilities that provide an electronic interface to customer assistance.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Help			N	5
Online Tutorials Component	Defines the set of capabilities that provide an electronic interface to educate and assist customers.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Tutorials			N	5
Alerts and Notifications Component	Defines the set of capabilities that allow a customer to be contacted in relation to a subscription or service of interest.	Customer Preferences	Alerts & Notifications			N	5
Inbound Correspondence Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities for the management of externally initiated communication between an organization and its stakeholders.	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence			N	5
Outbound Correspondence Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities for the management of internally initiated communication between an organization and its stakeholders.	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence			N	5
Process Tracking Component	Defines the set of capabilities to allow the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			N	5
Change Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities that control the process for updates or modifications to the existing documents, software or business process of an organization.	Management of Process	Change Management			N	5
Configuration Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities that control hardware and software environments, as well as documents of an organization.	Management of Process	Configuration Management			N	5
Program/Project Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities for the management and control of a particular effort of an organization.	Management of Process	Program / Project Management			N	5
Quality Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities intended to help determine the level of assurance that a product or service will satisfy certain requirements.	Management of Process	Quality Management			N	5
Business Rule Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities for the management of the enterprise processes that support an organization and its policies.	Management of Process	Business Rule Management			N	5
Risk Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification and probabilities or chance of hazards as they relate to a task, decision or long-term goal.	Management of Process	Risk Management			N	5

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 Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	U P I		
Procurement Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the ordering and purchasing of products and services.	Supply Chain Management	Procurement			N	5
Sourcing Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the supply of goods or services as well as the tracking and analysis of costs for these goods.	Supply Chain Management	Sourcing Management			N	5
Invoice/Requisition Tracking & Approval Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification of where a shipment or delivery is within the business cycle.	Supply Chain Management	Invoice / Requisition Tracking & Approval			N	5
Demand Forecasting/ Management	Defines the set of capabilities that facilitate the prediction of sufficient production to meet an organization's sales of a product or service.	Business Intelligence	Demand Forecasting / Management			N	5
Decision Support & Planning	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analyze information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made.	Business Intelligence	Decision Support & Planning			N	5
Ad-Hoc Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis.	Reporting	Ad hoc			N	5
Standardized/ Canned	Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of preconceived or pre-written reports.	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			N	5
OLAP Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the analysis of information that has been summarized into multidimensional views and hierarchies.	Reporting	OLAP			N	5
Graphing/ Charting	Defines the set of capabilities that support the presentation of information in the form of diagrams or tables.	Visualization	Graphic / Charting			N	5
Data Exchange Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the interchange of information between multiple systems or applications.	Data Management	Data Exchange			N	5
Meta Data Management Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance and administration of data that describes data.	Data Management	Meta Data Management			N	5
Extraction & Transformation Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the manipulation and change of data.	Data Management	Extraction & Transformation			N	5
Loading & Archiving Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the population of a data source with external data.	Data Management	Loading & Archiving			N	5

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 Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Legacy Integration Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the communication between newer generation hardware or software applications and the previous, major generation of hardware or software applications.	Development & Integration	Legacy Integration			N	5
Enterprise Application Integration Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the redesigning of disparate information systems into one system that uses a common set of data structures and rules.	Development & Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			N	5
Data Integration Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the organization of data from separate data sources into a single source using middleware or application integration as well as the modification of system data models to capture new information within a single system.	Development & Integration	Data Integration			N	5
Instrumentation & Testing Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the validation of application or system capabilities and requirements.	Development & Integration	Instrumentation & Testing			N	5
Software Development Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the creation of both graphical and process application or system software.	Development & Integration	Software Development			N	5
Document Library Component	Defines the set of capabilities that support the grouping and archiving of files and records on a server.	Collaboration	Document Library			N	5
Task Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support a specific undertaking or function assigned to an employee.	Collaboration	Task Management			N	5
Forms Creation	Defines the set of capabilities that support the design and generation of electronic or physical forms and templates for use within the business cycle by an organization and its stakeholders.	Forms Management	Forms Creation			N	5
Forms Modification	Defines the set of capabilities that support the maintenance of electronic or physical forms, templates and their respective elements and fields.	Forms Management	Forms Modification			N	5
Query	Defines the set of capabilities that support retrieval of records that satisfy specific query selection criteria.	Search	Query			N	5
Identification &	Defines the set of capabilities that	Security	Identification &			N	5

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 Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		
Authentication	support obtaining information about those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of those users.	Management	Authentication				
Access Control	Defines the set of capabilities that support the management of permissions for logging onto a computer or network.	Security Management	Access Control			N	5
Digital Signature	Defines the set of capabilities that guarantee the unaltered state of a file.	Security Management	Digital Signature Management Incident Response			N	5
Verification	Defines the set of capabilities that support the confirmation of authority to enter a computer system, application or network.	Security Management	Verification			N	5

- 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 this 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)
Online Help	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Oracle Tutor, Adobe RoboHelp, CA Unicenter
Online Tutorials	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Oracle Tutor, Adobe Captivate
Alerts & Notifications	Service Access & Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Corps of Engineers Intranet Architecture
Inbound Correspondence	Service Access & Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration Communications	Microsoft Outlook
Outbound Correspondence	Service Access & Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration Communications	Microsoft Outlook
Process Tracking	Service Interface & Integration	Interoperability	Data Types	Oracle Database
Process Tracking	Service Interface & Integration	Interface	Service Description	API
Change Management	Service Interface & Integration	Interface	Service Description	API
Configuration Management	Service Interface & Integration	Interoperability	Data Types	Oracle Database
Program / Project Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Management, Primavera MyPrimavera
Quality Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Management, Primavera MyPrimavera
Business Rule Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Management, Primavera MyPrimavera
Risk Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Management, Primavera MyPrimavera
Procurement	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Management, Primavera MyPrimavera
Sourcing Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Management, Primavera MyPrimavera
Invoice / Requisition Tracking & Approval	Component Framework	Data Management	Platform Independent	Oracle Projects Discoverer
Demand Forecasting / Management	Component Framework	Data Management	Platform Independent	Oracle Financial Analyzer
Decision Support & Planning	Component Framework	Data Management	Platform Independent	Primavera Project Scheduler

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)
Ad hoc	Component Framework	Data Management (Reporting & Analysis)	Platform Independent	Oracle Projects Discoverer Oracle Financial Analyzer
Standardized / Canned	Component Framework	Data Management (Reporting & Analysis)	Platform Independent	Oracle Projects Discoverer Oracle Financial Analyzer
OLAP	Component Framework	Data Management (Reporting & Analysis)	Platform Independent	Oracle Financial Analyzer
Graphic / Charting	Component Framework	Presentation/Interface	Static Display	HTML
Data Exchange	Service Platform & Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Oracle, Java2 Runtime, SQLPLUS
Meta Data Management	Service Platform & Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Oracle, Java2 Runtime, SQLPLUS
Extraction & Transformation	Service Platform & Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Oracle, Java2 Runtime, SQLPLUS
Loading & Archiving	Service Platform & Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	Oracle, Java2 Runtime, SQLPLUS
Legacy Integration	Service Interface & Integration	Integration	Middleware	Primavera Project Management
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface & Integration	Integration	Middleware	Primavera Project Management
Data Integration	Service Interface & Integration	Integration	Middleware	Primavera Project Management
Instrumentation & Testing	Service Interface & Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	Primavera MyPrimavera
Software Development	Service Interface & Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	Primavera MyPrimavera
Document Library	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Microsoft SharePoint (MOSS 7)
Task Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Intranet	Microsoft SharePoint (MOSS 7)
Forms Creation	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera MyPrimavera
Forms Modification	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	Primavera MyPrimavera
Query	Service Platform & Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Oracle Applications & Oracle Reports
Identification & Authentication	Service Access & Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication	Authenticated Access at UNIX level and data base level

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)
Access Control	Service Access & Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication	Authenticated Access at UNIX level and data base level
Digital Signature Management Incident Response	Service Access & Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication	Authenticated Access at UNIX level and data base level
Verification	Service Access & Delivery	Service Requirements	Compliance – Security & Privacy	NIST FIPS guidelines Privacy Act guidelines

- 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 **No**

- a. If “yes,” please describe.

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

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.

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

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 investment? Yes No
X a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? Dec. 31, 1999
 b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
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
Alternative 1	Enhanced PROMIS - Rewrite the programs code using 2002 technology	43,835,395	
Alternative 2	P2 - Purchase COTS software and configure P2 to enable the Corps business Processes to be used.	31,114,842	
Alternative 3	Decentralized Tools – Each PM selects own PM tool. Project data is not shared.	52,000,000	

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

Alternative 2 was chosen for the reasons outlined below.

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

A comparison of alternatives shows that P2 outperforms Enhanced PROMIS in all of the economic performance measures calculated. P2 is lower than Enhanced PROMIS and is the preferred alternative. In terms of the BCR, Enhanced PROMIS has fewer benefits than costs and a BCR of less than one. P2, on the other hand, indicates benefits that are more than twice the total costs.

The P2 Program's cost-benefits analysis shows that the P2 Option had a B/C ratio of 2.15 vs. the B/C ratio of 0.8. for the Enhanced PROMIS option. Quantitative benefits include:

- Increased management efficiency and effectiveness (e.g. single data entry instead of multiple entry points)
- Increased productivity (in terms of staff hours per task)
- Lower maintenance costs in the future
- Increased operational efficiency and evaluation (through ability to track data related to specific parameters defined within each business function of the Corps O&M program)
- Greater access to project data
- Increases productivity and sharing of information among project staff

- Reduced risk in project execution to higher quality information being available to all involved parties via a single shared database and at faster speeds.
- Provides fully integrated COTS software applications.
- Fully Supports Regional Business Centers
- Will subsume multiple legacy systems
 - ABS
 - PRISM
 - GI Database
 - PPDS
 - CWAS
 - FORCON
 - CERAMMS

5. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **Yes** No

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? This investment the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment

b. If “yes,” please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
PROMIS		2004

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 No
 a. If “yes,” what is the date of the plan?

The P2 DITSCAP was signed in April 2004. The authorization to Operate (ATO) was signed in May 2004.

- b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year’s submission to OMB? Yes No
 c. If “yes,” describe any significant changes:

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

Date Identified	Area of Risk	Description	Probability of Occurrence	Strategy for Mitigation	Current Status
July 2003	1) Schedule	Shift of schedule to the right due to various factors including changes in technical requirements or misalignment with component requirements and implementation plans (Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)	Basic	Multiple project plans at all levels of the program, each of which is overseen by a manager and rolled up to the program oversight level.	P2 has been deployed and the implementation phase was completed during FY05.....
July 2001	2) Initial Costs	The potential for over or underestimating costs prior to starting a program (Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)	Basic	Well-planned requirements analysis and cost realism analysis.	Development and deployment costs grew by 12.5 %. The remaining development work is minor and will be completed with sustainment funds by 30 Sep 2006.
July 2001	3) Life-cycle Costs	The project re-capitalization plans do not accurately portray requirements for technology improvements	Medium	Stay abreast of industry trends and costs and update plans frequently Employ sound acquisition strategies to ensure reliable cost performance	Market studies and technology reviews performed periodically; an updated cost-benefit analysis in Complete an assessment every two years Last assessment Dec 2004
July 2001	4) Technical Obsolescence	Hardware and software components do not meet emerging security requirements (Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)	Basic	Ensure ongoing coordination with ASA (ALT), DISA, DOD, and DHS in matters pertaining to new security requirements and features. Hardware is replaced at the end of its lifecycle.	The P2 DITSCAP was approved in April 2004. Monitoring and compliance will be performed in accordance with the P2 LCMIS. LCMIS will be updated during 2006 in concert with major COTS upgrade
April 2002	5) Feasibility	Integrating similar but separately developed systems will prove unfeasible	Basic	Ensure integration is driven by a business case and the P2 EA; integration planned	A business case will be developed for any new integration initiative. The P2 EA drives the P2 Initiative. Established CM

		(Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)		and accomplished through program planning, and CM, and security processes.	and security processes and procedures are in place to ensure that all impacts of any integration proposal can be assessed.
July 2001	6) Reliability of Systems	Excessive system downtime or incompatibility between program systems	Basic	Ensure reliability through prototyping, contractual performance requirements, stress testing, redundancy, etc. Perform upfront planning with input and consensus from initiative managers	Performance testing was completed after IOC and has been performed during deployment to insure that the system is configured correctly and that we have the appropriate communications hardware to support P2.
Sep 2002	7) Dependencies and Interoperability	Dependency on other Legacy Systems for data. E.g. CEFMS, RMS, Etc	Medium	Back-up both systems at the same time.	Continually communicate with PMs who run the other systems.
Sep 2002	8) Surety	Linking different systems independently designed by separate agencies and other e-Government initiatives can be costly and/or not technically feasible.	Medium	Create well-defined system interfaces with an integration work group.	A Configuration Control Board will ensure that interfaces are not impacted by changes
July 2001	9) Monopoly for future procurements	USACE will become dependent on in-house staff to maintain and operate P2. (Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)	Medium	Ensure the Acquisition Strategy Plan addresses the exclusion of singular dependencies.	Multiple contractors are already in place to operate and maintain P2.
July 2001	10) Capability of Agency to Manage the Investment	Project performance will degrade to a level where budget support jeopardizes the Corps to adequately operate and maintain P2. (Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)	Basic	Ensure that the PMO is properly staffed and that the IPT is in place, staffed with qualified and experienced personnel. Ensure the development of and adherence to SLAs and performance metrics program-wide.	Performance metrics are included in all contract documents.
01/29/95	12) Organizational and Change Management	Lack of strong executive buy-in and support for successful implementation of the program will jeopardize program continuity.	Medium	Ensure program support and visibility at highest levels of USACE; plan for continual training, guidance and documentation for USACE workforce.	Program has support from the Chief of Engineers and the USACE CIO and other executive levels; the program is included in all components of the Corps' EA and is based on the PMBP; training programs in place for all program initiatives.
08/20/02	13) Business	Combining various initiatives and implementing them Corps-wide will require extensive business process reengineering and will cause disruptive culture shock and resistance.	Medium	Establish guidelines and regulations for business processes to create a common corporate behavior and framework for all Corps work. Provide training on these processes and program system initiatives.	PMBP established (2001) a training curriculum. The Chief of Engineers and his Senior Leaders have recognized the risks and relationships between the PMBP acceptances (which includes p2). PMBP development and cultural development teams were linked to together to assure synchronized and consistency among the business processes, the

		points across the program. (Risk last updated on 1 July 2005)			interfaces could be accessed. Security Plans developed for the P2 system. DITSCAP evaluations were completed during April 2004.
08/20/02	18) Privacy	The program and its initiatives will not meet privacy requirements.	Basic	Ensure that the program's systems design and operational guidelines properly address privacy requirements, where applicable.	This initiative does not involve information in identifiable form collected from or about members of the public.
08/20/02	19) Project Resources	Inadequate project resources will jeopardize the program's success.	Medium	Ensure project resources through strong program management, executive sponsorship, and identified integrated project teams.	Full-time program and subordinate project managers have been appointed, supported by designated experts from field, mid-level USACE offices, and assistance from HQUSACE program management team by a configuration management LCMIS process mitigates much of the risk. Annual submission of LCMIS documentation, justifications to Congress and availability for on-call briefings to HQDA, OM, and Congressional Staffs ensure problem identification, resolution, and communication to stakeholders.

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 **No**

2 Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%?
(CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) Yes **No**

a. If “yes,” was it the? CV SV

Both

b. If “yes,” explain the causes of the variance: (long text)

c. If “yes,” describe the corrective actions: (long text)

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?

Yes **No**

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

(Date)

b. If “yes”, when was it approved by OMB?

(Date)

9. 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.

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) Planned/Actual		Total Cost (\$M) Planned/Actual		Schedule/Cost (# days/\$M)		
Acquisition and configuration of the COTS that form P2. Development of key Interfaces and purchase of required hardware.	04/07/2000	\$18.25	09/30/2002	09/30/2002	\$18.25	\$18.25	0	0	100%
FY03 Development Tasks 1. Complete Key Interfaces: FEMS, REMIS, REFMIS, RECIS and CEMRS 2. Solution Demo Lab - System adjustments 3. System Acceptance Test - System adjustments 4. Initial Operating Capability - System adjustments 5. Purchase COOP server	10/01/2002	\$12.24	03/31/2003	03/31/2004	\$12.24	\$12.24	360	0	100%
Deployment of P2 , continue configuration	07/31/2003	\$3.17	07/31/2004	07/31/2004	\$3.17	\$3.17	0	0	100%
Implementation of P2, complete configuration	03/30/2005	\$0.26	03/30/2005	03/30/2005	\$0.26	\$258,800	0	0	100%
Development and Deployment P2, Phase II	01/31/2004	\$2.0	09/30/2006	09/30/2006	\$2.0	\$0.98			70%
P2 Operations, Maintenance, and Support for FY05	09/30/2005	\$2.0	09/30/2005	09/30/2005	\$2.0	\$3.48	0	+\$1.48	100%
P2 Operations, Maintenance, and Support for FY06	09/30/2006	\$2.0	09/30/2006						
P2 Operations, Maintenance, and Support for FY07	09/30/2007	\$1.93	09/30/2007						
P2 Operations, Maintenance, and Support for FY08	09/30/2008	\$1.9	09/30/2008						

Part III: For “Operation and Maintenance” investments ONLY (Steady State)

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.

Section A: 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 No
 a. If “yes,” what is the date of the plan? _____
 b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year’s submission to OMB? Yes No
 c. If “yes,” describe any significant changes: _____

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? Yes No
 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 No
 a. If “yes,” provide the date the analysis was completed.
 b. If “yes,” what were the results?
 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)?

2. b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table:					
Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance
	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost (\$M)	Schedule:Cost (# days:\$M)