

BY10 Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Exhibit 300

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

In Part I, complete Sections A, B, C, and D for all capital assets (IT and non-IT). Complete Sections E and F for IT capital assets.

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

- (1) Date of Submission:
- (2) Agency: 422
- (3) Bureau: 00
- (4) Name of this Capital Asset:
(250 Character Max)
- (5) Unique Project Identifier:
Format xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx
(For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)
- (6) What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? Multi-Agency Collaboration
Please note: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010, should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.
- (7) What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2005
- (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: (2500 Char Max)

GMLOB is a multi-agency initiative to develop a government-wide solution supporting end-to-end grants management activities promoting citizen access, customer service, and agency financial and technical stewardship. GMLOB's goals are to: Improve service to internal and external customers; increase standardization and streamlining; increase value delivered through IT to agencies, grantees, and the public; and reduce the number of grants systems government-wide. This Exhibit 300 reflects the PMO, a non-IT function. The target operating model states that the grants management community will process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services. A "consortia-based" approach is used to execute the operating model. Each consortium provides planning, leadership, business, and program direction to define a common solution to meet its members' needs. The common solution is hosted and operated by a service center under a Consortium Lead that provides the system or system components. The Department of Education (ED), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the National Science Foundation (NSF) were named as Consortium Leads by OMB in the FY2007 President's Budget. The majority of agencies have either signed an MOU with a Consortium Lead to plan migration, or have received a year-long OMB approved exemption from partnering, and are pursuing alternative solutions. Several agencies have not yet signed an MOU with a Consortium, but will be completing specific milestones in alignment

with the initiative. The initiative is supported by the GMLOB PMO which is funded by partner agency contributions. The PMO supports the following work lanes: governance, performance management and reporting, communications and outreach, consortia support, non-consortia support, and standards and streamlining. In August 2007, the Grants Executive Board approved extension of PMO support to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act and the Grants Policy Committee. GMLOB delivers benefits to the grant community and meets government-wide missions, strategic goals and objectives. GMLOB will: promote inter-agency consolidation and streamlining for grants processes, systems, and forms, resulting in decreased costs and effort for agency grants management; and ease the grantee burden associated with government-wide reporting of grant program performance.

(9) Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? yes
 (9a) If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

(10) Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? yes

(11) Contact Information of Project Manager?

Name:	Mary Santonastasso (NSF), Terry Hurst (HHS) (co-leads)
Phone Number:	Mary Santonastasso: 703-292-4565, Terry Hurst: 202-205-3514
E-Mail:	Mary Santonastasso: msantona@nsf.gov, Terry Hurst: terry.hurst@hhs.gov

(11a) What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the project/program manager?
Waiver Issued

(11b) When was the Project Manager assigned?

(11c) What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification?
 If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification?

(12) Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?
no

(12a) Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? no

(12b) Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) no

[12b1] If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? Select...

[12b2] If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? Select...

[12b3] If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? Select...

(13) Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? yes

If "yes," select all that apply:

President's Management Agenda (PMA) Initiatives

Expanded E-Government

(13a) 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?)

NSF and HHS are the co-managing partners of GMLOB. GMLOB supports the objectives of the PMA's Expanded Electronic Government goal by: streamlining processes and reducing redundant requirements; reducing administrative burden on grantees; producing more efficient and effective agency execution of grants; reducing government-wide reporting burden; enabling interoperability; developing standardized nomenclature, harmonized processes, and identification of common interface touch points.

(14) Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's no Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

(14a) If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? Select...

(14b) If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? Select...

(14c) If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? Select...

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

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

(17) In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance): Select...

(18) Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB's Memorandum M-05-23)? Select...

(19) Is this a financial management system? Select...

(19a) If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? Select...

[19a1] If "yes," which compliance area:

[19a2] If "no," what does it address?

(19b) 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 FY2010 funding request for the following?
(This should total 100%)

Hardware %:	Software %:	Services %:	Other %:	Total %
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	1.#QNAN

(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?

Select...

(22) Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name:

Phone Number:

Title:

E-Mail:

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

(24) Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? yes

Section B: Summary of Funding (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 & Earlier (Spending Prior to 2008)	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY +1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 2014 and beyond	Total
Planning	\$2.743	\$4.488	\$3.310	\$3.811					\$14.352
Acquisition	\$13.735	\$13.722	\$12.379	\$11.071					\$50.907
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	\$16.478	\$18.210	\$15.689	\$14.882	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$65.259
Operations & Maintenance	\$10.750	\$4.935	\$8.101	\$11.188					\$34.974
TOTAL	\$27.228	\$23.145	\$23.790	\$26.070	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$100.233
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	\$2.540	\$2.530	\$3.040	\$2.710					\$10.820
Number of FTE represented by cost	13	15	16	17					61

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**

(2a) If "yes," How many and in what year?

ACF: No additional FTEs required by the project. NSF: This project will require NSF to hire a total of seven additional FTEs. NSF hired two FTEs in PY2007 and will hire two additional FTEs in CY 008, two in BY2009, and one in BY 2010. ED: Two additional government FTEs may be required in FY2009, depending on the number of consortium partners.

(3) If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

ED: In order to mitigate risk and optimize budget dollars the Department has modified the G5 Integrator contract from a Time and Materials contract to a firm-fixed price contract. Based upon contract negotiations the G5 project funding has been stabilized. NSF: The scope of Research.gov has increased as the result of new legislative mandates such as the America Competes Act and agency requirements for public information dissemination. To address this increased scope, Research.gov plans to take a conservative, phased approach to develop, pilot, and implement services to assure alignment with legislative mandates as they are more fully defined. The scope of Research.gov has also increased to meet stakeholder demand for improved Reviewer Management services, which will be developed and housed on Research.gov. ACF: N/A, ACF's summary of spending has not changed from the FY2009 President's budget request.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

(1) Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders 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.

Contract or Task Order Number:
GS-23F-9806H

Type of Contract/TO Used (in accordance with FAR Part 16):
T&M: Time & Materials

Has the Contract been awarded? yes

If yes, what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? 03/30/2006

Contract/TO Start Date: 05/01/2006 Contract/TO End Date: 10/15/2008

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$2.342

Is this an Interagency Acquisition? no

Is it performance based? no Competitively awarded? no

What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? NA

Is EVM in the contract? no

Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses? yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name:
Steve Strength NSF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email):
(703)-292-8242 / sstrengr@nsf.gov

CO FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level: 3

If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? Select...

(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:

The GMLOB PMO itself is not involved in acquisition or development activities. Contract Number: GS23F9806 (SRA Touchstone) does not require earned value because the contract is for program management and is not related to IT development.

(3) Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? n/a

(3a) Explain why not or how this is being done?

N/A

(4) Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?

no

(4a) If "yes", what is the date?

[4a1] Is it current? Select...

(4b) If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? no

[4b1] If "no," briefly explain why:

The GMLOB PMO is not involved in acquisition or development activities.

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 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 the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area IT	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Mission and Business	Information	ACF: Number of	Four contracts	Reduce to one	Reduced to

		<u>Results</u>	<u>Management</u>	service grant system funding development contracts		contract (Enterprise GATES)	one contract
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of OPDIV-unique grants processes and policies	Three OPDIV-unique systems	Reduce to one system (Enterprise GATES)	Reduced to one system
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of HHS social service grants managed through GATES	54%	Increase to 86%	Increased to 86%
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review	21 days	Reduce to one day for electronic submission	Reduced to one day
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GATES	99.0% scheduled availability	Increase to 99.5% scheduled availability	Increased to 99.5%
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within Enterprise GATES	Four OPDIVs (AoA, ACF, IHS, CMS)	Increase to six OPDIVs	Increased to six OPDIVS (added OPHS and HRSA)
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of Enterprise Architecture (EA) framework models completed	One model (As-Is) partially completed	Increase to two models (As-Is and To-Be) completed and integrated	Two models (As-Is and To-Be) completed and integrated
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Level of E-Authentication	E-Authentication level 1	Increase to E-Authentication level 2	Increased to E-Authentication level 2
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed via Grants.gov	10% of grant applications via Grants.gov	Increase to 20% of grant applications via Grants.gov	Increased to 30% of grant applications via Grants.gov
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC	10% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increase to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increased to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent alignment of GrantSolutions.gov v/GATES OLDC with ACF and HHS Enterprise IT Architecture	60% alignment, excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g., PowerBuilder clients)	Increase to 100% alignment excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g. PowerBuilder clients)	Increased to 100% alignment excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g. PowerBuilder clients)
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review	One day	Maintain one day	Maintained one day
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov	Up to 90 days to review and approve grant applications	Reduce 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and approve grant	Reduced 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and

				v/GATES grant applications		applications	approve grant applications
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.5% scheduled availability	Increase to 99.9% scheduled availability	Increased to 99.9% scheduled availability
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of partner grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	6 partners	Increase to seven partners	Increased to seven partners
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed electronically	30% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 40% of grant applications processed electronically	Increased to 39.6% of grant applications filed electronically
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	50% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 55% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increased to 55% of grant reports submitted electronically
2007	Effective Manag...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Percent reduction of contractor data entry for grant applications	100% of 2006 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2006 processing time	Decreased to 95% of 2006 processing time
2007	Effective Manag...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of ACF: GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	maintained 99.9% scheduled availability
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of partner grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Seven partners	Increase to eight partners	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed electronically	40% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 45% of grant applications submitted electronically	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Impact or Burden</u>	ACF: Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	55% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 60% of grant reports submitted electronically	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ACF: Percent reduction of contractor data entry processing time for grant applications	100% of 2007 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2007 processing time	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Availability</u>	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Information Management</u>	ACF: Number of partner grants	Eight Partners	Increase to nine partners	TBD

				management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES			
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grants applications processed electronically	45% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 50% of grant applications processed electronically	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	60% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 65% of grant reports submitted electronically	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF:Percent reduction of contractor data entry processing time for grant applications	100% of 2008 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2008 processing time	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of partner grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/Enterprise GATES	Nine partners	Increase to ten partners	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grants applications processed electronically	50% of grant applications processed electronically	Increase to 55% of grant applications processed electronically	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF:Percent of grant reports submitted electronically	65% of grant reports submitted electronically	Increase to 70% of grant reports submitted electronically	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF:Percent reduction of contractor data entry processing time for grant applications	100% of 2009 processing time	Decrease to 95% of 2009 processing time	TBD
2010	S.O. 3.1 - Promo...	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				

2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2005	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	0	0
2006	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	Consortia Lead agencies selected by OMB	3 designated Consortia Lead agencies and 2 MoUs signed by member agencies to partner with ACF
2007	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	3 designated Consortia Lead agencies and 11 agencies signed MOU's to partner with a Consortium. 7 agencies pursuing alternate solutions.
2008	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2009	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2010	Reduce cost, im...	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2011		Select...	Select...				
2008	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	0	3	3
2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	NSF: Grantee satisfaction	0	60%	70%
2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	NSF: # of Agencies using	0	2	2

				offerings			
2008	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Participation	NSF: # of Registered Users	0	2,000	2,618
2008	Stewardship	Technology	Availability	NSF: Portal Uptime	0	99%	99.9934%
2009	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	3	4	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	NSF: Grantee Satisfaction	60%	65%	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	NSF: # of Agencies using offerings	2	3	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	NSF: # of Registered Users	2,000	3,800	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Technology	Availability	NSF: Portal Uptime	99%	99.5%	TBD
2010	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	4	5	TBD
2010	Stewardship	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	NSF: Grantee satisfaction	65%	70%	TBD
2010	Stewardship	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	NSF: # of Agencies using offerings	3	4	TBD
2010	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Participation	NSF: # of Registered Users	3,800	5,400	TBD
2010	Stewardship	Technology	Availability	NSF: Portal Uptime	99.5%	99.9%	TBD
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ED: Selection as a GMLOB consortia lead in order to achieve the goal of reducing the number of grant management systems in the Federal government.	The GMLOB is a new initiative and there are no consortia providers.	Recommended as a GMLOB consortia Lead	ED received formal approval from OMB to go forward as a consortia lead on 12/2/2005
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ED: # of client agencies by 4th Quarter 06	0	1	As of Q4 FY 06 there are no partners. Progress

							toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	ED: Project Management Office (PMO) contract will be awarded by April 2006 to establish internal processes and best practices.	No PMO exists for project	PMO in place	PMO contract awarded 4/3/06
2006	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Data Reliability and Quality</u>	ED: # of COTS products reviewed in market analysis to support ED's grant management business process.	Market analysis prior to legacy system was not conducted.	8	18 vendors were evaluated to assess viability of COTS solution to support ED's grants management business process
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Satisfaction</u>	ED: A formal G5 Governance Structure (consisting of consortia partners and ED) will be adopted and implemented by Q1 FY07	No G5 Consortia Governance structure exists as of Q2 FY06.	A formal governance plan that identifies the governance structure and the roles, responsibilities, and governing procedures will be in place by Q1 FY07.	As of December 06, a formal governance plan has been adopted and is being implemented. The First G5 Executive Steering Committee meeting took place on 1/30/2007.
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Mission and Business Results</u>	<u>Central Fiscal Operations</u>	ED: client agency participation in development decisions	0 - GMLOB is a new initiative. No baseline information exists.	100% of all client agencies will participate in all G5 development decisions	As of December 2006, no partners have joined ED consortia. OMB has decided to delay the 2nd round of consortia leads. The affect is that an incomplete 2nd round makes it harder for current consortia leads to close deals with partner agencies
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>New Customers and Market Penetration</u>	ED: # of client agencies	0	2	ED has no partner agencies
2007	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Standards Compliance and Deviations</u>	ED: Adoption of CMMI Level 3 or better software development lifecycle practices to ensure	CMMI Level 3 or better does not exist for the project as of Q2 FY06	CMMI Level 3 or better will be adopted by the G5 project.	The G5 Integrator is certified at a CMMI level 3 and currently pursuing

				repeatable, disciplined methodology to solution development.			CMMI level 5 certification
2008	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Financial Management</u>	ED: # of identified requirements	211 total Phase 1 requirements have been identified.	100% implementation of critical requirements	100%
2008	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Errors</u>	ED: # of test cases passed (A&I & UAT)	720 test cases must pass in each test cycle.	More than 720 test cases	Testing has been delayed. Until testing is complete, the project cannot report the total # of defects and what will be defrred. Results will be reported when testing is complete.
2008	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Errors</u>	ED: # of defects found in UAT testing	900 defects can be identified during UAT	No more than 900 defects should be encountered in UAT.	Testing has been delayed. Until testing is complete, the project cannot report the total # of defects and what will be defrred. Results will be reported when testing is complete.
2008	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Processes and Activities</u>	<u>Lifecycle/Change Management</u>	ED: Total defects found vs. total defects deferred to next build/phase	45 defects can be deferred.	No more than 45 defects can be deferred.	Testing has been delayed. Until testing is complete, the project cannot report the total # of defects and what will be defrred. Results will be reported when testing is complete.
2008	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Satisfaction</u>	ED: % of stakeholders are informed about the G5 implementation	80% of the stakeholders will be informed.	No less than 80% will be informed.	95%
2008	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Customer Results</u>	<u>Customer Training</u>	ED: % of respondents are prepared to fully utilize the G5 system	70% of respondents will be prepared.	No less than 70% will be prepared.	85%
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Compliance</u>	ED: 100% of internal and external customers with disabilities can access and utilize the functionality of the system	100%	100%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.

2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Technology	Availability	ED: System Availability	G5 will be available 95% of the time	98% uptime	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Processes and Activities	System Development	ED: Change Requests (CR's) will not exceed % of the current project budget baseline	33%	10%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Processes and Activities	System Development	ED: % of prioritized severity 3&4 Defect Management Records (DMRs) will be resolved by the start of UAT for each project phase	80%	95%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Processes and Activities	System Development	ED:% of planned test cases execute successfully	90%	90%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Mission and Business Results	Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education	ED: Processing applications from Grants.gov	Applications will be processed with 1/2 hour 90% of the time	Applications will be processed with 1/2 hour 95% of the time	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Customer Results	Service Efficiency	ED: Timeliness of Hotline issues resolved	95% @ 24 hr	98%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Mission and Business Results	Compliance	ED:% of discretionary grant competitions transferred to Grants.gov	100%	100% less OMB approved exceptions	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2009	Cross-goal Strat...	Mission and Business Results	Compliance	ED: % of discretionary electronic application process (via e-App/Grants.gov)	100%	100% less OMB approved exceptions	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Technology	Compliance	ED:100% of internal and external customers with disabilities can access and utilize the functionality of the system	100%	100%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Technology	Availability	ED: System Availability	G5 will be available 95% of the time	98% uptime	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a

							quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Processes and Activities	System Development	ED: Project Change Requests (PCR's) will not exceed % of the current project budget baseline	33%	10%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Processes and Activities	System Development	ED: % of prioritized severity 3&4 Defect Management Records (DMRs) will be resolved by the start of UAT for each project phase	80%	95%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Processes and Activities	System Development	ED: % of planned test cases execute successfully	90%	90%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Mission and Business Results	Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education	ED: Processing applications from Grants.gov	Applications will be processed with 1/2 hour 90% of the time	Applications will be processed with 1/2 hour 95% of the time	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2010	Cross-goal Strat...	Customer Results	Service Efficiency	ED:Timeliness of Hotline issues resolved	95% @ 24 hr	98%	Progress towards performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2011		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2012		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				
2013		Select...	Select...				

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: Select...

(1a) 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. Select...

(3)

Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization -- 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)
----------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

(4)

Operational Systems - Security Table

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated system	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact Level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has the C&A been completed using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed Security Control Testing	Date Contingency Plan Tested
----------------	--------------------------------------	---	---	-------------------	---	---	------------------------------

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

(5a) If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? Select...

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

(6a) If "yes," specify the amount, a general description of the weakness, and 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 and Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name Of System	(b) Is this a new system?	(c) Is there at least one PIA which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
--------------------	---------------------------	---	----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

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? Select...

(1a) If "no," please explain why?

(2) Is this investment included in the agency’s EA Transition Strategy? Select...

(2a) If “yes,” provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency’s most recent annual EA Assessment.

(2b) If “no,” please explain why?

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

(3a) If “yes,” provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect.

(4) 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.

Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
				Component Name	UPI		

- 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) 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.

Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

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)
-----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

- 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., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)? Select...

(6a) If “yes,” please describe.

PART IV: Planning for “Multi-Agency Collaboration” ONLY

Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business (LoB), or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The “Multi-Agency Collaboration” choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as “Multi-Agency Collaboration” will complete only Parts I and IV of the Exhibit 300.

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

Multi-agency Collaborations, such as E-Gov and LOB initiatives, should develop a joint exhibit 300.

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

Stakeholder Table

Partner Agency	Joint Exhibit Approval Date
011	09/02/2008
014	09/02/2008
012	09/02/2008
184	09/02/2008
474	09/02/2008
007	09/02/2008
018	09/02/2008
019	09/02/2008
015	09/02/2008
020	09/02/2008
026	09/02/2008
005	09/02/2008
417	09/02/2008
009	09/02/2008
393	09/02/2008
422	09/02/2008
485	09/02/2008
024	09/02/2008
006	08/29/2008
010	09/02/2008
025	09/02/2008
418	09/02/2008
028	09/02/2008
016	09/02/2008
029	09/02/2008

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

Partner Capital Assets Within This Investment		
Partner Agency	Partner Agency Asset Title (Max 250 Characters)	Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2010)
018	G5 Grants Management Re-Design	018-14-01-01-01-1341-24
009	ACF GrantSolutions.gov / Grants Administration Tracking Evaluation System (GATES) - Grants Center for Excellence	009-70-04-00-01-1356-24
422	GMLOB Research.gov	422-00-01-04-01-1361-24

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

Partner Funding Strategies (\$ Millions)					
Agency	Partner Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2010)	CY Contribution	CY Fee For Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee For Service
485	485-00-04-02-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.041	
005	005-03-01-81-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.069	
006	006-03-01-50-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.047	
007	007-97-01-22-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.060	
018	018-14-01-01-04-1300-24	\$0.198		\$0.133	
019	019-60-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.047	
024	024-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.069	
009	009-00-01-99-01-1300-24	\$0.198		\$0.131	
025	025-00-01-09-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.069	
010	010-00-01-07-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.060	
011	011-03-01-10-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.099	
012	012-25-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.069	
014	014-00-01-08-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.032	
021	021-04-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.041	
015	015-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.032	
020	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.038	
474	474-00-04-01-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.060	
393	393-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.038	
026	026-00-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.060	
417	417-00-04-01-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.038	
418					

	418-00-01-02-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.038	
422	422-00-01-04-01-1300-24	\$0.174		\$0.082	
028	028-00-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.038	
016	016-00-01-02-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.038	
184	184-15-01-02-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.038	
029	029-00-01-21-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.032	

An alternatives analysis for multi-agency collaborations should also be obtained. At least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline (i.e. status quo), should be included in the joint exhibit 300. Use OMB circular A-94 for all investments and the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

(4) Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? yes

(4a) If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?

(4b) If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

(4c) If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

(5) Use the results of your alternative analysis to complete the following table:

Alternative Analysis Results

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs Estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits Estimate
Baseline	Status Quo <input type="checkbox"/> This alternative involves no streamlined or standardized grants management process and systems. The 26 federal grant-making agencies continue to use their own legacy agency back-office grants management processes and systems.	\$7,977.000	\$0.000
Consortia-Based Approach	The consortia-based approach creates interim planning structures, consortia, made up of one lead agency and one or more member agencies. The consortia approach aligns consortia around shared business interests. Each consortium provides planning, leadership, business, and program direction with the goal of defining a technical solution to meet its members' needs. The common solution defined by a consortium will be launched and hosted by a Federal service center.	\$990.000	\$3,354.000
Segmented Consolidation	This approach creates Federal service centers that provide end-to-end grants management services to support defined types of grants. A service center focuses on a specific type or types of grants (e.g. mandatory, discretionary, research and development) and the grantee communities that apply for those grants. Agencies use different service centers depending on which grant types they manage. Agencies managing a range of grant types, will be cross-serviced by multiple service centers.	\$1,361.000	\$2,851.000
Single End-to-End System	This approach creates a single service center that houses the single government solution for end-to-end grants management. All government agencies use the single solution to process and manage all types of grants awarded to all types of recipients.	\$1,475.000	\$2,066.000

(6) Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance Process and why was it chosen?

The viable alternatives were subjected to a thorough analysis, considering costs, benefits, and risks, to determine the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative was selected based on financial metrics, including net present value (NPV), return on investment (ROI), and benefit cost ratio (BC Ratio), as well as the ability to fulfill the GMLOB requirements and the President's Management Agenda in a timely manner. The Consortia-Based Approach was selected. The cost benefits of reducing the costs associated with multiple agencies developing and maintaining grants management systems are compelling. The total benefit of Alternative 1 over 10 years is \$3.4 billion, with a Net Present Value of \$1.5 billion. This option enables the GMLOB to experience near-term successes by capitalizing on the already deployed Grants.gov and leveraging existing service components within Consortia Lead agencies. This option also benefits agencies that do not have fully automated grants management solutions. It will expedite the grants processes and increase access and reach, thereby increasing the grants applications volume. The continued use of the Grants.gov portal presents a single grants face to the public. This increased grantee access to opportunities results in a wider pool of applicants for the programs open to the public. These near-term successes, all in alignment with the GMLOB vision, provide positive momentum at lower risk. In addition to the near-term benefits, the Consortia-Based Approach alternative will: streamline the grants processes; remove stove-piped operations; enable more efficient collection of statistics on government-wide grants activity and metrics by standardizing data elements and reporting, and by reducing the quantity of systems from which the government draws this data; improve the evaluation of program results and decision-making by standardizing the collection and reporting of data used to measure performance resulting in more accurate and comparable evaluations of program results; leverage existing technologies and relationships among agencies; mitigate political and technological challenges. The technology and business processes developed for this alternative can be modified for use in financial operations.

(7) What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Achieving GMLOB's objectives benefits the grant community and grant-making agencies by: streamlining business and technical processes across government and reducing redundant requirements for applicants and agencies; reducing administrative burden on grantees; producing more efficient and effective agency execution of grants through uniform application of advanced electronic grants administration processes; reducing government-wide reporting burden through standardization of electronic forms and forms management; enabling interoperability between systems for the pre-award, award, and post award components of grant administration; developing standardized nomenclature, harmonized processes, and identification of common interface touchpoints to reduce costs and effort associated with maintaining multiple interfaces, and interacting with diverse federal and applicant systems.

(7a) What year will the investment break even? (Specifically, when the budgeted cost savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

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

Federal Quantitative Benefits (\$millions):

Benefit Year	Budgeted Cost	Cost Avoidance	Justification For Budgeted Cost	Justification For Cost Avoidance
--------------	---------------	----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------

	Savings		Savings	
PY	\$7.010	\$34.290		
CY	\$2.740	\$31.100	Increased productivity of partner agencies through less time to create and administer grant awards and fewer reporting requirements. In the Consortia environment, cost is spread across agencies, reducing the burden on any single agency.	Fewer hardware requirements, increased system reliability, less duplication of efforts throughout the grant award process. Partner Agencies would otherwise have to invest in upgrades/enhancements to their systems, or in new systems/software to be able to meet the evolving needs of their users (internal Agency and grantees).
BY	\$2.810	\$36.115	Same as above	Same as above
BY+1	\$3.620	\$39.060	Same as above	Same as above
BY+2	\$3.930	\$24.662	Same as above	Same as above
BY+3	\$2.990	\$24.809	Same as above	Same as above
BY+4 and Beyond	\$0.000	\$12.860	Same as above	Same as above
Total LCC Benefit	\$23.100	\$202.896	LCC =Life Cycle Cost	

(9) Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? yes

(9a) 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?

Migration Investment

(9b) If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investments or Systems

Name of the Legacy Investment or System	UPI if available	Date Of System Retirement
HHS (Indian Health Services Discretionary System): I GEMS		12/31/2006
HHS AoA: Grants Management System		12/31/2006
HHS: GMATS (CMS Discretionary System)		12/31/2006
HHS OPHS: eGrants		01/31/2007
HHS HRSA: Electronic Handbooks **Date is a placeholder ONLY** Retirement TBD by HRSA	009-15-01-06-01-1060-00	12/31/2008
Treasury: Grants Management System at CDFI **Date is a placeholder ONLY**	015-05-04-00-02-1300-24	12/31/2010
ED: Grants Administration Payment System (GAPS)	018-14-01-01-01-1030-00	12/31/2010
EPA: Integrated Grants Management System	020-00-04-00-03-1306-24	10/01/2012
State: ABACUS	014-00-01-05-02-1534-00	12/31/2011
State: GFMIS		12/31/2011

State: Grants Database Management System		12/31/2011
State: Grants Module of Tracker		12/31/2011
State: OASIS		12/31/2011
State: Solicitations and Proposals		12/31/2011
DOC: Economic Development Administration Grants System ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by DOC pending resolution of FFATA compliance issues.	006-06-04-00-01-6001-00	12/31/2010
DOC: National Institute of Standards and Technology Grants Management System ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by DOC pending resolution of FFATA compliance issues.	006-55-04-00-01-7080-00	12/31/2010
DOC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Grants Online ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by DOC pending resolution of FFATA compliance issues.	006-48-04-00-01-3802-00	12/31/2010
NEA: Grants Management System (GMS)		09/30/2009
As Research.gov service offerings mature, NSF will decommission any redundant legacy capability (e.g., FastLane's Proposal Status and Research Performance Progress Reports).	422-00-04-00-01-0028-00	09/30/2011
Other Grants IT Applications, Reviewer System	422-00-04-00-01-0010-00	12/31/2015
USAID e-pics	000-00-01-00-01-0000-00	12/31/2012
USAID: NIMS	184-15-01-01-01-1010-00	10/31/2012
ETA - DOL eGrants	012-05-04-00-01-2495-00	10/01/2014

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.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

(1) Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? yes

(1a) If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

(1b) Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since the last year's submission to OMB? no

(1c) If "yes," describe any significant changes:

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

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

(2a) If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

(2b) If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

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

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

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

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

(1) Are you using EVM to manage this investment? no

(1a) If "yes," does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748? Select...

(1b) If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:

At this time, there are no capital assets or technology developmental efforts underway requiring the use of EVM. However, the GMLOB PMO is currently meeting schedule, cost, and performance goals.

(1c) If "N/A," please provide date operational analysis was conducted and a brief summary of the results?

Question #2 is not applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M

(2) Is the CV or SV greater than plus/minus (+-)10%?

(2) Is the CV or SV greater than plus/minus (+-)10%? no

(2a) If "yes," was it the CV, SV, or both? Select...

(2b) If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

(2c) If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

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

(3) Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year? no

(3a) If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

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

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline										
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Actual % Comp	Agency
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date - Planned	Completion Date - Actual	Total Cost (\$M) Planned	Total Cost (\$M) Actual	Sched Var (# days)	Cost Var (\$M)		
GATES GCoE Expansion- FY 2005	11/30/06	\$0.770	11/30/06	11/30/06	\$0.770	\$0.770	0	\$0.000	100.0	009
GATES Operations and Maintenance Fixed Price- FY 2005	8/18/06	\$3.912	8/18/06	8/18/06	\$3.912	\$3.910	0	-\$0.002	100.0	009
GrantSolution s.gov	8/18/07	\$1.000	8/18/07	8/18/07	\$1.000	\$0.940	0	-\$0.060	94.45	009

Expansion - FY 2006											
Operations and Maintenance - FY 2006	8/18/07	\$3.912	8/18/07	8/18/07	\$3.912	\$3.550	0	-\$0.363	88.27	009	
Mandatory Capabilities	5/30/09	\$0.813	5/30/09		\$0.813	\$0.390	0	\$0.423	47.96	009	
New Partner (NP3) Migration Preparation	12/31/10	\$1.128	12/31/10		\$1.128	\$0.000	0	-\$1.128	0	009	
Funds Control Upgrade	12/31/08	\$0.679	12/31/08		\$0.679	\$0.440	0	-\$0.239	65.1	009	
CMS Migration Preparation	6/30/08	\$0.855	6/30/08		\$0.855	\$0.850	0	-\$0.005	100	009	
AoA Migration Preparation	9/30/08	\$1.001	9/30/08		\$1.001	\$0.890	0	-\$0.111	88.23	009	
FSIS Migration Preparation	12/31/08	\$1.263	12/31/08		\$1.263	\$0.900	0	-\$0.363	71.11	009	
New Partner (NP1) Migration Preparation	2/28/10	\$1.337	2/28/10		\$1.337	\$0.000	0	-\$1.337	0	009	
New Partner (NP2) Migration Preparation	4/14/10	\$1.286	4/14/10		\$1.286	\$0.000	0	-\$1.286	0	009	
PATS Upgrade	8/31/09	\$1.644	8/31/09		\$1.644	\$1.640	0	-\$0.004	100	009	
New Partner (NP4) Migration Preparation										Select...	
Documentation Updates - FY 2007	8/18/08	\$0.561	8/18/08		\$0.561	\$0.540	0	-\$0.021	95.07	009	
Training & Help Desk Support - FY 2007	8/18/08	\$0.561	8/18/08		\$0.561	\$0.540	0	-\$0.021	95.07	009	
Program Management & Operations - FY 2007	8/18/08	\$0.561	8/18/08		\$0.561	\$0.540	0	-\$0.021	95.07	009	
Documentation Updates - FY 2008	8/18/09	\$0.617	8/18/09		\$0.617	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	
Training & Help Desk Support - FY 2008	8/18/09	\$0.617	8/18/09		\$0.617	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	
Program Management & Operations - FY 2008	8/18/09	\$0.617	8/18/09		\$0.617	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	
Documentation Updates - FY 2009	8/18/10	\$0.618	8/18/10		\$0.618	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009	

Training & Help Desk Support - FY 2009	8/18/10	\$0.618	8/18/10		\$0.618	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009
Program Management & Operations - FY 2009	8/18/10	\$0.618	8/18/10		\$0.618	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	009
Documentation Updates - FY2010										Select...
Training and Helpdesk Support -- FY2010										Select...
Program Management & Operations - FY2010										Select...
Documentation Updates -- FY2011										Select...
Training & Helpdesk Support -- FY2011										Select...
Program Management & Operations - FY2011										Select...
GrantSolution s.gov GATES Operations & Maintenance - FY2012										Select...
GrantSolution s.gov GATES Operations & Maintenance - FY2013										Select...
Develop and pilot service offerings	9/30/07	\$7.718	9/30/07	9/17/07	\$7.718	\$7.700	13	-\$0.018	96	422
Deploy service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/08	\$7.227	9/30/08		\$7.227	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	96	422
Operate and maintain service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/08	\$0.675	9/30/08		\$0.675	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	92	422
Deploy service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/09	\$7.409	9/30/09		\$7.409	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
Operate and maintain service offerings in a shared	9/30/09	\$2.591	9/30/09		\$2.591	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422

services environment										
Perform Ongoing DME Activities	9/30/10	\$11.222	9/30/10		\$11.222	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment	9/30/10	\$3.778	9/30/10		\$3.778	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment										Select...
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment										Select...
Perform Ongoing DME Activities										Select...
Perform Ongoing DME Activities										Select...
Perform Ongoing DME Activities										Select...
Operate and Maintain Service Offerings in a Shared Services Environment										Select...
Facilitation support for project scoping	8/30/04	\$0.060	8/30/04	8/30/04	\$0.060	\$0.061	0	\$0.001	100.0	018
Requirements Analysis	11/30/05	\$0.445	11/30/05	11/30/05	\$0.445	\$0.385	0	-\$0.060	100.0	018
Marketing Support	3/23/06	\$0.120	3/23/06	3/23/06	\$0.120	\$0.126	0	\$0.006	100.0	018
FY07 IV&V Support	9/30/07	\$0.500	9/30/07		\$0.500	\$0.495	0	\$0.000	100	018
FY08 IV&V Support	9/30/08	\$0.600	9/30/08		\$0.600	\$0.495	0	\$0.000	100	018
FY09 IV&V Support	9/30/09	\$0.314	9/30/09		\$0.550	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY06 PMO Support	9/30/06	\$0.513	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.513	\$0.271	0	\$0.240	100	018
FY07 PMO Support	9/30/07	\$0.500	9/30/07		\$0.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY08 PMO Support	9/30/08	\$0.500	9/30/08		\$0.500	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY09 PMO Support	9/30/09	\$0.358	9/30/09		\$0.450	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018

Security	9/30/09	\$0.200	9/30/09		\$0.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.1.1) Project Initiation /018 - Dept. of Education	12/30/06	\$0.740	12/30/06	12/14/06	\$0.740	\$0.740	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.1.2) Project Management Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.388	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.388	\$0.375	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.2.1) Overall System Requirements Analysis /018 - Dept. of Education	10/9/06	\$0.690	10/9/06	1/4/07	\$0.690	\$0.650	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.2.2) Overall System Design /018 - Dept. of Education	1/30/07	\$0.184	1/30/07	1/10/07	\$0.184	\$0.139	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.1) Analysis Phase I /018 - Dept. of Education	1/29/07	\$0.116	1/29/07	3/2/07	\$0.116	\$0.142	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.2) Design and Construction Phase1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$1.567	9/30/07	12/17/07	\$1.567	\$2.580	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.3) Conversion Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	7/30/07	\$0.119	7/30/07	9/14/07	\$0.119	\$0.700	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.4) A&I Testing Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.412	9/30/07	12/7/07	\$0.412	\$0.691	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.5) Training Development and Delivery Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.630	9/30/07	11/2/07	\$0.630	\$0.101	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.6) Installation Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	8/30/07	\$0.260	8/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.260	\$0.420	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.7) Transition Planning &Support Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	10/15/07	\$0.138	10/15/07	12/17/07	\$0.138	\$0.700	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.8) Planning Package-Post	10/15/07	\$0.300	10/15/07	1/11/08	\$0.300	\$0.300	0	\$0.000	100	018

Production Support Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education										
(1.1.3.9) Planning Package- Operations and Maintenance - Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	11/2/07	\$0.649	11/2/07		\$0.649	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	100	018
(1.1.3.10) Planning Package - Help Desk - Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	1/30/08	\$0.630	1/30/08	2/29/08	\$63.000	\$0.610	0	\$0.000	100	018
1.1.6.1 Software and Licensing Base Year 1 - Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.398	9/30/07	9/30/07	\$0.398	\$0.398	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.3.1) G5 Operation & Maintenance Phase 1 /018 - Dept. of Education	12/31/09	\$0.444	12/31/09		\$0.444	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.1.1) Project Management Phase 2 /018 - Dept. of Education	12/15/08	\$0.293	12/15/08		\$0.293	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.1) Phase 2 Requirements Analysis (Elaboration) / 018 - Dept. of Education	7/28/08	\$0.620	7/28/08		\$0.620	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.2) Phase 2 Design and Development / 018 - Dept. of Education	9/26/08	\$0.902	9/26/08		\$0.902	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.3) Phase 2 Conversion Development / 018 - Dept. of Education	12/12/08	\$0.188	12/12/08		\$0.188	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.4) Phase 2 System Testing /	10/20/08	\$0.400	10/20/08		\$0.400	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.5) Phase 2 Training Development and Delivery /	12/1/08	\$0.182	12/19/08		\$0.182	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.6)	12/1/08	\$0.261	12/1/08		\$0.261	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018

Phase 2 Technical Architecture /0 18 - Dept. of Education										
1.1.4.7) Phase 2 Pre- Implementation Support /	12/5/08	\$0.371	12/5/08		\$0.371	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.8) Phase 2 End to End Testing /	12/22/08	\$0.216	12/22/08		\$0.216	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.9) Phase 2 Transition Planning and Support /	12/15/08	\$0.167	12/15/08		\$0.167	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.10) Phase 2 Post Production Support /	12/29/08	\$0.420	12/29/08		\$0.420	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.11) Phase 2 Help Desk /	3/9/09	\$0.103	3/9/09		\$0.103	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.4.12) Phase 2 Operations and Maintenance /	12/14/09	\$0.579	12/14/09		\$0.579	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.2.1) Project Management Phase 3 /018 - Dept. of Education	12/15/08	\$0.444	12/15/08		\$0.444	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.3) Phase 3 Conversion Development /	10/2/09	\$0.538	10/2/09		\$0.538	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.2) Phase 3 Design and Development /	9/14/09	\$1.397	9/14/09		\$1.397	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.1) Phase 3 Requirements Analysis /	3/17/09	\$0.495	3/17/09		\$0.495	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.4) Phase 3 System Testing/ 018 - Dept. of Education	10/2/09	\$0.419	10/2/09		\$0.419	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.5) Phase 3 Training Development and Delivery / 018 -Dept. of Education	12/8/09	\$0.182	12/8/09		\$0.182	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.6) Phase 3 Technical Architecture / 018 - Dept. of Education	12/10/09	\$0.474	12/10/09		\$0.474	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018

(1.1.5.7) Phase 3 Pre- Implementatio n Support/ 018 - Dept. of Education	12/4/09	\$0.310	12/4/09		\$0.310	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.8) Phase 3 End to End Testing/ 018 Dept. of Education	12/2/09	\$0.171	12/2/09		\$0.171	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
(1.1.5.9) Phase 3 Transition Planning and Support/ 018 Dept. of Education	12/14/09	\$0.140	12/14/09		\$0.140	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY07 Software/ 018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/07	\$0.200	9/30/07		\$0.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY08 Software/ 018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/08	\$0.200	9/30/08		\$0.200	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY09 Software/ 018 - Dept. of Education	9/30/09	\$0.050	9/30/09		\$0.050	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	018
FY2005 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/05	\$0.898	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$0.798	\$0.223	0	\$0.000	100	422
FY2006 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/06	\$0.780	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.708	\$0.721	0	\$0.000	100	422
FY2007 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/07	\$1.504	9/30/07		\$1.444	\$0.428	0	\$0.000	92	422
FY2008 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/08	\$1.840	9/30/08		\$1.840	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422
FY2009 GMLOB PMO Support	9/30/09	\$1.840	9/30/09		\$1.840	\$0.000	0	\$0.000	0	422