

ENGLink Interactive

Budget year: FY2005
Agency: 202

- [Part I: Summary Information and Justification](#)
 - [Section A: Overview](#)
 - [Section B: Summary of Spending](#)
 - [Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy](#)
 - [Section D: Performance Information](#)
 - [Section E: Security and Privacy](#)
 - [Section F: Enterprise Architecture \(EA\)](#)
- [Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information](#)
 - [Section A: Alternatives Analysis](#)
 - [Section B: Risk Management](#)
 - [Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance](#)

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary Part I: Summary Information And Justification

Section A: Overview

1. Date of submission: **Sep 8, 2008**
2. Agency: **202**
3. Bureau: **00**
4. Name of this Capital Asset: **ENGLink Interactive**
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: **202-00-01-02-01-1020-00**
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2010? **Mixed Life Cycle**
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: **ENGLink Interactive began as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Emergency Management system and is rapidly becoming the premier USACE command and control system. When a natural or man-made disaster strikes the United States, the USACE is tasked to provide immediate comprehensive relief to the thousands impacted by the disaster. ENGLink has transformed the way USACE responds to emergencies by providing the framework for processing information and performing command and control of USACE elements. ENGLink represents "ground truth" reporting and allows deployed personnel real-time access to critical information. The system represents a single data entry point that standardizes and integrates methods of collecting, analyzing, forecasting and presenting information for decision makers. ENGLink Interactive continues to revolutionize the way the Corp handles its contingency planning and response. ENGLink's key functionality includes the deployment module and its reporting capabilities. The deployment module tracks personnel and mission requirements from the beginning to the end of a response. Interactive Taskers allow users to request staff and materials from other USACE organizations. Once personnel are deployed in ENGLink, they are tracked from the beginning to the end of their deployment, resulting in increased management and accountability of personnel. ENGLink's reports, viewable by all command elements, allow access to just-in-time, critical information. The Deployment Module reports provide answers to staffing needs, logistical concerns and the management of personnel. ENGLink was first**

developed to fulfill the role of a deployment tracking and personnel management software. It has grown well past those boundaries and now encompasses many new and varied USACE job responsibilities, from handling volunteers, performing communication checks, to processing threats and suspicious incidents. With this expansion has come a need for a redesign and technical refresh of the ENGLink application. ENGLink has become a tool of immense capability, but little consistency. The redesign will be implemented using modern web technologies. Key areas of improvements that are vital to the system's redesign include: increased automation and integration; improved user interface; increased reporting capabilities; and increased information sharing.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? **yes**
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? **Feb 22, 2008**
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? **yes**
11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
- | | |
|--------------|-------------------|
| Name | [Redacted] |
| Phone Number | [Redacted] |
| E-mail | [Redacted] |
- a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager? **New Program Manager**
- b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned? **Jun 22, 2008**
- c. 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? **Mar 31, 2009**
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. **yes**
- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? **no**
- b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) **[Not answered]**
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? **[Not answered]**
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? **[Not answered]**
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? **[Not answered]**
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? **yes**
- Expanded E-Government**
- a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? **ENGLink provides a single point of entry/dissemination for Command and Control decisions. It has automated the process of deploying personnel and equipment to disaster sites; and it has enabled an unprecedented degree of collaboration, ensuring that bureaucratic hurdles and breakdowns in communications associated with manual and paper processes no longer delay the provision of necessary emergency response services and the delivery of goods to those struck by disasters.**
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.) **yes**
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review? **no**
- b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? **10000004 - Corps of Engineers: Emergency Management**
- c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive? **Moderately Effective**
15. Is this investment for information technology? **yes**

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **Level 2**
17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) **(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment**
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4-FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)? **yes**
19. Is this a financial management system? **no**
- a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area? **[Not answered]**
1. If "yes," which compliance area: **[Not answered]**
2. If "no," what does it address? **[Not answered]**
- 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 **[Not answered]**
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following?
- Hardware **1**
- Software **1**
- Services **98**
- Other **[Not answered]**
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? **n/a**
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:
- Name **[Redacted]**
- Phone Number **[Redacted]**
- Title **Privacy Act Officer**
- E-mail **[Redacted]**
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? **no**
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? **yes**

Section B: Summary of Spending

1.

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 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0.368	0.608	0.758	0.775	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]
Acquisition:	0.496	1.263	1.266	1.298	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0.864	1.871	2.024	2.073	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]
Operations & Maintenance:	3.534	0.929	0.788	0.695	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]
TOTAL:	4.398	2.8	2.812	2.768	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]

Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	1.19	0.535	0.54	0.52	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	5	2	2	2	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]	[*]

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? **no**
 - a. If "yes", How many and in what year? [Not answered]
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes: **No change.**

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy

1.

Contracts/Task Orders Table:	
Contract or Task Order Number	GS-35F-0306J (Option 2)
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Firm Fixed Price
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Sep 30, 2005
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Oct 1, 2006
End date of Contract/Task Order	Sep 30, 2007
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	1.398
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	no
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	[Redacted]
CO Contact information (phone/email)	[Redacted]
Contracting Officer 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?	[Not answered]
Contract or Task Order Number	SPO700-98-D-4002
Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Cost Plus Fixed Fee
Has the contract been awarded	yes
If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Feb 15, 2007
Start date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 30, 2007
End date of Contract/Task Order	Mar 29, 2010
Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (\$M)	8.212
Is this an Interagency Acquisition?	no
Is it performance based?	yes
Competitively awarded?	no
What, if any, alternative financing option is being used?	NA
Is EVM in the contract?	yes
Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses?	yes
Name of CO	[Redacted]

CO Contact information (phone/email)	[Redacted]
Contracting Officer 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?	[Not answered]

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: **N/A**
3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? **yes**
 - a. Explain why not or how this is being done? **USACE does not allow information systems, web developed applications or products to be deployed unless they are made fully accessible to individuals with disabilities; language is included in all contracts for information systems and web products to ensure they are made accessible; ENGLink is a fully web based system that allows users to set browser preferences; its accessibility has been proven by daily use and feedback by a legally blind USACE employee.**
4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date? **Jul 20, 2007**
 1. Is it Current? **yes**
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed? [Not answered]
 1. If "no," briefly explain why: [Not answered]

Section D: Performance Information

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal (s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Emergency Response Extent to which RRVs are able to respond to an event to become operational	RRVs respond to an event within 18 hours	Maintain response time within 18 hours	All RRVs responded to an event within 18 hours; on average, the response time was 4.6 hours
2007	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of visitors logging on to the system	36,000 users within 60 organizations	Increase the number of visitors by 50 logins from each organization, or 3000 logins	In FY07, 100,000 visitors logged on to the system
2007	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.1: Attain and maintain a high, consistent state of preparedness	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Number of individuals trained for the ENGLINK Strike Team	0	Maintain 3 teams of 8 (total of 24), with 10 alternates	In FY07, 28 primary and 13 alternate ENGLink Strike Team employees were fully trained
	Strategic Goal 5,						

2007	Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Availability	Number of systems implemented	0	Install CNSS at downlink (Constituting 16 systems)	Two T-1 lines (Napa to WPC & Napa to CPC) were installed
2008	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response:	Percentage of tasker requests" filled by suspense date Historically, only 40% of taskers were filled within the requested amount of time	44% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	56% of tasker requests were filled prior to the suspense date during FY08
2008	Strategic objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of unique log-ins	In the past year, the number of unique logins was 2,105	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,210 users	2,290 unique logins during FY08
2008	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	In the current environment, it takes approx. 40 hours to build a customized report	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 32 TBD	Based upon the report requests we have had in the previous FY, we are rolling out new reports within 28 hours
2008	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The current system has 11 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data to 12 GB	Very large system growth from 11 GB in FY07 to a current size of 23.5 GB; this includes FY08 and up to September 1, 2008
2009	2009 Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response Percentage of "tasker requests" filled by suspense date	44% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	49% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
	2009 Strategic Goal 5, Objective						

2009	5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,210 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,320 users	TBD
2009	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 32 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 24	TBD
2009	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 23.5 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data by 20%	TBD
2010	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response Percentage of tasker requests filled by suspense date	49% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	55% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2010	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,320 users	Increase the number of unique logins by 5% or 2,436 users	TBD
2010	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 24 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 16	TBD
	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2:			Increase the amount of			

2010	Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 28.2 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data by 20%	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response Percentage of tasker requests filled by suspense date	55% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	61% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,436 users	Increase the number of logins by 5% or 2,558 users	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 16 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 14	TBD
2011	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 33.8 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data by 20%	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response Percentage of tasker requests filled by suspense date	61% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	68% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,558 users	Increase the number of logins by 5% or 2,686 users	TBD

	accessible information						
2012	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 14 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 12	TBD
2012	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 40.6 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data by 20%	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response Percentage of tasker requests filled by suspense date	68% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	75% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The system has 2,686 users	Increase the number of logins by 5% or 2,820 users	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 12 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 10	TBD
2013	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the	The system has 48.7 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data by 20%	TBD

	information			system			
2014	Strategic Goal 4, Objective 4.1.2: Provide rapid, effective, efficient all-hazards response	Mission and Business Results	Emergency Response	Improve response time to fill positions during an emergency response Percentage of tasker requests filled by suspense date	75% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	82% of tasker requests are filled by suspense date	TBD
2014	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Increase the number of users of the system: Number of unique log-ins	The systems has 2,820 users	Increase the number of logins by 5% or 2,961 users	TBD
2014	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.1: Ensure that the Civil Works mission is supported by an information architecture and capital investments in technology aimed at increasing work efficiencies and effectiveness	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Decrease the number of hours required to build a customized reports: Number of hours personnel spend building a report	Customized reports require 10 hours of personnel time	Decrease the number of hours to build a report to 8	TBD
2014	Strategic Goal 5, Objective 5.3.2: Develop and use electronic means and media to provide timely and easily accessible information	Technology	Data Storage	Increase the amount of information and reports available to users: The number of gigabytes of data stored within the system	The system has 58.4 GB of data	Increase the amount of stored data by 20%	TBD

Section E: Security and Privacy

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?: **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: **6.1**
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**

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned certification and accreditation (C&A) update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)
<i>There are no Systems in Planning.</i>			

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
ENGLink Interactive	Contractor and Government	Moderate	no	Dec 14, 2006	Other	Jan 7, 2008	Jan 7, 2008

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? **no**
 - a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? **[Not answered]**

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? **no**
 - a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness. **[Not answered]**

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above? **All individual contractor personnel making changes to ENGLink, installing upgrades and performing other programming activities that affect the system s configuration, sign security agreements prior to beginning work and almost all contractor staff assigned to the maintenance, upgrade and configuration development/management of ENGLink have Secret security clearances. The ENGLink servers are located in government-owned sites with permanent government staff collocated on site for monitoring and oversight. 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. ENGLink resides on the central USACE servers, which are managed by the ACE-IT Program, identified above. ACE-IT provides centralized IT support (for the Corps-wide Network and Processing Centers), which is government owned and contractor operated. The servers are maintained by contractors in government-owned space. Government USACE personnel are permanently co-located on site with these contractors and monitor, verify, and validate contractor security procedures. Additionally, GAO, the Army Audit Agency, and the Inspector General audit the Corps IT security annually. Internal security scans and on-site inspections/audits are performed annually on every Corps site to validate that the correct patches and security procedures are in compliance with government-wide and Army/DoD policy. The Corps Headquarters Acquisition Office provides local sites assistance with their contract language for generic and specific security requirements. USACE policy requires a review of all IT contract and acquisitions to ensure that background investigation requirements are appropriate for all contractors. In addition, ENGLink conducts Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Defense Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation (DIACAP) reviews annually to ensure compliance with federal and DoD security guidance.**

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Internet Link or Explanation	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Internet Link or Explanation
ENGLink			Army policy directs the Corps to submit PIAs to Army for posting to the DOD PIA website. They		ENGLink has not published a SORN to date; however it is a

Interactive	no	yes	are not to be posted for public review due to the fact that they contain FOUO information	no	planned item within the ENLink Capital Assets Plan for the EPRP
-------------	----	-----	---	----	---

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA)

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **yes**
 - a. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **ENLink Interactive**
 - b. If "no," please explain why? [Not answered]

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to <http://www.egov.gov>. **115-000**

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table :

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	Service Component Reused		Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
				Component Name	UPI		
Information Sharing	ENLink is a web-based application that allows simultaneous access to its table structures based on the predefined roles and responsibilities of the user	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	15
Knowledge Capture	ENLink is a web-based application that allows the collection of data through thin and thick client tools. ENLink's data collection directly follows USACE business rules and practices.	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	15
ENLink Auto-Notification	ENLink sends automatic email notifications when an action is requested of a user and/or when USACE employees are to be notified of actions performed within the ENLink system	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	10
Dynamic Reporting	Based on requirements, ENLink creates ad hoc reporting on predefined modules. Users can create dynamic reports and save for future use.	Reporting	Ad Hoc	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
Deployed	ENLink has an extensive reporting capability. Over 40 reports have been						

Reports, Organization Reports, Medical Reports	created to support deployment tracking. Command and control reports allow Headquarters to view the situation from a high level.	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
CEFMS Integration	ENGLink pulls financial information from CEFMS to support mission, facilities, and funding tracking.	Data Management	Data Exchange	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
GeoTools, Oracle Spatial	ENGLink has an extensive GIS module. The GIS module allows for customized mapping and user-defined queries and mapping of threats and suspicious incidents.	Visualization	Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	10
Access Control	ENGLink has user management to manage user accounts	Security Management	Access Control	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	3
Encryption	Enables secure transmission and storage of encrypted sensitive and/or private information.	Security Management	Cryptography	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	3
Instrumentation and Testing	Support the validation of application or system capabilities and requirements	Development and Integration	Instrumentation and Testing	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
Configuration Management	ENGLink utilizes the applications for managing source code, documentation, and change requests.	Management of Processes	Configuration Management	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	15
Reporting	ENGLink audits, creates, updates, finalizations and releases for all reports.	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5
Process Tracking	The ENGLink Feedback system tracks all requests for modifications, error tracking and enhancements. The system has the ability to assign personnel, track estimates, actuals and status. The ENGLink Feedback System tracks issues through the entire software development lifecycle.	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	No Reuse	5

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification
Information Sharing	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
	Service Access and			

Information Sharing	Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	HTTP
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	Oracle 10g RDBMS
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	Sun Javamail for JDK 1.4; Sun sendmail for Solaris 5.10
Ad Hoc	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+; Microsoft Excel 2003
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	Oracle 10g RDBMS
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle 10g Spatial
Mapping / Geospatial / Elevation / GPS	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+
Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	Apache SSL 128-bit; Oracle Transparent Data Encryption
Instrumentation and Testing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Feedback Issue Tracking system (Interactive Test Suite); Microsoft Word 2000+
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Subversion 1v..44 ; Merant PVCS; Microsoft Visual Source Safe v.6.0; JIRA Issue Tracking v.3.6
Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	Microsoft Internet Explorer v.5.0+;
Process Tracking	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	JIRA Issue Tracking v.3.6

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.Gov, Pay.Gov, etc)? **no**
- a. If "yes," please describe. **[Not answered]**

Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? **yes**
- a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? **Jul 2, 2007**
- b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? **[Not answered]**
- c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: **[Not answered]**

2. Alternatives Analysis Results:			
Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Alternative 1: Baseline	In the Status Quo environment, ENGLink will be maintained as it exists today without doing any Development, Modernization, and Enhancement (DME) work. No major modifications will be made to the system, while yearly maintenance and operations will continue. This is a low-cost solution, but it fails to meet USACE requirements and many user needs. It also fails to add quality/productivity enhancements.	8546483	0
Alternative 2: ENGLink Redesign Java Enterprise (J2EE)	This option uses the popular J2EE development platform. The J2EE solution would emphasize the use of best practices in web application development. J2EE applications work on both Unix and Windows-based server architectures, requiring no change to existing hardware/software licensing. The redesign would allow the USACE to employ volunteers more rapidly. Advantages include low upgrade cost, large and experienced workforce, best ROI, and low risk due to technical maturity of platform.	10706729	20073474
Alternative 3: ENGLink Redesign Microsoft.net	The Microsoft.net solution consists of the usage of a variety of programming languages and tools. This solution requires Microsoft-based server architecture and upfront costs towards software licensing. USACE IT architecture is based upon the Unix operating system. Advantages include short development time and integration with Microsoft SharePoint portal technology. Disadvantages include higher cost, shortage of knowledgeable IT staff, and risks involved in architectural requirements.	11406969	20073474
Alternative 4: ENGLink Redesign Oracle Application Express	This option would slightly enhance, upgrade and improve the existing solution for ENGLink to meet future business requirements. Oracle Application Express is a low-cost solution that enables quick-project turnaround, but suffers when application complexity grows. This solution provides less flexibility in the application's user interface and overall design. It does not meet ENGLink's need for strict focus on business requirements and long-term viability.	9854025	4572501

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen? **Alternative 2: ENGLink Redesign using Java Enterprise (J2EE) as the development platform is the selected alternative. The alternatives analysis table above presents the costs and benefits of each alternative based on a 5-year life cycle (FY2009–FY2013). A redesign of the ENGLink system will result in productivity and efficiency gains. With the enhancements, the process for identifying individuals to be deployed during an emergency response will be automated. This will result in a reduction in the amount of time the Corp's personnel spend manually filling a tasker request. In addition, tasker requests will be addressed in a faster turnaround time, which will prevent delays in deploying resources. ENGLink's ground truth reporting mechanism will be revitalized by adhering to an entirely dynamic and abstract approach. Functionality will be added to provide users with a variety of options for creating reports and extrapolating data. Various filters will be provided to allow an ENGLink user to dynamically change the scope of report data to fit their criteria. The enhancements will be developed using a flexible architecture, wherein logical and functional changes can be further implemented with little to no changes of source code. These features will significantly reduce the time personnel spend building customized reports for users. The Corps evaluated three options for implementing the ENGLink Redesign initiative. The current system is Oracle-based and the planned enhancements could be completed using this architecture. Upon further analysis, it was determined that this option would not significantly improve current business processes. The Corps also considered developing the enhanced system on a Microsoft.net architecture. The main drawback to this approach is the Corp's IT architecture is based upon the Unix operating system. Moving to a Microsoft environment would not only increase costs, but also risks too. It would be more difficult to integrate ENGLink with other systems and there may be a lack of knowledgeable IT support staff. Both Alternatives 2 and 3 result in the same quantitative and qualitative benefits; however, once costs and risks are considered, Alternative 2 is more desirable.**

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceeded

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized? **The ENLink redesign will provide the following qualitative benefits to the public, the Corps and its users: Faster Response in Emergency Situations: The redesign initiative is centered around improving the Corps preparedness for an emergency situation. The redesign will streamline and automate the process for identifying candidates for deployment when an emergency arises. It will enable the ENLink system to recommend individuals that have the required qualifications and are available for deployment. This will eliminate the process of manually verifying an individual is approved for deployment and will enable the Corps to respond faster during an emergency. Dynamic Reporting: ENLink’s reports allow access to just-in-time, critical information. The Deployment Module reports provide answers to staffing needs, logistical concern and the management of personnel. Another reporting feature is the Incident Reporting System, which is used for collecting and analyzing intelligence data. Previously, users only had access to canned reports, but with the redesign, users will have the ability to create their own reports through selecting criteria and report columns. Reports may then be exported to Excel for custom analysis. User Interface: Users will see an improved and standardized user interface and specialized options depending on their role(s) within the Corps. Communities of Practice: A centralized and collaborative environment will be created to allow users a mean for communicating and learning from other’s best practices.**

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits (\$millions):				
	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY-1 and Prior	0	0	N/A in FY06	N/A in FY06
PY	0	0	N/A in FY07	N/A in FY07
CY	0	0	N/A in FY08	N/A in FY08
BY	0	0	N/A in FY09	N/A in FY09
BY+1	0	0	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2010 are estimated to be at ~\$4.6m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2010 are estimated to be at ~\$4.6m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.
BY+2	0	0	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2011 are estimated to be at ~\$4.5m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2011 are estimated to be at ~\$4.5m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.
BY+3	0	0	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2012 are estimated to be at ~\$4.4m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2012 are estimated to be at ~\$4.4m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.
			Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2013 are estimated to be at	Overall benefits for the preferred alternative in 2013 are estimated to be at

BY+4 and Beyond	0	0	~\$4.3m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.	~\$4.3m based on productivity improvements (Reduction in Time) such as manually filling in tasker requests; lapse from tasker requests; and building customized reports. Additional analysis is required to determine specific cost savings and cost avoidance data required for justification purposes.
Total LCC Benefit	0	0	LCC = Life-cycle cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole? **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? **[Not answered]**
- b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

List of Legacy Investment or Systems		
Name of the Legacy Investment or Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
<i>There are no Legacy Investment or Systems.</i>		

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? **yes**
 - a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan? **Sep 8, 2006**
 - b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? **no**
 - c. If "yes," describe any significant changes: **[Not answered]**
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed? **[Not answered]**
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date? **[Not answered]**
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? **[Not answered]**
3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: **In conducting the alternatives analysis, risks were identified for each of the alternatives. The risks were quantitatively evaluated for probability and cost impact. To estimate the cost impact, each risk is mapped to the cost elements it is likely to affect. The cost estimates are then adjusted to account for the risk. The investment's life cycle costs were estimated based on technical expertise and prior experience with developing and managing both the existing system and similar systems. The life cycle cost estimates reflect appropriate growth and economic escalation factors to project realistic life cycle costs in future years.**

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

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? **yes**
2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100) **no**
 - a. If "yes," was it the? **[Not answered]**
 - b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance: **[Not answered]**

c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions [Not answered]

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

a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head? [Not answered]

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date Planned:Actual	Total Cost (\$M) Planned:Actual	Schedule:Cost (# days:\$M)				
FY05	Sep 30, 2005	1.457	Sep 30, 2005	Sep 30, 2005	1.457	1.416	0	0.041	100
FY06 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2006	0.931	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.931	0.931	0	0	100
FY06 ODCs and Travel	Sep 30, 2006	0.065	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.065	0.046	0	0.019	100
4. FY06 Help Desk Support	Sep 30, 2006	0.092	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.092	0.092	0	0	100
FY06 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2006	0.066	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.066	0.065	0	0.001	100
FY06 Training	Sep 30, 2006	0.096	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.096	0.094	0	0.002	100
FY06 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2006	0.042	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.042	0.041	0	0.001	100
FY06 Hardware / Software	Sep 30, 2006	0.046	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	0.046	0.046	0	0	100
FY07 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2007	0.98	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.98	0.98	0	0	100
FY07 ODCs and Travel	Sep 30, 2007	0.066	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.066	0.042	0	0.024	100
FY07 Help Desk Support	Sep 30, 2007	0.1	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.1	0.1	0	0	100
FY07 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2007	0.07	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.07	0.07	0	0	100
FY07 Training	Sep 30, 2007	0.1	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.1	0.1	0	0	100
FY07 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2007	0.08	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.08	0.08	0	0	100
FY07 Hardware / Software	Sep 30, 2007	0.03	Sep 30, 2007	Sep 30, 2007	0.03	0.03	0	0	100
FY08 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2008	0.608	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.608	0.081	0	0.527	100

FY08 ENLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2008	1.218	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	1.218	0.121	0	1.097	83
FY08 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2008	0.08	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.08	0.07	0	0.01	87.5
FY08 Training	Sep 30, 2008	0.105	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.105	0.95	0	0.1	90.4
FY08 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2008	0.06	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.06	0.55	0	0.005	91.6
FY08 Security	Sep 30, 2008	0.14	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.14	0.14	0	0	100
FY08 Hardware/Software	Sep 30, 2008	0.05	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.05	0.05	0	0	100
FY08 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2008	0.5	Sep 30, 2008	Sep 30, 2008	0.5	0.91	0	-0.41	0
FY09 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2009	0.758	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.758	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 ENLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2009	1.236	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	1.236	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2009	0.138	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.138	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 Training	Sep 30, 2009	0.11	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.11	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2009	0.06	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.06	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 Security	Sep 30, 2009	0.145	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.145	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 Hardware/Software	Sep 30, 2009	0.035	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.035	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY09 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2009	0.3	Sep 30, 2009	[Not answered]	0.3	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	[Not answered]	0
FY10 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2010	0.775	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.775	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY10 ENLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2010	1.283	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	1.283	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY10 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2010	0.153	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.153	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY10 Training	Sep 30, 2010	0.118	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.118	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY10 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2010	0.061	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.061	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY10 Security	Sep 30, 2010	0.153	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.153	0	[Not answered]	0	0

FY10 Hardware/ Software	Sep 30, 2010	0.296	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.296	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY10 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2010	0.205	Sep 30, 2010	[Not answered]	0.205	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 ENLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 Training	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 Security	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 Hardware/ Software	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY11 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2011	0	Sep 30, 2011	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 ENLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 Training	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 Security	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 Hardware/ Software	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY12 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2012	0	Sep 30, 2012	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 ENLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0

FY13 Training	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 Security	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 Hardware/ Software	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY13 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2013	0	Sep 30, 2013	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 Integrating IA Requirements & Architecture	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 ENGLink Redesign	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 Web Page Management	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 Training	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 Capital Planning Support	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 Security	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 Hardware/ Software	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0
FY14 O&M Support	Sep 30, 2014	0	Sep 30, 2014	[Not answered]	0	0	[Not answered]	0	0