Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2009-06-30
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-06-29
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-02-29

Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-30

Agency: 393 - National Archives and Records Administration Bureau: 00 - Agency-Wide Activity

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: Holdings Management System (HMS)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (UII): 393-000000038

Section B: Investment Detail

 Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.

NARA has recognized the need to improve its business processes to manage and track the physical aspects of permanent, hard-copy, archival records in its custody. HMS enables NARA to more effectively meet strategic goal two (We will preserve and process records to ensure access by the public as soon as legally possible) by enabling staff to more accurately locate Federal records holdings across all facilities, efficiently identify available and suitable space for storing archival holdings, reliably track the chain of custody of NARA archival holdings over time (responsibility and accountability), effectively document preservation needs and track actions done to NARA archival holdings over time, as well as reduce labor burden for tracking and reporting requirements. Before HMS was available, NARA had only partially automated and standardized business processes to manage hard-copy archival records. It did not use a common, integrated technology application to perform its tasks. Individual NARA units had to develop unique procedures and applications to carry out their work. As a result, the organization used multiple applications, paper-logs, and forms to manage hard-copy archival records. HMS integrates the many stand-alone automated and manual systems currently used throughout NARA for the management of hard-copy archival records into one system.

2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.

HMS has improved NARA efficiencies in the storage, circulation, and risk assessment of records, while focusing preservation actions on those records with greatest need. HMS is developed as an automated system to perform space management, integrated inventory control, circulation management and to capture preservation risk/assessment data and to record preservation actions conducted on archival records. The old Master Location Registers used throughout NARA do not provide the research rooms with automated assignment of pull slip and re-file tasks, grouping these assignments by location, the automated signature of pull slips and tracking of items that are out of circulation and cannot be retrieved. There was no centralized system to collect risk assessment data. Additionally there was no method of tracking a records preservation history, or the status of records currently undergoing preservation. The lack of a centralized system caused preservation assessment criteria to be applied differently throughout NARA. The manual nature of the old inventory, circulation and preservation management processes along with limited and inconsistent data did not provide the information NARA managers need to optimize their processes, as well as ensure the security of the holdings. The old environment with its standalone applications, logs and forms did not provide NARA with the tools to accurately forecast and track work load for preservation and circulation. HMS will enable its research room users to have legible pull slips that promote efficient retrieval of requested items. It will also free these technicians from manually selecting record pull and re-file jobs in the same stack location. Additionally HMS users are able to track the progress of processing projects, preservation / conservation activities, and reformatting. HMS provides users with critical information for use in yearly planning, and the development of risk lists. HMS will also benefit Researchers by providing quicker and more efficient retrieval of requested records. Many NARA stakeholders will benefit from HMS's ability to identify records in need of preservation. By combining the functionality of the many location registers SPACEMAN, and other systems used across NARA HMS will reduce the number of interfaces needed to perform circulation, preservation, space and location management, while providing a single source for reporting on the physical aspects of NARA's non electronic holdings.

3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.

During the PY, there have been deployments of HMS to Philadelphia, Boston, Riverside, Fort Worth, New York, Atlanta, and Kansas City. These deployments required mapping and migrating the data from the existing location registers and at risk databases, and providing end user training. More than 1.5 million barcode labels for the Archives I and II locations were printed and affixed, and the capability for facilities to print their own asset and shelf barcode labels was deployed. Functionality to support the Center for Legislative Archives loan processes was developed and deployed. Stack surveys at Archives II were completed to correct data inconsistencies in asset locations. Additional functionality to support offsite reference requests is currently being developed. The operations and maintenance of the production system was successfully managed with a 99% availability. Implemented over 50 change requests approved by the Configuration Control Board.

4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

In the CY and BY the HMS team is planning to complete the roll out of the system to the Chicago, Denver, Seattle, San Bruno, and Anchorage Regional Archives. Functionality to support the automation of the researcher reference request process will be developed and deployed. This will involve integration with other systems including Online Public Access and the Researcher Registration System. Also during this period the team will be developing and deploying the hand held barcode reader functionality. This will include the capability to scan asset and shelf tags for setting locations, as well as capturing various pieces of information related to transactions. These devices will also be capable of supporting loan processes and capturing digital signatures. Additionally the interface with the new OPA description tool will be developed. Finally the team will continue to implement change requests approved by the Configuration Control Board (CCB).

5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.

2009-04-01

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

| Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | PY-1 | PY | CY | ВУ | | | | | | |
| | & Prior | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | | | | | | |
| | Prior | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning Costs: | \$3.7 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | | | | | | |
| DME (Excluding Planning) Costs: | \$5.3 | \$1.6 | \$1.8 | \$1.4 | | | | | | |
| DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs: | \$0.4 | \$0.1 | \$0.1 | \$0.1 | | | | | | |
| Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE): | \$9.4 | \$1.7 | \$1.9 | \$1.5 | | | | | | |
| O & M Costs: | \$1.0 | \$0.6 | \$0.8 | \$0.8 | | | | | | |
| O & M Govt. FTEs: | \$0.2 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | | | | | | |
| Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE): | \$1.2 | \$0.6 | \$0.8 | \$0.8 | | | | | | |
| Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE): | \$10.6 | \$2.3 | \$2.7 | \$2.3 | | | | | | |
| Total Govt. FTE costs: | \$0.6 | \$0.1 | \$0.1 | \$0.1 | | | | | | |
| # of FTE rep by costs: | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$) | | \$-0.1 | \$0.1 | | | | | | | |
| Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%) | | -4.80% | 3.00% | | | | | | | |

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

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

| | Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------|--------|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Contract Type | EVM Required | Agency ID | Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID) | Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID | IDV Agency ID | Solicitation ID | Ultimate Contract Value (\$M) | Туре | PBSA ? | Effective Date | Actual or Expected End Date |
| Awarded | 8800 | NAMA-07-F-01 11 | GS-35F-0051K | 4730 | | | | | | | |
| Awarded | 8800 | NAMA-08-F-00 88 | GS-25F-0061P | 4730 | | | | | | | |

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:

Page 6 / 12 of Section300 Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-30 Exhibit 300 (2011)

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-06-29

Section B: Project Execution Data

| | | Table II.B. | 1 Projects | | |
|------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Project ID | Project Name | Project Description | Project Start Date | Project Completion Date | Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M) |
| 1 | Deployment to Regional Archives #8 | Analysis of systems and processes used at the Regional Archives facility and perform any system configurations necessary to accommodate unique data requirements. Analyze existing location registers and at risk databases for the facility. Map elements to HMS, perform test migrations and validate with site. Assist site with data alignment to HMS and perform additional test migrations as needed. Perform acceptance testing with facility, conduct end user training and perform final data migration and deploy system. | | | |
| 2 | Deployment to Regional Archives #9 | Analysis of systems and processes used at the Regional Archives facility and perform any system configurations necessary to accommodate unique data requirements. Analyze existing location registers and at risk databases for the facility. Map elements to HMS, perform test | | | |

| Table II.B.1 Projects | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Project ID | Project Name | Project Description | Project Start Date | Project Completion Date | Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M) | | | | |
| | | migrations and validate with site. Assist site with data alignment to HMS and perform additional test migrations as needed. Perform acceptance testing with facility, conduct end user training and perform final data migration and deploy system. | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Deployment to Regional Archives #10 | Analysis of systems and processes used at the Regional Archives facility and perform any system configurations necessary to accommodate unique data requirements. Analyze existing location registers and at risk databases for the facility. Map elements to HMS, perform test migrations and validate with site. Assist site with data alignment to HMS and perform additional test migrations as needed. Perform acceptance testing with facility, conduct end user training and perform final data migration and deploy system. | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Deployment to Regional Archives #11 | Analysis of systems and processes used at the Regional Archives facility and perform any system configurations necessary to accommodate unique data requirements. Analyze existing location registers and at risk databases for the facility. Map elements to HMS, perform test migrations and validate with site. Assist site with data alignment to HMS and perform additional test migrations as needed. Perform acceptance testing with facility, conduct end user training and perform final data migration and deploy system. | | | | | | | |

| | | Table II.B. | 1 Projects | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Project ID | Project Name | Project Description | Project Start Date | Project Completion Date | Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M) |
| 5 | Deployment to Regional Archives #12 | Analysis of systems and processes used at the Regional Archives facility and perform any system configurations necessary to accommodate unique data requirements. Analyze existing location registers and at risk databases for the facility. Map elements to HMS, perform test migrations and validate with site. Assist site with data alignment to HMS and perform additional test migrations as needed. Perform acceptance testing with facility, conduct end user training and perform final data migration and deploy system. | | | |

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

| Project ID | Name | Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M) | End Point Schedule Variance (in days) | End Point Schedule Variance (%) | Cost Variance (\$M) | Cost Variance (%) | Total Planned Cost (\$M) | Count of Activities | |
|------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 1 | Deployment to Regional Archives #8 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Deployment to Regional Archives #9 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Deployment to Regional Archives #10 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Deployment to Regional Archives #11 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Deployment to Regional Archives #12 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | Key Deliverables | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Project Name | Activity Name | Description | Planned Completion Date | Projected Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Duration (in days) | Schedule Variance (in days) | Schedule Variance (%) | | | |
| | Key Deliverables | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Name | Activity Name | Description | Planned Completion Date | Projected Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Duration (in days) | Schedule Variance (in days) | Schedule Variance (%) | | | |
| 1 | Regional Deployment A phase I | Data analysis and configuration for Regional archives #8 | 2011-10-28 | 2011-10-28 | 2011-10-28 | 25 | 0 | 0.00% | | | |
| 1 | Regional Deployment A phase II | Analyze, map and test migrate Regional Archives #8 MLR data. | 2011-12-02 | 2011-12-02 | 2011-12-09 | 32 | -7 | -21.88% | | | |
| 1 | Regional Deployment A phase III | Training, deployment and acceptance testing Regional Archives #8 | 2011-12-09 | 2011-12-09 | 2011-12-14 | 4 | -5 | -125.00% | | | |
| 2 | Regional Deployment A phase I | Data analysis and configuration for Regional archives #9. | 2012-01-06 | 2012-01-06 | 2012-01-13 | 25 | -7 | -28.00% | | | |
| 2 | Regional Deployment A phase II | Analyze, map and test migrate Regional Archives #9 MLR data. | 2012-02-10 | 2012-02-10 | 2012-02-13 | 32 | -3 | -9.38% | | | |
| 2 | Regional Deployment A phase III | Training, deployment and acceptance testing Regional Archives #9. | 2012-02-17 | 2012-02-17 | 2012-02-17 | 4 | 0 | 0.00% | | | |
| 3 | Regional Deployment A phase I | Data analysis and configuration for Regional archives #10. | 2012-03-16 | 2012-03-16 | 2012-03-16 | 25 | 0 | 0.00% | | | |
| 3 | Regional Deployment A Phase II | Analyze, map and test migrate Regional Archives #10 MLR data. | 2012-04-20 | 2012-04-20 | 2012-04-26 | 32 | -6 | -18.75% | | | |
| 3 | Regional Deployment A Phase III | Training, deployment and acceptance testing Regional Archives #10. | 2012-04-27 | 2012-04-27 | 2012-05-03 | 4 | -6 | -150.00% | | | |
| 4 | Regional Deployment | Data analysis and | 2012-05-25 | 2012-05-25 | 2012-05-25 | 25 | 0 | 0.00% | | | |

| | Key Deliverables | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Project Name | Activity Name | Description | Planned Completion Date | Projected Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Duration (in days) | Schedule Variance (in days) | Schedule Variance (%) | | | |
| | A phase I | configuration for Regional archives #11. | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Regional Deployment A Phase II | Analyze, map and test migrate Regional Archives #11 MLR data. | 2012-06-29 | 2012-06-29 | | 32 | -63 | -196.88% | | | |

Section C: Operational Data

| | Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|--|--|
| Metric Description | Unit of Measure | FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping | Measurement Condition | Baseline | Target for PY | Actual for PY | Target for CY | Reporting Frequency | | |
| Cubic feet records processed. | Cubic feet | Customer Results - Customer Benefit | Over target | 20287.000000 | 20287.000000 | 24313.000000 | 20287.000000 | Semi-Annual | | |
| Percentage of items requested in our research rooms are furnished within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time. | Percent | Customer Results - Customer Benefit | Over target | 95.590000 | 94.000000 | 94.000000 | 94.000000 | Semi-Annual | | |
| Researcher information request (i.e., Pull Slip) error rate. | Percent | Technology - Information and Data | Over target | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 0.00000 | 90.000000 | Semi-Annual | | |
| Percentage of textual records with locations correctly identified. | Percent | Technology - Information and Data | Over target | 90.000000 | 0.000000 | 90.00000 | 90.00000 | Quarterly | | |
| Percentage of special media records with locations correctly identified. | Percent | Technology - Information and Data | Over target | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.000000 | 90.000000 | Quarterly | | |
| Percentage of time system is up and available to end users. | Percent | Technology - Efficiency | Over target | 99.860000 | 98.860000 | 99.860000 | 98.870000 | Monthly | | |
| Percentage of help desk tickets closed within 1 days. | Percent | Customer Results - Customer Benefit | Over target | 90.000000 | 90.00000 | 90.00000 | 90.000000 | Monthly | | |