

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

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

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. **Date of Submission:** 2009-06-15 16:59:12
2. **Agency:** 023
3. **Bureau:** 30
4. **Name of this Investment:** Financial Management Line of Business Managing Partner - Dashboard
5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier:** 023-30-01-01-01-1100-24
6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?:** Multi-Agency Collaboration
 - Planning
 - Full Acquisition
 - Operations and Maintenance
 - Mixed Life Cycle
 - Multi-Agency Collaboration
7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?** FY2004
8. **Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.**

There are no IT systems supporting the FMLOB program office, the IT systems associated with this initiative are the property of 4 Federal Shared Service Providers offering financial management services to any Federal agency under the umbrella of the FMLOB program office. FMLOB is undertaking several initiatives to reduce the cost and risks to implement modern financial systems. Among the initiatives are projects to standardize business processes and data elements, including the development of a common government-wide classification (CGAC) structure for use by all Federal agencies. The President's Management Agenda (PMA) addresses the need for citizen-centered, results-oriented, and market-based federal government initiatives. "Citizen-centered, not bureaucracy-centered." The proposed investment, leveraging as it does the benefits of competition, improvements in technology, and the economies of scale and skill, will achieve cost savings and cost avoidances that will allow Federal agencies to re-deploy resources to activities with greater importance to citizens. "Results-oriented." The proposed investment enhances the timeliness, reliability, and accuracy of financial information, and achieves a measure of standardization and consistency in financial processes and terminology that will permit managers to use financial information more effectively and efficiently in achieving program results. "Market-based." The proposed investment is the product of competition among Federal and commercial shared service providers. The shared-services approach recommended takes continuing advantage of competition among providers under this solution to the degree Federal agencies can shop from among the providers under the shared-services approach for the best services to suit their needs. The goals of the FMLoB are aligned with Federal Government initiatives including: President's Management Agenda Federal Enterprise Architecture E-Government Act of 2002 Office of the President E-Government Initiatives Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 Government Management Reform Act of 1994 Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act of 1982 Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 Cash Management Improvement Act of 1990 Prompt Payment Act of 1982, amended in 1988 Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 Inspector General Act 78

 - a. **Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register.**

9. Did the Agency’s Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? *

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? *

10. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

- Name: *
- Phone Number: *
- Email: *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? *

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

| Financial management system name(s) | System acronym | Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| * | * | * |

a. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): *

- computer system security requirement;
- internal control system requirement;
- core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
- Federal accounting standard;
- U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
- this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMIA compliance area;
- Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMIA

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

1.

| Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-------|
| | PY1 and earlier | PY 2009 | CY 2010 | BY 2011 | BY+1 2012 | BY+2 2013 | BY+3 2014 | BY+4 and beyond | Total |
| Planning: | * | \$3.3 | \$7.3 | \$1.3 | * | * | * | * | * |
| Acquisition: | * | \$15.5 | \$34.4 | \$47.8 | * | * | * | * | * |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | * | \$18.8 | \$41.7 | \$49.1 | * | * | * | * | * |
| Operations & Maintenance: | * | \$65.5 | \$64.9 | \$67.9 | * | * | * | * | * |
| Disposition Costs (optional): | * | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | \$0.0 | * | * | * | * | * |
| SUBTOTAL: | * | \$84.3 | \$106.6 | \$117.0 | * | * | * | * | * |
| Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above. | | | | | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | * | \$29.7 | \$38.6 | \$42.4 | * | * | * | * | * |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | * | \$255.0 | \$261.0 | \$280.0 | * | * | * | * | * |
| TOTAL(including FTE costs) | * | \$369.0 | \$406.2 | \$439.4 | * | * | * | * | * |

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President’s Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

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

1. **Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table**

| Contract or Task Order Number | Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16) | Has the contract been awarded (Y/N) | If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? | Start date of Contract/ Task Order | End date of Contract/ Task Order | Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (M) | Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N) | Is it performance based? (Y/N) | Competitively awarded? (Y/N) | What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A) | Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N) |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| GSV0006 PD1013-I DV-GS10 F0216N | Firm Fixed Price | Y | 2006-09-28 | 2006-09-29 | 2011-09-30 | \$10.6 | Y | Y | Y | * | * |

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

*

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? *

a.If "yes," what is the date? *

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

Table 1: Performance Information Table

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|-------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| 2007 | 3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions. | Customer Results | Customer Satisfaction | Percentage of agencies with SSPs that are satisfied with their SSPs | None | 70% of CFO Act Agencies and non CFO Act Agencies reporting that they are satisfied with their SSP, based on a 75% survey response of SSP customers. | As of 8/5/08 average satisfaction rating of 85.6% with an average response rate of 52.9% |
| 2007 | 4.Innovation:De velop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of CFO Act Agency systems migrated or in the process of migrating for all required services, but not necessarily fully deployed to an SSP | None | 25% initiated migration by end of FY2007 (a CFO Act Agency is considered in the process of migrating when that agency has in place a signed master agreement with an SSP | As of 8/1/2007, 31.58% of CFO Act agency system have either migrated or are in at least the planning stages of migration to an SSP |
| 2007 | 4.Innovation:De velop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of non-CFO Act Agency systems initiate migration analysis or in the process of initiating migration analysis. | None | 50% of required small agencies initiate migration analysis per small agency guidance by end of FY2007. | As of 8/1/2007, 58% of non-CFO Act agency systems have either migrated or are in the planning stage of migration to an SSP |
| 2007 | 4.Innovation:De velop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Processes and Activities | Innovation and Improvement | % of all General Ledger Transactions entered into SSPs General Ledger. Transactions shall be defined as the total number of debits and credits down to the detail level used to support the external reporting to the Treasury of the trial balance. | None | At least 30% of all G/L transactions reported to FMLOB are processed by SSPs | As of 9/30/2007, 30.4% of G/L transactions reported were processed by SSPs |
| 2008 | 3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition | Customer Results | Customer Satisfaction | Percentage of agencies with SSPs that are satisfied with their SSP | Average customer satisfaction rate of 79% in 2007 | 75% of CFO Act Agencies and non CFO Act Agencies reporting that they are satisfied with | Avg. customer satisfaction rating of 85.6% based on avg. response rate of 52.9% for all four SSPs |

Table 1: Performance Information Table

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| | services and business solutions. | | | | | their SSP. Based on a 75% survey response of SSP customers. | |
| 2008 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of non CFO Act Agencies that initiate migration analysis or in the process of initiating migration analysis. | 2007 baseline is 58% | An additional 10% increase in non-CFO Act agency system migration | 66.2% 3rd quarter FY08 |
| 2008 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of CFO Act Agencies migrated or in the process of migrating for all required services, but not necessarily fully deployed to an SSP. | 2007 baseline is 31.58% | An additional 10% of the remaining CFO Act agency systems migrate | 43.6% 3rd quarter fy08 |
| 2008 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Processes and Activities | Innovation and Improvement | % of all General Ledger Transactions entered into SSPs General Ledger. Transactions shall be defined as the total number of debits and credits down to the detail level used to support the external reporting to the Treasury of the trial balance | 2007 baseline is 30.4% | Increase of 5% of total G/L transactions as reported to FMLOB are processed by SSPs | As of 3rd quarter FY08 25.1%; NOTE: Not all agencies report this metric, and not all SSPs report for all of their customers. |
| 2008 | 3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions. | Technology | Operations and Maintenance Costs | Cost savings attributed to retirement of CFO Act and Non-CFO Act agency legacy core financial systems | None | Aggregate annual cost savings of at least \$50M | ted aggregate cost savings over a two-year period of \$145M based on 86 Non-CFO Act agency financial systems migrated (estimated annual cost of \$105k/system) and 34 CFO Act bureau/agency systems migrated (estimated annual cost of \$1.866M/syste |

Table 1: Performance Information Table

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | m). |
| 2009 | 3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions. | Customer Results | Customer Satisfaction | Percentage of agencies with SSPs that are satisfied with their SSPs. | 2008 baseline of 85.6% customer satisfaction rating | 85% of CFO Act Agencies and non CFO Act Agencies reporting that they are satisfied with their SSP. | 2009 result: overall satisfaction rating of 90.5%, based on overall response rate of 59.4% |
| 2009 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of non CFO Act Agency systems that initiate migration analysis or in the process of initiating migration analysis. | 2008 baseline of 58% | An additional 5% non-CFO Act agency systems migrate or initiate planning to migrate to an SSP | As of Dec. 31 66.2% |
| 2009 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of CFO Act Agency systems migrated or in the process of migrating for all required services, but not necessarily fully deployed to an SSP | 2008 baseline 31.58% | An additional 5% of CFO Act agency systems migrate or initiate migration planning to SSPs | As of Dec. 31 43.6% |
| 2009 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Processes and Activities | Innovation and Improvement | % of all G/L transactions entered into SSPs General Ledger. Transactions shall be defined as the total number of debits and credits down to the detail level used to support the external reporting to the Treasury of the trial balance. | To be determined based on 2008 results | Increase by 5% in total G/L transactions reported to FMLOB are processed by SSPs | January, 2009: 41.0%; April, 2009: 49.9%; March, 2009: 19.9% |
| 2009 | 3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions. | Technology | Operations and Maintenance Costs | Cost savings attributed to retirement of CFO Act and Non-CFO Act agency legacy core financial systems | 2008 estimated savings of \$145M | Aggregate annual cost savings of at least \$200M | This is an annual report |
| 2010 | 3.Best Value:Develop | Customer Results | Customer Satisfaction | Percentage of agencies with | TBD based on 2009 results | TBD | TBD |

Table 1: Performance Information Table

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|--------|----------------|
| | and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions. | | | SSPs that are satisfied with their SSPs | | | |
| 2010 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of CFO Act Agency systems migrated or in the process of migrating for all required services, but not necessarily deployed to an SSP | TBD based on 2009 results | TBD | TBD |
| 2010 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Mission and Business Results | Central Fiscal Operations | % of non CFO Act Agency systems that initiate migration analysis or in the process of initiating migration analysis | TBD based on 2009 results | TBD | TBD |
| 2010 | 4.Innovation:Develop new and better ways of conducting business that result in more productive and effective Federal policies and administrative operations. | Processes and Activities | Innovation and Improvement | % of all G/L transactions entered into SSPs General Ledger. Transactions shall be defined as the total number of debits and credits down to the detail level used to support the external reporting to the Treasury of the trial balance. | TBD based on 2009 results | TBD | TBD |
| 2010 | 3.Best Value:Develop and deliver timely, accurate, and cost-effective acquisition services and business solutions. | Technology | Operations and Maintenance Costs | Cost savings attributed to retirement of CFO Acct and Non-CFO Act agency legacy core financial systems | TBD based on 2009 results | TBD | TBD |

Part IV: Planning For "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY

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

| 1. Stakeholder Table: | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Partner Agency | Joint exhibit approval date |
| * | * |

| 2. Partner Capital Assets within this Investment: | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| Partner Agency | Partner Agency Asset Title | Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011) |
| * | * | * |

| 3. Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions): | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Partner Agency | Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011) | CY Contribution | BY Contribution | BY Contribution | BY Fee-for-Service |
| * | * | * | * | * | * |

- 1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? *
 - a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? *
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? *
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why: *

2. Does this investment replace any legacy systems investments? Disposition costs (costs of retirement of legacy systems) may be included as a category in Part I, Section B, Summary of Funding, or in separate investments, classified as major or non-major. For legacy system investments being replaced by this investment, include the following data on these legacy investments.

| 4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems | UPI if available | Date of the System Retirement |
| * | * | * |

3. For Multi-Agency Investments, Cost and Schedule Milestone table should be completed in the same format as Part II Section A and Part III Section A, above. NOTE: The Ex 300 schema includes an optional Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) field that is not depicted in the table below.

| 5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Description of Milestones | Planned Cost (\$M) | Actual Cost (\$M) | Planned Start Date | Actual Start Date | Planned Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Planned Percent Complete | Actual Percent Complete |
| Continue operations of FMLoB | \$1.6 | \$0.0 | 2011-10-01 | | 2012-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| FY05 DME | \$0.2 | \$0.2 | 2004-10-01 | 2004-10-01 | 2005-09-30 | 2005-09-30 | 0.00% | 100.00% |
| Continue operations of FMLoB | \$1.6 | \$0.0 | 2012-10-01 | | 2013-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| FY06 DME | \$1.8 | \$1.8 | 2005-10-01 | 2005-10-01 | 2006-09-30 | 2006-09-30 | 0.00% | 100.00% |
| Continue | \$1.8 | \$0.0 | 2015-10-01 | | 2016-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |

| 5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Description of Milestones | Planned Cost (\$M) | Actual Cost (\$M) | Planned Start Date | Actual Start Date | Planned Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Planned Percent Complete | Actual Percent Complete |
| operations of FMLoB | | | | | | | | |
| Continue operations of FMLoB | \$1.7 | \$0.0 | 2013-10-01 | | 2014-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| FY07 DME | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | 2006-10-01 | 2006-10-01 | 2007-09-30 | 2007-09-30 | 0.00% | 100.00% |
| FY08 SS | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | 2007-10-01 | 2007-10-01 | 2008-09-30 | 2008-09-30 | 0.00% | 100.00% |
| Continue to develop standard business processes, interfaces, objects/rules and data objects for select core FM functions | \$1.9 | \$0.0 | 2016-10-01 | | 2017-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Continue operations of FMLoB | \$1.7 | \$0.0 | 2014-10-01 | | 2015-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Continue operations of FMLoB | \$3.9 | \$0.0 | 2010-10-01 | | 2011-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Continue operations of FMLoB | \$43.7 | \$10.9 | 2009-10-01 | | 2010-09-30 | | 25.00% | 25.00% |
| FY09 SS | \$2.0 | \$2.0 | 2008-10-01 | 2008-10-01 | 2009-09-30 | 2009-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY2010 DME of FMLoB | \$79.7 | \$19.9 | 2009-10-01 | 2009-10-01 | 2010-09-30 | | 0.00% | 25.00% |

* - Indicates data is redacted.