

INITIATIVE DEFINITION BY08*Initiative Definition BY08*

| | |
|--|---|
| Template Name | IT Investment BY2008 |
| Investment Name | ADM - 964750 - HUD eGrants Consolidated |
| Investment Revision Number | 8 |
| Is this investment a consolidated business case? | No |
| Point of Contact | Raleigh, Judith L |
| Revision Comment | |
| Class | IT |

I.A: OVERVIEW BY08*Descriptive Information BY08*

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of Submission | 9/11/2006 |
| Agency | Department of Housing and Urban Development |
| Bureau | Working Capital Fund |
| Name of this Capital Asset | ADM - 964750 - HUD eGrants Consolidated |
| Full UPI Code | 025-00-04-00-01-1640-00 |
| Four Digit UPI Code | 1640 |
| Two Digit UPI Code | 00 |
| Exhibit 53 Part | IT Investments for Grants Management |
| OMB Investment Type | 01 - Major Investment |
| OMB Exhibit 53 Major Mission Area | |
| PY Full UPI Code | 025-00-04-00-01-1316-00-101-002 |
| What kind of investment will this be in this Budget Year? | Mixed Life Cycle |
| If this investment supports homeland security, Indicate by corresponding number which homeland security mission area(s) this investment supports? | |
| OMB Short Description | This consolidated eGrants initiative will develop an enterprise solution to manage \$26B in grants with limited development for the four program offices that have no automation. It will also allow for alignment with DOT as a co-lead of a GMLoB Consortium. |
| Investment C&A Status | 25 - Some or all of the systems within this investment have been through a C&A Process, some systems have been granted Full Authority to Operate |

Screening Questions BY08

| | |
|---|--|
| What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? | FY2006 |
| 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 investment will fund the consolidated eGrants initiative to develop an enterprise solution to manage \$26B in grants at HUD as well as a transition to a GMLoB HUDOT Consortium. The HUDOT consortium already has one committed customer (SBA). |

As HUD transitions to an enterprise solution and becomes a COE co-lead, the agency will develop a concept of operations, conduct an alternative analysis to find the technology solutions that will best suit all of its program needs, and develop a performance plan for measuring success.

Due to this consolidated e-grants solution, HUD will meet its strategic goal of improving management and internal controls by increasing interoperability and data availability as well as its goal of improving accountability, service delivery, and customer service by sharing data and reducing legacy systems. This investment will help HUD strengthen communities by facilitating more effective delivery of affordable housing and is the cornerstone of HUD's Vision 2010.

HUD is requesting the resources to support the successful continuation of the eGrants program. The eGrants program will establish a program management office (PMO), strategically align and implement leading service-oriented components, and develop and execute plans to reuse existing agency assets to support common and unique business processes. HUD will co-lead a single, full-service GM service center with DOT and will finish developing an investment strategy (including acquisition) in May 2007.

In FY07, HUD will continue the consortia process, establish the JPMO, undergo the first round of crosscutting service (intake), end legacy development contracts, redirect resources/funding for current (legacy) contracts, and begin to retire systems.

In FY08, HUD will rollout a second round of crosscutting service (data sharing), activate strategic new enterprise contracts, capture legislative requirements to ready HUD systems for the consortium, and retire redundant services.

By FY09, the enterprise solution will be fully implemented. The last stage of this process includes implementing the third round of crosscutting service, resulting in complete consortium alignment, and the elimination of all remaining redundant services. In addition, all remaining contracts will be consolidated into one eGrants contract.

| | |
|--|--|
| Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? | Yes |
| If "yes," what was the date of this approval? | 8/15/2006 |
| Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? | Yes |
| Contact information of Project Manager? | |
| Project Manager Name | |
| Raleigh, Judith L | |
| Project Manager Phone Number | 202-708-1006 x2076 |
| Project Manager E-mail | Judith_L._Raleigh@hud.gov |
| Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project. | Yes |
| Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? | Yes |
| Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) | No |
| If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? | |
| If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? | |
| If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? | |
| Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives? | Yes |
| If "yes," check all of the PMA initiatives that apply: | Eliminating Improper Payments, Expanded E-Government, Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance |
| 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 |
| Does this investment address a weakness found during the PART Review? | Yes |
| If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program? | Community Development Block Grant (Formula) |
| If "yes," what PART rating did it receive? | Ineffective |
| Is this investment for information technology? | Yes |
| Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? | In expanding electronic government, HUD will consolidate the 27 stove-piped systems managing HUD grants, standardize grants reporting, and reduce the administrative burden on grantees. HUD will eliminate improper payments by integrating with the HUD enterprise financial management system, sharing common data, and using the GM performance reporting capabilities. HUD will improve its management and performance by better auditing, overseeing, and monitoring grants. |

IT Screening Questions BY08

| | |
|---|---|
| If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section. | |
| What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) | Level 2 |
| What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance): | (2) Project manager qualification is under review for this investment |
| Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)? | No |
| Is this a financial management system? | No |
| If "yes", does this investment address a FFMA compliance area? | No |
| If "yes," which FFMA compliance area? | |
| If "no," what does it address? | |
| 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 | |
| Provide the Percentage Financial Management for the budget year | 0.724000 |
| What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%) | 100.000000 |
| For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for hardware? | 8.000000 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for software? | 12.000000 |
| For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for services? | 80.000000 |
| For budget year, what percentage of the total investment is for other services? | 0 |
| 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 |

Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Privacy Officer Name | Smith, Jeanette |
| Privacy Officer Phone Number | 202-708-0614 x8602 |
| Privacy Officer Title | Departmental Privacy Act Officer |
| Privacy Officer E-mail | Jeanette_Smith@HUD.gov |
| Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval? | Yes |

I.B: SUMMARY OF SPENDING BY08

Summary of Spending BY08

Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT STAGES

* Costs in thousands

| | PY - 1 and Earlier | PY 2006 | CY 2007 | BY 2008 | BY + 1 2009 | BY + 2 2010 | BY + 3 2011 | BY + 4 and Beyond | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------|----------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
| Planning | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 3771.110 | 602.238 | 1887.702 | 1691.65 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 3771.110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| A. Project Initiation/Planning | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 2155.434 | 511.152 | 317.702 | 181.65 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 2155.434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| B. Requirements Definition | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 1615.676 | 39.543 | 860 | 700 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 1615.676 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| C. System Design | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 51.543 | 710 | 810 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Acquisition | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 50 | 9800.762 | 7412.298 | 7906.35 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| D. Software Acquisition | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 16.317 | 107.5 | 107.5 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| E. Hardware/Infrastructure Acquisition | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 16.317 | 107.5 | 107.5 | | | | | |
| Outlays | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| F. New Development/Perfective Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| Budgetary Resources | 0 | 9662.266 | 5337.298 | 4651.35 | | | | | |

| | PY - 6 2000 | PY - 5 2001 | PY - 4 2002 | PY - 3 2003 | PY - 2 2004 | PY - 1 2005 | PY 2006 | CY 2007 | BY 2008 | BY + 1 2009 | BY + 2 2010 | BY + 3 2011 | BY + 4 2012 | BY + 5 2013 | BY + 6 2014 | BY + 7 2015 | BY + 8 2016 | Total |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Security | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Program Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| IT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | |

*This row represents the 'Number of FTE represented by cost' from Summary of Spending table and will be sent to OMB.

Funding Questions BY08

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? | Yes |
| How many and in what year? | 1 FTE in FY08 for eGrants |
| If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes. | |
| Provide the Percent Budget Formulation (BF) for the budget year | 0 |
| Provide the Percent Budget Execution (BE) for the budget year | 0 |

Funding Sources BY08

Funding Sources

* Costs in thousands

| FS Name: MAX Code | Row Type | PY - 6 2000 | PY - 5 2001 | PY - 4 2002 | PY - 3 2003 | PY - 2 2004 | PY - 1 2005 | PY 2006 | CY 2007 | BY 2008 | BY + 1 2009 | BY + 2 2010 | BY + 3 2011 | BY + 4 2012 | BY + 5 2013 | BY + 6 2014 | BY + 7 2015 | BY + 8 2016 | Total |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Working Capital Fund: 025-35-4586-0 On Ex.53: Yes | DME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3152.682 | 9300 | 9598 | | | | | | | | | |
| | SS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7921.345 | 10357.352 | 8790 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11074.027 | 19657.352 | 18388 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Yearly Budgets | DME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3152.682 | 9300 | 9598 | | | | | | | | | |
| | SS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7921.345 | 10357.352 | 8790 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11074.027 | 19657.352 | 18388 | | | | | | | | | |

Contract/Task Orders Table

| Row Number | Contract or Task Order Number | Type of Contract/ Task Order | Has the contract been awarded? | 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 | Is this an Interagency Acquisition? | Is it performance based? | Competitively awarded? | What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? | Is EVM in the contract? | Does the contract include the required security and privacy clauses? | Name of CO | CO Contact information (phone/email) | Contracting Officer Certification Level | If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? |
|------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | C-OPC-22358 | Firm-fixed-price, | Yes | 3/11/2003 | 3/11/2003 | 9/30/2007 | 11560770 | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | Glymph, Kelvin | 202-708-7133 / Kelvin_X_Glymph | N/A | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|------------------|---|-----|----------|--|--|
| | | performance-based contract with Blank Purchase Agreement (BPA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | @hud.gov | | |
| 2 | C-DEN-01933 | Firm-fixed-price, performance-based contract | Yes | 9/27/2004 | 9/27/2004 | 9/30/2007 | 2900000 | No | Yes | No | NA | No | Yes | Glymph, Kelvin | 202-708-7133 / Kelvin_X._Glymph@hud.gov | N/A | Yes | | |
| 3 | C-OPC-22891 | Firm-fixed-price, performance-based contract | Yes | 6/5/2006 | 6/5/2006 | 9/30/2007 | 2132774 | No | Yes | No | NA | No | Yes | Glymph, Kelvin | 202-708-7133 / Kelvin_X._Glymph@hud.gov | N/A | Yes | | |
| 4 | GSC-TFMG-05-31385 | 8A Stars (Time and Material) | Yes | 12/1/2005 | 12/1/2005 | 9/30/2007 | 1533600 | No | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes | Yes | McDowell, Chiara | Chiara.McDowell@gsa.gov | N/A | Yes | | |
| 5 | C-DEN-02058 eGrants | 8A Sole Source | Yes | 6/2/2006 | 6/2/2006 | 9/30/2007 | 974356 | No | Yes | No | NA | Yes | Yes | Surber, Keith | Keith_Surber@hud.gov | N/A | Yes | | |
| 6 | Strategic Alignment | TBD | No | 10/1/2007 | 10/1/2007 | 1/1/1900 | 0.001 | No | Yes | No | NA | Yes | Yes | McDowell, Chiara | Chiara.McDowell@gsa.gov | N/A | Yes | | |

Contract/Task Order Questions BY08

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

Earned value is only required for investments classified as majors that were started after 2005. Thus, IDIS, SAGIS/Resource Allocation, and eGrants Modernization are the only systems required to include earned value in their contracts/task orders. All of these contracts have been updated to include this clause. Operational/Steady-state investments will not modify their contracts to include this clause unless expressly asked by the HUD OCIO.

Contracts with "NO" EVM indicated in the contract are maintenance contracts which practice "Operational Analysis".

Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

Yes

Explain why (508 Compliance)?

HUD has established a pre-acquisition certification process to ensure that appropriate Section 508 compliance provisions are included in awarded contracts. Products requiring compliance are inspected upon delivery before acceptance. HUD eGrants will ensure compliance to Section 508 because COTS or GOTS software packages that are not 508 compliant will not be purchased. In addition, any software development will be built 508 compliant and will be tested before release.

Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?

No

What is the date of your acquisition plan?

If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?

Yes

If "no," briefly explain why:

An acquisition plan will be developed by February 2007. This will be developed in conjunction with the eGrants Modernization contract.

I.D: PERFORMANCE INFORMATION BY08

Performance Goals & Measures BY08

Agencies must use the Performance Goals and Measures Table below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Performance Goals and Measures

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Performance Measure | Actual/baseline (from Previous Year) | Planned Performance Metric (Target) | Performance Metric Results (Actual) |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|-------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 2005 | Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Average annual processing time per applicant for PIH rental assistance programs award and notification | Average annual processing per applicant is 100 business days | Reduce annual processing time by 12 percent | Delay in Implementation |
| 2005 | Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability | Mission and Business Results | Community and Social Services | Homeownership Promotion | Number of housing units processed by the four CPD grant programs contained in the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) | 336,599 housing units benefiting (FY2002) | At least 260,848 housing units benefiting | 338,622 housing units benefiting from IDIS-supported grant programs in FY2005. |
| 2005 | Goal E: Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management and Accountability | Mission and Business Results | Financial Management | Reporting and Information | Dollar amount of annual improper rent subsidy payments | \$2 billion (source PMA report 2004) | Reduce improper rent subsidy payments by 5% | \$990M |
| 2005 | | Processes and Activities | Productivity and Efficiency | Productivity | Percent of PIH formula grant programs calculated using automated systems | 0 percent of PIH formula grant programs are calculated using an automated system | 10 percent of PIH formula grant programs are calculated using an automated system. | Delay in Implementation |
| 2005 | | Technology | Information and Data | Internal Data Sharing | Percent of PIH rental assistance program dollars reviewed and awarded using a federal financial management compliant system. | 0 percent of PIH rental assistance program dollars reviewed and awarded using a federal financial management compliant system. | Increase the PIH rental assistance program dollars to 15 percent | Delay in implementation |
| 2006 | | Customer Results | Service Accessibility | Integration | Percentage of PHAs using Resource Allocation to process HCV portable vouchers billing. | 0% of PHAs are using system to process portable vouchers billing. Current process is a manual process between PHAs | 20% of PHAs use system to process portable vouchers billing. | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |
| 2006 | | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | Average annual processing time | Average annual processing time | Reduce annual | Results shall be reported in |

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | per rental assistance program award and notification | per program is 88 days. | processing time by 10 percent over FY05 levels | December 2006 |
| 2006 | | Mission and Business Results | Community and Social Services | Homeownership Promotion | Number of housing units processed by the four CPD grant programs contained in the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) | 336,599 housing units benefiting (FY2002) | A 16% increase in housing units benefiting from IDIS-supported grant programs (over FY2005). | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |
| 2006 | | Mission and Business Results | Information and Technology Management | Information Management | Percent of funding processed in a centralized database for detailed data analysis and decision making | Zero percent of PIH program funding is in a centralized database for detailed data analysis and decision making. | 38% | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |
| 2006 | | Mission and Business Results | Planning and Resource Allocation | Management Improvement | Percentage of PIH records tracked at detailed item levels using Resource Allocation | 0% of current funding expenditure is tracked in detailed business line item levels. | 80 % of all HCV funding records are tracked and stored according to its fund code, program codes and line items | Results shall be reported in April 2007 |
| 2006 | | Processes and Activities | Productivity and Efficiency | Productivity | Percent of PIH formula/subsidy programs calculated using automated systems | 15 percent of PIH formula/subsidy programs are calculated using automated systems. | 38% | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |
| 2006 | | Processes and Activities | Quality | Complaints | % of renewal funding appealed | 40% of total participants appealed for adjustment on HCV renewal funding allocation | Reduce the appeals by 8% of total participants | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |
| 2006 | | Technology | Efficiency | Interoperability | Percent of PIH programs that either are linked to or consolidated with other applications through Resource Allocation (J2EE compliant) | Zero percent of PIH programs in Resource Allocation that are linked or consolidated with other applications. | 38% | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | systems | | | |
| 2006 | | Technology | Information and Data | Internal Data Sharing | Number of manual funding allocation processes automated and integrated by PIH | 0 out of 9 processes are automated | 3 out of 9 HCV processes to be automated. | Results shall be reported in December 2006 |
| 2007 | | Customer Results | Service Accessibility | Integration | Percentage of PHAs using Resource Allocation to process HCV portable vouchers billing. | 0% of PHAs are using system to process portable vouchers billing. Current process is a manual process between PHAs | 30% of PHAs use system to process portable vouchers billing. | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |
| 2007 | | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | Average annual processing time per rental assistance program award and notification | Average annual processing time per program is 88 days. | Reduce annual processing time by 10 percent over FY06 levels | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |
| 2007 | | Mission and Business Results | Community and Social Services | Homeownership Promotion | Number of housing units processed by the four CPD grant programs contained in the Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) | 336,599 housing units benefiting (FY2002) | A 20% increase in housing units benefiting from IDIS-supported grant programs (over FY2006). | |
| 2007 | | Mission and Business Results | Information and Technology Management | Information Management | Percent of funding processed in a centralized database for detailed data analysis and decision making | Zero percent of PIH program funding is in a centralized database for detailed data analysis and decision making. | 75% | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |
| 2007 | | Mission and Business Results | Planning and Resource Allocation | Management Improvement | Percentage of PIH records tracked at detailed item levels using Resource Allocation | 0% of current funding expenditure is tracked in detailed business line item levels. | 90 % of all HCV funding records are tracked and stored according to its fund code, program codes and line items | Results shall be reported in April 2008 |
| 2007 | | Processes and Activities | Productivity and Efficiency | Productivity | Percent of PIH formula grant programs calculated using automated systems | 15 percent of PIH formula grant programs are calculated using an automated | 75 percent of PIH formula grant programs are calculated | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | system | using an automated system. | |
| 2007 | | Processes and Activities | Quality | Complaints | % of renewal funding appealed | 40% of total participants appealed for adjustment on HCV renewal funding allocation | Reduce the appeals by 6% of total participants | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |
| 2007 | | Technology | Efficiency | Interoperability | Percent of PIH programs that either are linked to or consolidated with other applications through Resource Allocation (J2EE compliant) systems | Zero percent of PIH programs in Resource Allocation that are linked or consolidated with other applications. | 75% | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |
| 2007 | | Technology | Information and Data | Internal Data Sharing | Number of manual funding allocation processes automated and integrated by PIH | 0 out of 9 processes are automated | 6 out of 9 HCV processes to be automated. | Results shall be reported in December 2007 |
| 2008 | | Customer Results | Service Accessibility | Integration | Percentage of PHAs using Resource Allocation to process HCV portable vouchers billing. | 0% of PHAs are using system to process portable vouchers billing. Current process is a manual process between PHAs | 80% of PHAs use system to process portable vouchers billing. | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |
| 2008 | | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | Average time (in days) between application submission and grant award | A new metric. Baselines for competitive and for formula grants will be drawn from FY07 data. | A decrease of 5% | |
| 2008 | | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Delivery Time | Average annual processing time per rental assistance program award and notification | Average annual processing time per program is 88 days. | Reduce annual processing time by 10 percent over FY07 levels | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |
| 2008 | | Mission and Business Results | Community and Social Services | Homeownership Promotion | Number of housing units processed by the four CPD grant programs contained in the Integrated Disbursement and | 336,599 housing units benefiting (FY2002) | A 24% increase in housing units benefiting from IDIS-supported grant programs (over | |

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Information System (IDIS) | | FY2007). | |
| 2008 | | Mission and Business Results | Information and Technology Management | Information Management | Percent of funding processed in a centralized database for detailed data analysis and decision making | Zero percent of PIH program funding is in a centralized database for detailed data analysis and decision making. | 95% | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |
| 2008 | | Mission and Business Results | Planning and Resource Allocation | Management Improvement | Percentage of PIH records tracked at detailed item levels using Resource Allocation | 0% of current funding expenditure is tracked in detailed business line item levels. | 99% of all HCV funding records are tracked and stored according to its fund code, program codes and line items | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |
| 2008 | | Mission and Business Results | Public Affairs | Customer Services | % of HUD grant opportunities available online | 39 funding opportunities available on Grants.gov | An increase of 5% | |
| 2008 | | Processes and Activities | Productivity and Efficiency | Efficiency | % of redundant workflow components and processes | New metric. Will be baselined from FY07 data. | A decrease of 5% | |
| 2008 | | Processes and Activities | Productivity and Efficiency | Productivity | Percent of PIH formula/subsidy programs calculated using automated systems | 15 percent of PIH formula/subsidy programs are calculated using automated systems. | 95% | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |
| 2008 | | Processes and Activities | Quality | Complaints | % of renewal funding appealed | 40% of total participants appealed for adjustment on HCV renewal funding allocation | Reduce the appeals by 5% of total participants | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |
| 2008 | | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | % of HUD grant applications rejected due to invalid or incomplete information | A new metric. Baselines for competitive and for formula grants will be drawn from FY07 data. | Reduce by 5% | |
| 2008 | | Technology | Efficiency | Interoperability | % of grant applications that are received by HUD in XML | 5000 applications are received by HUD in XML | An increase of 5% | |
| 2008 | | Technology | Information and Data | Internal Data Sharing | % of grants management systems that | New metric. Will be baselined from | An increase of 5% | |

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvement to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | interoperate | FY07 data. | | |
| 2008 | | Technology | Information and Data | Internal Data Sharing | Number of manual funding allocation processes automated and integrated by PIH | 0 out of 9 processes are automated | 7 out of 9 HCV processes to be automated. | Results shall be reported in December 2008 |

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

I.E: SECURITY AND PRIVACY BY08

Costs & Risks BY08

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

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

Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment? **Yes**

Provide the Percentage IT Security for the budget year **4.440000**

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**

Security: Planning Systems BY08

Systems in Planning - Security

| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | Planned Operational Date | Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date |
|----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| EDSYS | Government Only | 9/30/2006 | 8/15/2006 |
| SAGIS | Government Only | 9/22/2006 | 9/14/2006 |

Security: Operational Systems BY08

Operational Systems - Security

| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level | Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? | Date C&A Complete | What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? | Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing | Date the contingency plan tested |
|----------------|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| DRGR | Contractor Only | Low | Yes | 6/5/2006 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 12/5/2005 |
| EZ/EC Locator | Government Only | Low | Yes | 6/30/2005 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 12/5/2005 |
| GMP | Contractor Only | Moderate | Yes | 6/5/2006 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 12/5/2005 |
| IDIS | Contractor Only | High | Yes | 6/5/2005 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 7/5/2006 |
| RC/EZ/EC | Contractor Only | Low | Yes | 6/5/2006 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 12/5/2005 |
| SNAPS | Contractor | Moderate | Yes | 6/5/2005 | NIST 800-26 | 9/1/2006 | 6/6/2006 |

| Name of System | Agency/ or Contractor Operated System? | NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level | Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? | Date C&A Complete | What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? | Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing | Date the contingency plan tested |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | Only | | | | | | |
| System C39 (PERMS) | Government Only | Low | Yes | 6/30/2005 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 12/5/2005 |
| System P008 (IAES) | Government Only | Low | Yes | 5/24/2005 | FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53 | 9/1/2006 | 12/5/2005 |

Security: Weaknesses & Contractor Procedures BY08

Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG? **Yes**

If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process? **Yes**

Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses? **No**

If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

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

HUD requires contractors to be in compliance with its security policy cited in the HUD 2400.24 (Rev 2) Security Handbook. HUD monitors, verifies, and validates contractor's security procedures thoroughly. In addition, contractors are required to take a mandatory training, "Enterprise Security Awareness for Critical Infrastructure Assurance." Contract provisions will be established to conduct contractor reporting, site inspections, audits, and personnel background investigations on a periodic basis to ensure contractor's compliance with all security requirements. All HUD contracts are required to comply with HUD IT operations and security policy. IT Data Centers are required to follow FISMA, A-130, A-11, and other major federal requirements. Contractor procedures are monitored through biweekly status meetings where security incidents and events, results of automated scans, and audit trails may be reviewed.

Privacy: Planning & Operational Systems BY08

Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy

| Name of System | Is this a new system? | Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? | Is the PIA available to the public? | Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? | Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06? |
|----------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| DRGR | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| EDSYS | Yes | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| EZ/EC Locator | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| GMP | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| IDIS | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| RC/EZ/EC | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |

| Name of System | Is this a new system? | Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system? | Is the PIA available to the public? | Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? | Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06? |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | of records. |
| SAGIS | Yes | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| SNAPS | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| System C39 (PERMS) | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |
| System P008 (IAES) | No | Yes. | Yes. | No | No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records. |

I.F: ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (EA) BY08

General EA Questions BY08

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

Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? **Yes**

If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? **Yes**

If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. **Grants Management Modernization and Alignment with GMLoB Consortia**

If "no," please explain why this investment is not included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

FEA SRM BY08

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component | FEA Service Component Reused Name | FEA Service Component Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | BY Funding Percentage |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Extraction and Transformation | Defines the set of capabilities that support the manipulation and change of data. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Extraction and Transformation | | | No Reuse | 4 |
| Loading and Archiving | Defines the set of capabilities that support the population of a data source with external data. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Loading and Archiving | | | No Reuse | 4 |
| Activity-Based Management | Support a defined, | Back Office Services | Financial Management | Activity-Based Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component | FEA Service Component Reused Name | FEA Service Component Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | BY Funding Percentage |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | specific set of finance related tasks for a given objective. | | | | | | | |
| Decision Support and Planning | Defines the set of capabilities that support the analysis of information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made. | Business Analytical Services | Business Intelligence | Decision Support and Planning | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Data Mining | Defines the set of capabilities that provide for the efficient discovery of non-obvious, valuable patterns and relationships within a large collection of data. | Business Analytical Services | Knowledge Discovery | Data Mining | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Ad Hoc | Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of dynamic reports on an as needed basis. | Business Analytical Services | Reporting | Ad Hoc | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Standardized/Canned | Defines the set of capabilities that support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports. | Business Analytical Services | Reporting | Standardized / Canned | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Performance Management | Performance Management refers to a range of measures designed to assure that Federal resources are used efficiently and effectively. | Business Management Services | Investment Management | Performance Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Business Rule Management | Defines the set of capabilities for the management of the enterprise | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Business Rule Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component | FEA Service Component Reused Name | FEA Service Component Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | BY Funding Percentage |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | processes that support an organization and its policies. | | | | | | | |
| Program/Project Management | Defines the set of capabilities for the management and control of a particular effort of an organization. | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Program / Project Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Customer Analytics | Define the set of capabilities that allow for the analysis of an organization's customers as well as the scoring of third party information as it relates to an organization's customers. | Customer Services | Customer Relationship Management | Brand Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Customer Feedback | Defines the set of capabilities that are used to collect, analyze and handle comments and feedback from an organization's customers. | Customer Services | Customer Relationship Management | Customer Feedback | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Partner Relationship Management | Collaboration between an organization and its business partners and other parties. | Customer Services | Customer Relationship Management | Partner Relationship Management | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Surveys | Defines the set of capabilities that are used to collect useful information from an organization's customers. | Customer Services | Customer Relationship Management | Surveys | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Content Authoring | Defines the capabilities that allow for the creation of tutorials, CBT | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Content Authoring | | | No Reuse | 3 |

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component | FEA Service Component Reused Name | FEA Service Component Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | BY Funding Percentage |
|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | courseware, Web sites, CD ROMS and other interactive programs. | | | | | | | |
| Content Publishing and Delivery | Defines the set of capabilities that allow for the propagation of interactive programs. | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Content Publishing and Delivery | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Content Review and Approval | Defines the capabilities that allow for the approval of interactive programs. | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Content Review and Approval | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Tagging and Aggregation | Defines the set of capabilities that support the identification of specific content within a larger set of content for collection and summarization. | Digital Asset Services | Content Management | Tagging and Aggregation | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Classification | Defines the set of capabilities that support the categorization of documents. | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Classification | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Indexing | Defines the set of capabilities that support the rapid retrieval of documents through a structured numbering construct. | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Indexing | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Information Retrieval | Defines the set of capabilities that allow access to data and information for use by an organization and its stakeholders. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Retrieval | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Information Sharing | Defines the set of capabilities that support | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Sharing | | | No Reuse | 3 |

| Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Domain | FEA SRM Service Type | FEA SRM Component | FEA Service Component Reused Name | FEA Service Component Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | BY Funding Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | the use of documents and data in a multi-user environment for use by an organization and its stakeholders. | | | | | | | |
| Knowledge Capture | Capabilities to capture information. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Knowledge Capture | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Defines the set of capabilities that support the transfer of knowledge to the end customer. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | | | No Reuse | 3 |
| Process Tracking | Defines the set of capabilities to allow the monitoring of activities within the business. | Process Automation Services | Tracking and Workflow | Process Tracking | | | No Reuse | 5 |
| Query | Query defines the set of capabilities that support retrieval of records that satisfy specific query selection criteria. | Support Services | Search | Query | | | No Reuse | 3 |

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

FEA TRM BY08

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Classification | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Dependent | J2EE |
| Decision Support and Planning | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent | InfoTerra Grantium 3.0 |
| Business Rule | Component | Business Logic | Platform | J2EE |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Management | Framework | | Independent | |
| Business Rule Management | Component Framework | Business Logic | Platform Independent | J2EE, Info Terra Grantium 3.0 |
| Extraction and Transformation | Component Framework | Data Interchange | Data Exchange | XML, SOAP, XTML |
| Indexing | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | ADO, .net, JDBC |
| Information Sharing | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Nomad 6.50a |
| Knowledge Capture | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Nomad 6.50a |
| Information Retrieval | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Nomad 6.50a, |
| Customer Analytics | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Nomad 6.50a, Web SQL 1.2/Unspecified |
| Surveys | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Nomad 6.50a,Web SQL 1.2/Unspecified |
| Activity-Based Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Web SQL 1.2/unspecified |
| Knowledge Capture | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Web SQL 1.2/Unspecified |
| Data Mining | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Web SQL 1.2/Unspecified, Nomad 6.50a |
| Partner Relationship Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Web SQL 1.2/Unspecified,Nomad 6.50a |
| Process Tracking | Component Framework | Data Management | Database Connectivity | Web SQL 1.2/Unspecified,Nomad 6.50a |
| Customer Analytics | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Decision Crystal Reports 8.0,Crystal Reports version unspecified/5.0/6.0 |
| Knowledge Capture | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Decision Crystal Reports 8.0,Crystal Reports version unspecified/5.0/6.0,DEPCON Central v5r2 |
| Partner Relationship Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Decision Crystal Reports 8.0,Crystal Reports version unspecified/5.0/6.0,DEPCON Central v5r2 |
| Data Mining | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Reports version unspecified/5.0/6.0, Crystal Decision Crystal Reports 8.0 |
| Surveys | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Reports version unspecified/5.0/6.0,Crystal Decision Crystal Reports 8.0 |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Reports, SAS, SPSS |
| Ad Hoc | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Reports, SAS, SPSS |
| Standardized / Canned | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | Crystal Reports, SAS, SPSS |
| Customer Feedback | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | DEPCON Central v5r2 |
| Performance Management | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | DEPCON Central v5r2 |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Process Tracking | Component Framework | Data Management | Reporting and Analysis | DEPCON Central v5r2 |
| Content Authoring | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Content Authoring | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Content Publishing and Delivery | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Content Review and Approval | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Customer Analytics | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Data Mining | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Information Retrieval | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Information Retrieval | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Information Sharing | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Knowledge Capture | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Partner Relationship Management | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Process Tracking | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Surveys | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Tagging and Aggregation | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Dynamic Server-Side Display | Microsoft Active Server Pages (ASP)/2.0 |
| Business Rule Management | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Static Display | PureEdge XML, PDF |
| Business Rule Management | Component Framework | Presentation / Interface | Static Display | PureEdge XML, PDF |
| Business Rule Management | Component Framework | Security | Certificates / Digital Signatures | X.500 |
| Customer Feedback | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | Open SSH Server/Client |
| Performance Management | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | Open SSH Server/Client |
| Process Tracking | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | Open SSH Server/Client |
| Customer Analytics | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | TelnetD 4.0 |
| Data Mining | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | TelnetD 4.0 |
| Surveys | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | TelnetD 4.0 |
| Knowledge Capture | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | TelnetD 4.0,Open SSH Server/Client |
| Partner Relationship | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | TelnetD 4.0,Open SSH Server/Client |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Management | | | | |
| Business Rule Management | Component Framework | Security | Supporting Security Services | X.500 |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Lotus Notes/Domino Mail 6.5 Lotus SMTP Gateway |
| Performance Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Microsoft Internet Explorer 4.0 or Earlier |
| Process Tracking | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Collaboration / Communications | Microsoft Internet Explorer 4.0 or Earlier |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | Extensible Markup Language (XML) |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Other Electronic Channels | Extensible Markup Language (XML) |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | Internet Explorer 6.01 Netscape Communicator 7.0 |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | Internet Explorer 6.01 Netscape Communicator 7.0 |
| Customer Feedback | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | Microsoft Internet Explorer 4.0 or Earlier |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | Microsoft Internet Explorer 4.0 or Earlier |
| Partner Relationship Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Web Browser | Microsoft Internet Explorer 4.0 or Earlier |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Access Channels | Wireless / PDA | Lotus Notes/Domino Mail 6.5 Lotus SMTP Gateway |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Authentication / Single Sign-on | PassGo, Sun One, Directory Server Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Authentication / Single Sign-on | PassGo, Sun One, Directory Server, Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Authentication / Single Sign-on | Section 508 BigShot, Dragon Naturally, Speaking JAWS for Windows, KurzWeil 1000, MAGIc for Windows, Nxi NextCom, |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Requirements | Legislative / Compliance | Section 508 BigShot, Dragon Naturally, Speaking JAWS for Windows, KurzWeil 1000, MAGIc for Windows, Nxi NextCom, Optelec, ClearView 700, Spectrum CCTV, PowerBraille, SuperVista, WinTalk TTY |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Service Transport | Transfer Control Protocol (TCP), Internet Protocol (IPv6), File Transfer Protocol (FTP), Hyper Text Transfer (HTTP), Hyper Text Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS), IP Security (IPSEC) |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | Dynamic Host Configuration (DHCP), Domain Name System (DNS), IMAP/POP3, Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP), Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP), Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP), H323 ESMTP |
| Business Rule Management | Service Access and Delivery | Service Transport | Supporting Network Services | Dynamic Host Configuration (DHCP), Domain Name System (DNS), IMAP/POP3, Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP), Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP), Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP), H323 ESMTP |
| Customer Analytics | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | COM+ |
| Data Mining | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | COM+ |
| Surveys | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | COM+ |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | COM+, TIP 1100 |
| Partner Relationship Management | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | COM+, TIP 1100 |
| Customer Feedback | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | TIP 1100 |
| Performance Management | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | TIP 1100 |
| Performance Management | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | TIP 1100 |
| Process Tracking | Service Interface and Integration | Integration | Middleware | TIP 1100 |
| Loading and Archiving | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Format / Classification | XML |
| Loading and Archiving | Service Interface and Integration | Interoperability | Data Format / Classification | XML |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | DBASE II/III, Microsoft Access 95/97, Fox Pro, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |
| Process Tracking | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | DBASE II/III, Microsoft Access 95/97, FoxPro, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0, IMS, VSAM, Microsoft Access 95/97, DB2 /Database 2 Version 4.0, FoxPro, UDS DMS, Microsoft SQL Server 2000, SQL |
| Program / Project | Service Platform and | Database / Storage | Database | FoxPro, Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Management | Infrastructure | | | |
| Query | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | FoxPro,Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |
| Performance Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | IMS,VSAM,Microsoft Access 95/97,DB2 /Database 2 Version 4.0,FoxPro,UDS DMS |
| Partner Relationship Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Microsoft Access 95/97,DBASE 11/111,FoxPro,Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0,IMS,VSAM,Microsoft Access 95/97,DB2 /Database 2 Version 4.0,DB2 /Database 2 Version 4.0,FoxPro,UDS DMS,Microsoft SQL Server 2000,SQL,Microsoft Access 95/97,Oracle 8i,F |
| Surveys | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Microsoft Access 95/97,Oracle 8i,FoxPro,Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |
| Customer Feedback | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Microsoft Access 95/97,VSAM,IMS,DB2 /Database 2 Version 4.0,FoxPro,UDS DMS |
| Knowledge Distribution and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0,FoxPro |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0,Microsoft Access 95/97,DBASE 11/111,FoxPro,Microsoft Access 95/97,SQL,Microsoft SQL Server 2000,Oracle 8i |
| Data Mining | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | Oracle 8i,Microsoft Access 95/97 |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | SQL,Microsoft SQL Server 2000,FoxPro,Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | SQL,Microsoft SQL Server 2000,FoxPro,Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database | SQL,Microsoft SQL Server 2000,FoxPro,Microsoft SQL Server 6.5/6.5 Client/7.0 |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Application Servers | SunOne Enterprise Apache/Tomcat BEA WebLogic |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Application Servers | SunOne Enterprise Apache/Tomcat BEA WebLogic |
| Customer Analytics | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Microsoft Internet Information Server 3.0/4.0/5.0 |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Microsoft Internet Information Server 3.0/4.0/5.0 |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Microsoft Internet Information Server 3.0/4.0/5.0 |
| Knowledge | Service | Delivery | Web Servers | Microsoft Internet Information Server |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Capture | Platform and Infrastructure | Servers | | 3.0/4.0/5.0 |
| Partner Relationship Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Microsoft Internet Information Server 3.0/4.0/5.0 |
| Process Tracking | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Delivery Servers | Web Servers | Microsoft Internet Information Server 3.0/4.0/5.0 |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | Enterprise-level managed switch Workgroup-level switch, Network bridge Media converter, Range extender (network repeater) |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) | Enterprise-level managed switch Workgroup-level switch, Network bridge Media converter, Range extender (network repeater) |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | Ethernet, T1/E1, ATM, OC3 |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Network Devices / Standards | Ethernet, T1/E1, ATM, OC3 |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Open Standards (UNIX), Enterprise Server, Intel-based server, Community Intel-based workstation |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers | Open Standards (UNIX), Enterprise Server, Intel-based server, Community Intel-based workstation |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | ERWin 3.5/Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | ERWin 3.5/Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | ERWin 3.5/Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Partner Relationship Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | ERWin 3.5/Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Process Tracking | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | ERWin 3.5/Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Surveys | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | ERWin 3.5/Unspecified, Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | Oracle Designer 2000 |
| Customer Analytics | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Modeling | Oracle Designer 2000, ERWin 3.5/Unspecified |
| Data Mining | Service Platform and | Software Engineering | Modeling | Oracle Designer 2000, ERWin 3.5/Unspecified |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | Infrastructure | | | |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus |
| Customer Feedback | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus,Eastman Enterprise Work Management,Endeavor |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus,Eastman Enterprise Work Management,Endeavor |
| Partner Relationship Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus,Eastman Enterprise Work Management,Endeavor |
| Performance Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus,Eastman Enterprise Work Management,Endeavor |
| Process Tracking | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | CMPlus,Eastman Enterprise Work Management,Endeavor |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | PVCS |
| Business Rule Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management | PVCS |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | COBOL/OS390 v2.01.0/COBOL II,PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5,OS390,IBM JCL |
| Data Mining | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified)/5.x/6.0 |
| Surveys | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified)/5.x/6.0 |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Microsoft Windows NT 3.51/4.0 SP5/4.0 SP6 and SP6a /version unspecified,COBOL/OS390 v2.01.0/COBOL II,PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5 |
| Knowledge Capture | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | Microsoft Windows NT 3.51/4.0 SP5/4.0 SP6 and SP6a/version unspecified,SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09 |
| Customer Feedback | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | OS390,COBOL/OS390 v2.01.0/COBOL II,IBM JCL,Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified)/5.x/6.0 |
| Customer Analytics | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5,Microsoft Visual Basic (version unspecified)/5.x/6.0 |
| Information Retrieval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5,Microsoft Windows NT 3.51/4.0 SP5/4.0 SP6 and SP6a/version unspecified |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5,Microsoft Windows |

| FEA SRM Component | FEA TRM Service Area | FEA TRM Service Category | FEA TRM Service Standard | Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | Infrastructure | | | NT 3.51/4.0 SP5/4.0 SP6 and SP6a/version unspecified,PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5 |
| Content Review and Approval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09 |
| Content Authoring | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09 |
| Content Publishing and Delivery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09 |
| Content Review and Approval | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09 |
| Tagging and Aggregation | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Platform Dependent | SAS IML - Interactive Matrix Language 6.09 |
| Activity-Based Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Support Platforms | Wireless / Mobile | Microsoft Windows NT 3.51/4.0 SP5/4.0 SP6 and SP6a /version unspecified,COBOL/OS390 v2.01.0/COBOL II,PowerBuilder (version unspecified)/5.0/6.5 |

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

Reuse & Information Sharing BY08

Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

Yes

If "yes," please describe how the application will leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government.

This will utilize all available functions of the Grants.gov portal. Grantees will use the Grants.gov portal to find grant opportunities, apply for grants, and obtain status of submissions. HUD program offices use Grants.gov to post opportunities and keep the grantee apprised of the status of their application.

Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

No

If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

FEA Primary Mapping BY08

FEA Primary Mapping

Reference Model:

BRM

Business Area:

Services For Citizens

Line of Business:

Community and Social Services

Sub Function:

Community and Regional Development

Mapping Code:

101002

II.A: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS BY08

Analysis Background BY08

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?

No

If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?

If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

5/30/2007

If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

N/A

Alternatives Table BY08

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternatives Analysis Results

| Send to OMB | Alternative Analyzed | Description of Alternative | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| True | TBD | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| True | TBD | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| True | TBD | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| False | | | 0 | 0 |
| False | | | 0 | 0 |

Selected Alternative BY08

Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance process and why was it chosen?

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

II.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? No

What is the date of the risk management plan?

Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? No

If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan:

If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed? Yes

If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan? 11/30/2006

If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

Investment Risks BY08

Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

This will be addressed when the Risk Management Plan is formulated.

II.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Earned Value BY08

Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? Yes

Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

What is the Planned Value (PV)? 17.672000

What is the Earned Value (EV)? 17.180000

What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? 17.174000

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? Contractor Only

EVMS "As of" date: 6/30/2006

What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)? 0.972000

What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? -0.492200

What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? 1.000000

What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)? 0.005200

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

Cost/Schedule Variance BY08

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

If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?

If "yes," explain the variance:

If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?

What is the most current "Estimate at Completion"? 35.777000

Performance Baseline BY08

Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year? **No**

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

If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

| Milestone Number | Description of Milestone | Initial Baseline | | Current Baseline | | | | Current Baseline Variance | | Percent Complete |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------|------------|---------|---------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | Planned Completion Date | Total Cost (Estimated) | Completion Date | | Total Cost | | Schedule (# days) | Cost | |
| | | | | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | | | |
| 0 | eGrants Consolidated | 09/30/2016 | \$257.550 | 09/30/2016 | | \$203.224 | \$8.797 | | \$194.427 | 4.86% |
| 1 | eGrants PMO Project Plan | 09/30/2016 | \$210.364 | 09/30/2016 | | \$162.038 | \$0.192 | | \$161.846 | 0.50% |
| 1.0 | eGrants Planning | 06/04/2007 | \$0.942 | 06/04/2007 | | \$1.543 | \$0.192 | | \$1.351 | 52.53% |
| 1.1 | Program Management Support | 06/04/2007 | \$0.270 | 06/04/2007 | | \$0.270 | \$0.081 | | \$0.189 | 30.00% |
| 1.2 | Project Management | 06/04/2007 | \$0.158 | 06/04/2007 | | \$0.158 | \$0.047 | | \$0.111 | 30.00% |
| 1.3 | Technical Support | 02/27/2007 | \$0.170 | 02/27/2007 | | \$0.771 | \$0.064 | | \$0.707 | 81.78% |
| 1.3.1 | Functional Requirements | 11/21/2006 | \$0.034 | 11/21/2006 | | \$0.000 | | | | 5.00% |
| 1.3.1 | Update OMB 300 | 09/11/2006 | \$0.046 | 09/11/2006 | | \$0.630 | \$0.063 | | \$0.567 | 100.00% |
| 1.3.2 | Risk Management Plan | 11/30/2006 | \$0.005 | 11/30/2006 | | \$0.005 | \$0.001 | | \$0.004 | 10.00% |
| 1.3.3 | Modernization Strategy | 01/29/2007 | \$0.022 | 01/29/2007 | | \$0.051 | \$0.000 | | \$0.051 | 0% |
| 1.3.5 | Concept of Operations | 12/11/2006 | \$0.017 | 12/11/2006 | | \$0.017 | \$0.000 | | \$0.017 | 0% |
| 1.3.5 | Performance Measurement Plan | 02/27/2007 | \$0.017 | 02/27/2007 | | \$0.017 | \$0.000 | | \$0.017 | 0% |
| 1.3.6 | Acquisition Plan | 02/01/2007 | \$0.012 | 02/01/2007 | | \$0.013 | \$0.000 | | \$0.013 | 0% |
| 1.3.7 | Alternative Analysis | 01/29/2007 | \$0.017 | 01/29/2007 | | \$0.038 | \$0.000 | | \$0.038 | 0% |
| 1.4 | Strategic Alignment Activities | 06/04/2007 | \$0.344 | 06/04/2007 | | \$0.344 | \$0.000 | | \$0.344 | 15.00% |
| 1.6 | eGrants FY06 Maintenance | 09/30/2006 | \$0.632 | 09/30/2006 | | \$0.632 | \$0.000 | | \$0.632 | 0% |
| 1.7 | eGrants FY07 Development | 09/30/2007 | \$15.300 | 09/30/2007 | | \$15.300 | | | | 0% |
| 1.7.1 | Continue Consortia | 09/30/2007 | \$3.825 | 09/30/2007 | | \$3.825 | | | | 0% |
| 1.7.2 | Establish Joint PMO | 09/30/2007 | \$3.825 | 09/30/2007 | | \$3.825 | | | | 0% |
| 1.7.3 | Create Cross Cutting Services - Round 1 | 09/30/2007 | \$3.825 | 09/30/2007 | | \$3.825 | | | | 0% |
| 1.7.4 | Redirect Resources Funding | 09/30/2007 | \$3.825 | 09/30/2007 | | \$3.825 | | | | 0% |
| 1.8 | eGrants FY08 Development | 09/30/2008 | \$9.580 | 09/30/2008 | | \$9.580 | | | | 0% |
| 1.8.1 | Rollout Second Round of Cross Cutting Services | 09/30/2008 | \$2.395 | 09/30/2008 | | \$2.395 | | | | 0% |
| | Finalize | 09/30/2008 | \$2.395 | 09/30/2008 | | \$2.395 | | | | 0% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|----------------|--|------------------|-------------|
| 1.8.2 | Existing Contracts and Activate New Ones | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.8.3 | Finalize Legislative Requirements to Ready HUD Systems for Consortium | 09/30/2008 | \$2.395 | 09/30/2008 | | \$2.395 | | | | 0% |
| 1.8.4 | Retire Redundant Services | 09/30/2008 | \$2.395 | 09/30/2008 | | \$2.395 | | | | 0% |
| 1.9 | eGrants FY09 Development | 09/30/2009 | \$12.620 | 09/30/2009 | | \$12.620 | | | | 0% |
| 1.9.1 | Complete Enterprise Implementation | 09/30/2009 | \$6.310 | 09/30/2009 | | \$6.310 | | | | 0% |
| 1.9.2 | Consolidate Remaining Contracts | 09/30/2009 | \$6.310 | 09/30/2009 | | \$6.310 | | | | 0% |
| 1.10 | eGrants FY07 Maintenance | 09/30/2007 | \$2.450 | 09/30/2009 | | \$2.450 | | | | 0% |
| 1.10 | eGrants FY08 Maintenance | 09/30/2008 | \$7.452 | 09/30/2008 | | \$7.452 | \$0.000 | | \$7.452 | 0% |
| 1.11 | eGrants FY09 Development | 09/30/2009 | \$12.275 | 09/30/2009 | | \$12.275 | | | | 0% |
| 1.12 | eGrants FY09 Maintenance | 09/30/2009 | \$10.000 | 09/30/2009 | | \$10.000 | | | | 0% |
| 1.12 | eGrants FY10 Development | 09/30/2010 | \$15.989 | 09/30/2010 | | \$15.989 | | | | 0% |
| 1.12 | eGrants FY10 Maintenance | 09/30/2010 | \$6.000 | 09/30/2010 | | \$6.000 | | | | 0% |
| 1.13 | eGrants FY11 Development | 09/30/2011 | \$7.830 | 09/30/2011 | | \$7.830 | | | | 0% |
| 1.13 | eGrants FY12 and Beyond Development | 09/30/2016 | \$41.650 | 09/30/2016 | | \$41.650 | | | | 0% |
| 1.14 | FY 12 and Beyond Maintenance | 09/30/2016 | \$67.644 | 09/30/2016 | | \$18.717 | | | | 0% |
| 2 | Legacy Investments | 09/30/2011 | \$47.186 | 09/30/2011 | | \$41.186 | \$8.605 | | \$32.581 | 22.02% |
| 2.1 | FY05 Development | 09/30/2005 | \$0.639 | 09/30/2005 | | \$0.639 | \$0.639 | | \$0.000 | 100.00% |
| 2.2 | FY06 Development | 09/30/2006 | \$8.153 | 09/30/2006 | | \$2.153 | \$1.615 | | \$0.538 | 75.00% |
| 2.3 | FY05 Maintenance | 09/30/2005 | \$1.888 | 09/30/2005 | | \$1.888 | \$1.888 | | \$0.000 | 100.00% |
| 2.4 | FY06 Maintenance | 09/30/2006 | \$6.569 | 09/30/2006 | | \$6.569 | \$4.463 | | \$2.106 | 75.00% |
| 2.5 | FY07 Maintenance | 09/30/2007 | \$5.951 | 09/30/2007 | | \$5.951 | | | | 0% |
| 2.6 | FY08 Maintenance | 09/30/2008 | \$7.450 | 09/30/2008 | | \$7.450 | | | | 0% |
| 2.7 | FY09 Maintenance | 09/30/2009 | \$5.850 | 09/30/2009 | | \$5.850 | | | | 0% |
| 2.8 | FY10 Maintenance | 09/30/2010 | \$5.850 | 09/30/2010 | | \$5.850 | | | | 0% |
| 2.9 | FY11 Maintenance | 09/30/2011 | \$4.836 | 09/30/2011 | | \$4.836 | | | | 0% |
| Project Totals | | 09/30/2016 | \$257.550 | 09/30/2016 | | \$203.224 | \$8.797 | | \$194.427 | 4.86 |

III.A: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? | No |
| What is the date of the risk management plan? | |
| Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? | No |
| If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan: | |
| If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed? | Yes |
| If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan? | 11/30/2006 |
| If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? | |

III.B: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Operational Analysis BY08

| | |
|--|--|
| Was operational analysis conducted? | |
| If "yes," provide the date the operational analysis was completed. | |
| Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results. | |
| If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future: | |

Performance Baseline BY08

Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts.

What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? **Contractor Only**

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

| Milestone Number | Description of Milestone | Planned | | Actual | | Variance | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------|-------------------|------|
| | | Completion Date | Total Cost | Completion Date | Total Cost | Schedule (# days) | Cost |
| Project Totals | | | | | | | |

IV.A: E-GOV AND LINES OF BUSINESS OVERSIGHT BY08

Partners BY08

Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative or a Line of Business(LOB), i.e., selected the E-Gov and LOB Oversight choice in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above. Investments identified as E-Gov and LOB Oversight will complete only Parts I and IV of the exhibit 300.

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

As a joint exhibit 300, please identify the agency stakeholders. Provide the partner agency and partner agency approval date for this joint exhibit 300.

Stakeholder Table

| Partner Agency Name | Partner Agency | Joint Exhibit Approval Date |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|

Partnering Strategies BY08

Provide the partnering strategies you are implementing with the participating agencies and organizations. Identify all partner agency capital assets supporting the common solution; Managing Partner capital assets should also be included in this joint exhibit 300. These capital assets should be included in the Summary of Spending table of Part I, Section B. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53)

Partner Capital Assets within this Investment

| Partner Agency Name | Partner Agency | Partner Agency Asset Title | Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY2008) |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--|
|---------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--|

Partner Funding BY08

For jointly funded initiative activities, provide in the "Partner Funding Strategies Table": the name(s) of partner agencies; the UPI of the partner agency investments; and the partner agency contributions for CY and BY. Please indicate partner contribution amounts (in-kind contributions should also be included in this amount) and fee-for-service amounts. (Partner Agency Asset UPIs should also appear on the Partner Agency's exhibit 53. For non-IT fee-for-service amounts the Partner exhibit 53 UPI can be left blank)

Partner Funding Strategies

| Partner Agency Name | Partner Agency | Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY2008) | CY Contribution | CY Fee-for-Service | BY Contribution | BY Fee-for-Service |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|

Analysis Background BY08

An Alternatives Analysis for E-Gov and LOB initiatives should also be obtained. At least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline (i.e., the status quo),

should be included in the joint exhibit 300. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project? **No**

If "yes," what is the date of the analysis?

If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? **5/30/2007**

If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:
N/A

Alternatives Table BY08

Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

Alternatives Analysis Results

| Send to OMB | Alternative Analyzed | Description of Alternative | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate | Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| True | TBD | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| True | TBD | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| True | TBD | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| False | | | 0 | 0 |
| False | | | 0 | 0 |

Selected Alternative BY08

Which alternative was selected by the Initiative Governance process and why was it chosen?

What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Quantitative Benefits BY08

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

Federal Quantitative Benefits

| | Budgeted Cost Savings | Cost Avoidance | Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings | Justification for Cost Avoidance |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|----------------------------------|
| PY - 6 2000 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PY - 5 2001 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PY - 4 2002 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PY - 3 2003 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PY - 2 2004 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PY - 1 2005 | 0 | 0 | | |
| PY 2006 | 0 | 0 | | |
| CY 2007 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY 2008 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 1 2009 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 2 2010 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 3 2011 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 4 2012 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 5 2013 | 0 | 0 | | |

| | Budgeted Cost Savings | Cost Avoidance | Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings | Justification for Cost Avoidance |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|----------------------------------|
| BY + 6 2014 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 7 2015 | 0 | 0 | | |
| BY + 8 2016 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total LLC Benefit | 0 | 0 | | |

IV.B: RISK MANAGEMENT BY08

Risk Management Plan BY08

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? | No |
| What is the date of the risk management plan? | |
| Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB? | No |
| If "yes," describe any significant changes to the Risk Management Plan: | |
| If there currently is no risk plan, will a plan be developed? | Yes |
| If "yes," what is the planned completion date of the risk plan? | 11/30/2006 |
| If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks? | |

Investment Risks BY08

Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

This will be addressed when the Risk Management Plan is formulated.

IV.C: COST AND SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE BY08

Earned Value BY08

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

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

| | |
|---|-----|
| Are you using EVM to manage this investment? | |
| Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard - 748? | Yes |
| If "no," explain plans to implement EVM: | |

Please provide a brief summary of the operational analysis results.

This sub-sections questions are NOT applicable for capital assets with ONLY O&M

Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)? | Contractor Only |
| EVMS "As of" date: | 6/30/2006 |
| What is the Planned Value (PV)? | 17.672000 |
| What is the Earned Value (EV)? | 17.180000 |
| What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)? | 17.174000 |
| What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)? | 0.972000 |
| What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)? | -0.492200 |
| What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)? | 1.000000 |
| What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)? | 0.005200 |

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

Cost/Schedule Variance BY08

| | |
|--|----|
| Is the CV% or SV% greater than 10%? (CV% = CV/EV x 100; SV% = SV/PV x 100) | No |
| If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both? | |
| If "yes," explain the variance: | |
| If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken? | |

