

BY09 Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary Exhibit 300

PART I: SUMMARY INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION

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

Submission Date Time:

09/10/2007

Submission Id: 4,765

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

The following series of questions are to be completed for all investments to help OMB to identify which agency and bureau is responsible for managing each capital asset, which OMB MAX budget account funds the project, the kind of the project, who to contact with questions about the information provided in the exhibit 300, and whether or not it is an IT or a non-IT capital asset.

(1) Date of Submission:	2007-09-10-04:00
(2) Agency:	422
(3) Bureau:	00
(4) Name of this Capital Asset: (250 Character Max)	Grants Management Line of Business (GMLOB)
(5) Unique ID (Unique Project Identifier):	422-00-01-04-01-1300-24
Format xxx-xx-xx-xx-xx-xxxx-xx (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	
(6) What kind of investment will this be in FY2009?	Multi-Agency Collaboration

(7) What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2005
--	--------

(8) Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes a gap in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap: (2500 Char Max)

GMLOB is a multi-agency initiative to develop a government-wide solution to support end-to-end grants management activities that promote citizen access, customer service, and agency financial and technical stewardship. The initiative's goals are to: improve customer service, reduce cost, and increase standardization and streamlining. This Exhibit 300 reflects the PMO, a non-IT function, and also captures a roll up of the selected Consortia Leads, which require IT investments and are captured in agency Exhibit 300s. The target operating model states that the grants management community will process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services. A "consortia-based" approach is being used to execute the operating model. Each consortium provides planning, leadership, business, and program direction with the goal of defining a common solution to meet its members' needs. The common solution is hosted and operated by a service center under a Consortium Lead that provides the system or system components. The Department of Education (ED), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the National Science Foundation (NSF) were named as Consortia Leads by OMB in the FY 2006 President's Budget. OMB may elect to name additional Consortia Lead agencies in the future. The initiative is supported by the GMLoB PMO which is funded by partner agency contributions. The PMO supports the following work lanes: governance, reporting, communications, consortia and migrating agency support, and standards and streamlining. In August 2007, the Grants Executive Board approved extension of PMO support to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act and the Grants Policy Committee. GMLOB delivers benefits to the grant community and meets government-wide missions, strategic goals and objectives. GMLOB will: promote inter-agency consolidation and streamlining for grants processes, systems, and forms; reduce the number of disparate systems, resulting in decreased costs and effort associated with training, support, operations, maintenance, and development; reduce the number of data sources and ease the grantee burden associated with government-wide reporting of grant program performance; and provide a standardized approach to allow organizations with their own grants processing systems to integrate with GMLOB consortium-driven service centers.

(9) Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	2007-08-20-04:00

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

(11) Contact Information of Project Manager?

Name:	NSF and HHS have been named as co-managing partners for GMLOB. The co-program managers are: Mary Santonastasso (NSF), Terry Hurst (HHS)
Phone Number:	Mary Santonastasso: 703-292-4565, Terry Hurst: 202-205-3514
E-Mail:	Mary Santonastasso: msantona@nsf.gov, Terry Hurst: terry.hurst@hhs.gov

(11a) What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?
Senior/Expert-level

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

(a) Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	yes
(b) Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	no
[1] If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	Select...
[2] If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	Select...
[3] If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	Select...

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

If "yes," select all that apply:

President's Management Agenda (PMA) Initiatives
Expanded E-Government

a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?

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

(14) Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?

no

(a) If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	Select...
(b) If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program ?	
(c) If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	Select...

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

yes
 If the answer to Question 15 was "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below.
 If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

(16) What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council PM Guidance)?	Level 3
(17) What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
(18) Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB's Memorandum M-05-23)?	yes
(19) Is this a financial management system?	no

(a) If "yes," does this investment address a FFMLA compliance area?	Select...
[1] If "yes," which compliance area:	
[2] If "no," what does it address?	
(b) If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52:	

(20) What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following?

(This should total 100%)

Hardware %:	Software %:	Services %:	Other %:	Total %
11	6	80	2	99

(21) If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

yes

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

Name:	Leslie A. Jensen
Phone Number:	703-292-8060
Title:	NSF Privacy Act Officer
E-Mail:	ljensen@nsf.gov

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

(24) Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas? no

Section B: Summary of Funding (All Capital Assets)

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

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)									
All amounts represent Budget Authority (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 & Earlier (Spending Prior to 2007)	PY 2007	CY 2008	BY 2009	BY +1 2010	BY+2 2011	BY+3 2012	BY+4 2013 and beyond	Total
Planning	\$0.945	\$2.748	\$4.490	\$3.920					
Acquisition	\$5.091	\$10.423	\$19.522	\$15.976					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition	\$6.036	\$13.171	\$24.012	\$19.896					
Operations & Maintenance	\$7.160	\$3.590	\$4.285	\$7.906					
TOTAL	\$13.196	\$16.761	\$28.297	\$27.802					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	\$1.047	\$1.995	\$2.668	\$3.190					
Number of FTE represented by cost	7	14	16	17					

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

(2) Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's? yes

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

• ACF: No additional FTE's required by the project. • NSF: This project will require NSF to hire a total of seven additional FTEs. NSF hired two FTEs in PY 2007 and will hire two additional FTEs in CY 2008, two in BY 2009, and one in BY 2010. • ED: Two additional government FTEs may be required in FY09, depending on the number of consortia partners.

(3) If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

• ACF: New business partners require additional, unanticipated development efforts. Project was re-baselined in May 2007 to include approximately \$3M new development costs. • NSF: The scope of Research.gov has increased as the result of new legislative mandates such as the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act and agency requirements for public information dissemination.

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

(1) Complete the table for all contracts and/or task orders in place or planned for this investment:

<p>Contract or Task Order Number: G5-25F-9806H Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes Contract Actual/Planned Award Date: 03/30/2006 Contract/TO Start Date: 05/01/2006 Contract/TO End Date: 04/30/2008 Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.883 Inter Agency Acquisition: no Performance Based Contract: no Competitively Awarded Contract: no Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: no Security Privacy Clause: yes</p> <p>Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information: CO Name: Steven Strength, NSF CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): (703)-292-8242 / sstrengt@nsf.gov CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3 If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) Select...</p>
<p>Contract or Task Order Number: 1406-04-06-CT-63779 Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes Contract Actual/Planned Award Date: 11/30/2006 Contract/TO Start Date: 12/01/2006</p>

Contract/TO End Date:
08/18/2007
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.000 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: yes
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: 1435-04-05-42978 Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
08/18/2006
Contract/TO Start Date:
08/19/2006
Contract/TO End Date:
08/18/2007
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.580 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: yes
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials
Has the Contract Being Awarded: no
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
08/18/2007
Contract/TO Start Date:
08/19/2007

Contract/TO End Date:
08/18/2008
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.022 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: yes
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: 1435-04-05-42978 Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
08/18/2007
Contract/TO Start Date:
08/19/2007
Contract/TO End Date:
08/18/2008
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.590 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: yes
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials
Has the Contract Being Awarded: no
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
08/18/2008
Contract/TO Start Date:
08/19/2008

Contract/TO End Date:

08/18/2009

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.040 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: 1435-04-05-42978 Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price

Has the Contract Being Awarded: no

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

08/18/2008

Contract/TO Start Date:

08/19/2008

Contract/TO End Date:

08/18/2009

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.610 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials

Has the Contract Being Awarded: no

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

08/18/2009

Contract/TO Start Date:

08/19/2009

Contract/TO End Date:

08/18/2010

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.069 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: 1435-04-05-42978 Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price

Has the Contract Being Awarded: no

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

08/18/2009

Contract/TO Start Date:

08/19/2009

Contract/TO End Date:

08/18/2010

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.660 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: 1435-04-05-42978 Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price

Has the Contract Being Awarded: no

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

08/18/2010

Contract/TO Start Date:

08/19/2010

Contract/TO End Date:
08/18/2011
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.710 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: yes
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price
Has the Contract Being Awarded: no
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
08/18/2011
Contract/TO Start Date:
08/19/2011
Contract/TO End Date:
08/18/2012
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.770 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: yes
Competitively Awarded Contract: yes
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price
Has the Contract Being Awarded: no
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
08/18/2012
Contract/TO Start Date:
08/19/2012
Contract/TO End Date:

08/18/2013

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.880 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins, ACF

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: FFP: Firm Fixed Price

Has the Contract Being Awarded: no

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

08/18/2013

Contract/TO Start Date:

08/19/2013

Contract/TO End Date:

08/18/2014

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$3.935 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: David Jenkins

CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-690-5802 / david.jenkins@acf.hhs.gov

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): NA

If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) yes

Contract or Task Order Number: Booz Allen Hamilton Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M:
Time & Materials

Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

03/30/2007

Contract/TO Start Date:

04/01/2007

Contract/TO End Date:

04/01/2009

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$27.200 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Steven Strength, NSF

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

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3

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

Contract or Task Order Number: Hosting Provider -- TBD Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials

Has the Contract Being Awarded: no

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

09/30/2007

Contract/TO Start Date:

10/01/2007

Contract/TO End Date:

10/01/2008

Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.800 Inter Agency Acquisition: no

Performance Based Contract: yes

Competitively Awarded Contract: yes

Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes

Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Steven Strength, NSF

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

CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3

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

Contract or Task Order Number: SRA Touchstone Contract No: GS23F9806H Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials

Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes

Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:

01/01/2007

Contract/TO Start Date:

01/01/2007

Contract/TO End Date:
06/01/2008
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$0.500 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: no
Competitively Awarded Contract: no
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: no
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Steven Strength, NSF
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 703-292-8242 / sstrength@nsf.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) Select...

Contract or Task Order Number: Contract ED06CO0031, PMO for G5 Project Type of
Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
04/03/2006
Contract/TO Start Date:
04/03/2006
Contract/TO End Date:
12/31/2008
Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.288 Inter Agency Acquisition: no
Performance Based Contract: no
Competitively Awarded Contract: no
Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes
Security Privacy Clause: yes

Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:

CO Name: Terence Haynes, ED
CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-245-6179 / Terence.Haynes@ed.gov
CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3
If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) Select...

Contract or Task Order Number: ED-06-DO-0269, IBM G-5 Grants Management Type of
Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials
Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes
Contract Actual/Planned Award Date:
09/30/2006
Contract/TO Start Date:

<p>10/02/2006 Contract/TO End Date: 09/30/2009 Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$14.805 Inter Agency Acquisition: no Performance Based Contract: yes Competitively Awarded Contract: yes Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes Security Privacy Clause: yes</p> <p>Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:</p> <p>CO Name: Terence Haynes, ED CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-245-6179 / Terence.Haynes@ed.gov CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3 If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) Select...</p>
<p>Contract or Task Order Number: ED-06-CO-0136, 1 Source Consulting, Independent Type of Contract/TO Used: T&M: Time & Materials Has the Contract Being Awarded: yes Contract Actual/Planned Award Date: 09/30/2006 Contract/TO Start Date: 10/02/2006 Contract/TO End Date: 09/30/2008 Contract/TO Total Value (\$M): \$1.485 Inter Agency Acquisition: no Performance Based Contract: no Competitively Awarded Contract: no Alternative Financing: NA EVM Required: yes Security Privacy Clause: yes</p> <p>Contracting Officer (CO) Contact Information:</p> <p>CO Name: Terence Haynes, ED CO Contact Information (Phone/Email): 202-245-6179 / Terence.Haynes@ed.gov CO Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A): 3 If N/A has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N) Select...</p>

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

The GMLOB PMO itself is not involved in acquisition or development activities. Contract Number: GS23F9806 (SRA Touchstone) does not require earned value because the contract is for program management and is not related to IT development. The GMLOB PMO, however, will work with Consortia Leads and service centers involved in acquisition or development activities to use an EVM system in accordance with their agency policies.

(3) Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance? yes

Section 508 Compliance Explanation:

Section 508 requires that electronic and information technology developed, procured, used, or maintained by all agencies and departments of the Federal Government be accessible both to Federal employees with disabilities and to members of the public with disabilities.

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

no

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

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

[1] If "no," briefly explain why:

The GMLOB PMO is not involved in acquisition or development activities. However, each Consortium is expected to develop an acquisition plan in accordance with their agency requirements. The date of each Consortium's acquisition plan is as follows: ACF: 5/2/07; NSF: 7/31/07; ED: 1/2/06

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s)	Measurement Area IT	Measurement Grouping IT	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to	Actual Results
-------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	----------	------------------------	----------------

	Supported					the Baseline	
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of service grant system funding development contracts	Four contracts	Reduce to one contract (Enterprise GATES)	Reduced to one contract
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of OPDIV-unique grants processes and policies	Three OPDIV-unique systems	Reduce to one system (Enterprise GATES)	Reduced to one system
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of HHS social service grants managed through GATES	54%	Increase to 86%	Increased to 86%
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF: Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review	21 days	Reduce to one day for electronic submission	Reduced to one day
2005	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GATES	99.0% scheduled availability	Increase to 99.5% scheduled availability	Increased to 99.5%
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within Enterprise GATES	Four OPDIVs (AoA, ACF, IHS, CMS)	Increase to six OPDIVs	Increased to six OPDIVS (added OPHS and HRSA)

	across the lifespan						
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of Enterprise Architecture (EA) framework models completed	One model (As-Is) partially completed	Increase to two models (As-Is and To-Be) completed and integrated	Two models (As-Is and To-Be) completed and integrated
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Level of E-Authentication	E-Authentication level 1	Increase to E-Authentication level 2	Increased to E-Authentication level 2
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed via Grants.gov	10% of grant applications via Grants.gov	Increase to 20% of grant applications via Grants.gov	Increased to 20% of grant applications via Grants.gov
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC	10% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increase to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increased to 50% of grantees reporting via OLDC
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Availability	ACF: Percent alignment of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES OLDC with ACF and HHS Enterprise IT Architecture	60% alignment, excluding some legacy GATES components (e.g., PowerBuilder clients)	Increase to 100% alignment	Increased to 100% alignment
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF: Number of days between submission of grant application to initiation of HHS Review	One day	Maintain one day	Maintained one day

	and families across the lifespan						
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF: Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications	Up to 90 days to review and approve grant applications	Reduce 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and approve grant applications	Reduced 20%, or up to 72 days, to review and approve grant applications
2006	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.5% scheduled availability	Increase to 99.9% scheduled availability	Increased to 99.9% scheduled availability
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Technology	Load levels	ACF: Software requirements for a GrantSolutions.gov/GATES client workstation	6 MB	Reduce to 0 MB (web browser based access)	TBD
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Six OPDIVs	Increase to seven OPDIVs	TBD
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of non-competing grants applications processed via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	20% of non-competing grant applications via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Increase to 25% of non-competing grant applications via e GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	TBD
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC	50% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increase to 55% of grantees reporting via OLDC	TBD

	individuals and families across the lifespan						
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF: Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications	Up to 72 days to review and approve grant applications	Reduce 20%, or up to 58 days, to review and approve grant applications	TBD
2007	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Seven OPDIVs	Increase to eight OPDIVs	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	25% of grant applications via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Increase to 30% of grants applications via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC	55% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increase to 60% of grantees reporting via OLDC	TBD
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF: Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications	up to 58 days to review and approve grant applications	Reduce 20%, or up to 46 days, to review and approve grant applications	TBD

	well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan						
2008	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ACF: Number of OPDIV grants management system requirements integrated within GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Eight OPDIVs	Increase to nine OPDIVs	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of grants applications processed via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	30% of grant applications via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	Increase to 35% of grant applications via GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ACF: Percent of grants reporting processed via OLDC	60% of grantees reporting via OLDC	Increase to 65% of grantees reporting via OLDC	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence and social well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ACF: Number of days to review and approve GrantSolutions.gov/GATES grant applications	Up to 46 days to review and approve grant applications	Reduce 20%, or up to 37 days, to review and approve grant applications	TBD
2009	S.O. 3.1 - Promote the economic independence	Technology	Availability	ACF: Percent of time for scheduled availability of GrantSolutions.gov/GATES	99.9% scheduled availability	Maintain 99.9% scheduled availability	TBD

2011		
2011		
2011		
2011		
2012		
2012		

2012		
2012		
2012		
2013		
2013		
2013		

2013							
2013							
2005	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization and streamlining	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	0	0
2006	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization and streamlining	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	Consortia Lead agencies selected by OMB	3 designated Consortia Lead agencies and 2 MoU's signed by member agencies to partner with ACF
2007	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization and streamlining	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	10 subagencies are currently working with or being cross-served by a Consortium
2008	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD

	n and streamlining						
2009	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization and streamlining	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2010	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization and streamlining	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2011	Reduce cost, improve customer service, increase standardization and streamlining	Processes and Activities	Participation	PMO: Agency Participation in Consortia	0	All grant-making agencies will be participating in a consortium	TBD
2008	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	0	3	TBD
2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	NSF: Grantee satisfaction	0	60%	TBD
2008	Stewardship	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	NSF: # of Agencies using offerings	0	2	TBD
2008	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Participation	NSF: # of Registered Users	0	2,000	TBD
2008	Stewardship	Technology	Availability	NSF: Portal Uptime	0	99%	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Mission and Business Results	Scientific and Technological Research and Innovation	NSF: # of Grants Management service offerings	3	4	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	NSF: Grantee Satisfaction	60%	65%	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	NSF: # of Agencies using offerings	2	3	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Processes and Activities	Innovation and Improvement	NSF: # of Registered Users	2,000	5,000	TBD
2009	Stewardship	Technology	Availability	NSF: Portal Uptime	99%	99.5%	TBD
2010							
2010							
2010							
2010							

2010							
2011							
2011							
2011							
2011							
2011							
2012							
2012							
2012							
2012							
2012							
2006	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Customer Results	Customer Impact or Burden	ED: Selection as a GMLOB consortia lead in order to achieve the goal of reducing the number of grant management systems in the Federal government.	The GMLOB is a new initiative and there are no consortia providers.	Recommended as a GMLOB consortia Lead	ED received formal approval from OMB to go forward as a consortia lead on 12/2/2005
2006	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Mission and Business Results	Information Management	ED: # of client agencies by 4th Quarter 06	0	1	As of Q4 FY 06 there are no partners. Progress toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2006	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	ED: Project Management Office (PMO) contract will be awarded by April 2006 to establish internal processes and best practices.	No PMO exists for project	PMO in place	PMO contract awarded 4/3/06
2006	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Technology	Data Reliability and Quality	ED: # of COTS products reviewed in market analysis to support ED's grant management business process.	Market analysis prior to legacy system was not conducted.	8	18 vendors were evaluated to assess viability of COTS solution to support ED's grants management business process
2007	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ED: A formal G5 Governance Structure (consisting of consortia partners and ED) will be adopted and implemented by Q1 FY07	No G5 Consortia Governance structure exists as of Q2 FY06.	A formal governance plan that identifies the governance structure and the roles, responsibilities, and governing procedures will be in place by Q1 FY07.	As of December 06, a formal governance plan has been adopted and is being implemented. The First G5 Executive Steering Committee meeting took place on 1/30/2007.
2007	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	ED: client agency participation in development decisions	0 - GMLOB is a new initiative. No baseline information exists.	100% of all client agencies will participate in all G5 development decisions	As of December 2006, no partners have joined ED consortia. OMB has decided to delay the 2nd round of consortia leads. The affect is that an

							incomplete 2nd round makes it harder for current consortia leads to close deals with partner agencies
2007	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	ED: # of client agencies	0	2	ED has no partner agencies
2007	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Technology	Compliance and Deviations	ED: Adoption of CMMI Level 3 or better software development lifecycle practices to ensure repeatable, disciplined methodology to solution development.	CMMI Level 3 or better does not exist for the project as of Q2 FY06	CMMI Level 3 or better will be adopted by the G5 project.	The G5 Integrator is certified at a CMMI level 3 and currently pursuing CMMI level 5 certification
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Processes and Activities	Financial Management	ED: # of identified requirements	211 total Phase 1 requirements have been identified.	100% implementation of critical requirements	Progress toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Technology	Lifecycle/Change Management	ED: # of changes to the functional architecture & candidate services	A maximum of 50 changes can be identified	No more than 50 changes.	Progress toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Technology	Lifecycle/Change Management	ED: # of design/development updates to the G5 portal	A maximum of 50 updates to the design/ development can be identified	No more than 50 updates.	Progress toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Processes and Activities	Errors	ED: # of test cases passed (A&I & UAT)	720 test cases must pass in each test cycle.	More than 720 test cases	Progress toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Processes and Activities	Errors	ED: # of defects found in UAT testing	900 defects can be identified during UAT	No more than 900 defects should be encountered in UAT.	Progress toward performance goals will be reported on a quarterly basis.
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Processes and Activities	Lifecycle/Change Management	ED: Total defects found vs. total defects deferred to next build/phase	45 defects can be deferred.	No more than 45 defects can be deferred.	TBD
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	ED: % of stakeholders are informed about the G5 implementation	80% of the stakeholders will be informed.	No less than 80% will be informed.	TBD
2008	Cross-goal Strategy on Management: Objective 1	Customer Results	Customer Training	ED: % of respondents are prepared to fully utilize the G5 system	70% of respondents will be prepared.	No less than 70% will be prepared.	TBD

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets Only)

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

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the “Systems in Planning” table (Table 3) and the “Operational Systems” table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the “Name of System” column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled “Name of System” in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer “yes” for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

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

(1) Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment: **yes**

(a) If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year: **7.0**

(2) Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment. **yes**

(3) Systems in Planning - Security:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Planned or Actual C&A Completion Date
ED G5	Contractor and Government	11/13/2007	10/01/2007
NSF Research Portal	Government Only	12/31/2007	11/30/2007

(4) Operational Systems - Security:

Name Of System	Agency Or Contractor Operated system	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact Level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has the C&A been completed using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards we used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Completed Security Control Testing	Date Contingency Plan Tested
ACF OA Grants Administration Tracking & Evaluation System	Government Only	Moderate	yes	05/30/06	FIPS 200 / NIST 800-53	12/11/05	12/11/05

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

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

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

no

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

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

ACF: ACF contractors are subject to the provisions of the GrantSolutions.gov/GATES Integrated Privacy and Security Plan. Security procedures and controls are monitored, verified, and validated by a joint Federal/contractor team. The GrantSolutions.gov/GATES system contracts require all contractor staff to have appropriate background checks. Before contractor staff can access GrantSolutions.gov/GATES data, they must go through an approval process, receive security awareness training, and sign a rules of behavior document. Security level designations, need-to-know, and security profiles for each position controls access to data. NSF: NSF's Division of Information security team conducts annual security control reviews. NSF uses a range of methods to review the security of operations through contract requirements, project management oversight and review, certification and accreditation processes, IG independent reviews, proactive testing of controls through penetration testing and vulnerability scans to ensure services are adequately secure and meet the requirements of FISMA, OMB policy, NIST guidelines and NSF policy. All NSF employees and contract staff are required to complete an on-line security training class each year, including the rules of behavior. Background checks are done routinely as a part of the NSF contracting process, and IT security requirements are stated

in the contract's statement of work. Contractor security procedures are monitored, verified, and validated by the Agency in the same way as for government employees. ED: Contractors working on the G5 system are required to undergo background investigations commensurate with level of risk associated with their position within 14 days of the date the contractor employee is placed in a position. Upon starting work for the Department, the contractor's position risk level is determined by the Contracting Officer's Representative and the contractor is then required to submit the appropriate security paperwork within two weeks. All contractors are required to go through security awareness training on an annual basis. In addition, certain NIST job categories, such as database administrators, developers, and network administrators, are required to attend specialized security training. All training is available through and tracked by the Department.

(8) Planning and Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name Of System	(b) Is this a new system?	(c) Is there at least one PIA which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
ED G5	yes	no	No, because PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	yes	The internet link is not yet available, but will be available upon implementation of G5.
ACF OA Grants Administration Tracking & Evaluation System	no	yes	http://www.hhs.gov/pia/acf/html/New%20ACF%20PIA_August1320074.html	no	This system is not subject to the Privacy Act and therefore does not require a SORN.
NSF Research Portal	yes	no	This system is not yet operational, but the PIA is in progress in anticipation of operations. The planned date for PIA completion is November 30, 2007. The PIA will be posted on Research.gov when it is operational.	yes	This system is not yet operational, but the SORN is in progress in anticipation of operations. The SORN will be posted to the Federal Register on October 15, 2007.

Details for Text Options:

Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets Only)

In order to successfully address this area of the 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.

(1) Is this investment included in your agency’s target enterprise architecture? **yes**
 (a) If "no," please explain why?

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

a. If “yes,” provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency’s most recent annual EA Assessment.	NSF: GMLOB Research.gov; ED: G5 - Grants Management System Redesign
b. If “no,” please explain why?	

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

a. If “yes,” provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency’s most recent annual EA Assessment.

ACF: Grants Management; NSF: Grants Management

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

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEASRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA Service Component Reused (b)		Internal External Reuse (c)	Funding Percentage (d)
				Reused Service Component Name	Reused Service Component UPI		
ACF: Identification and Authentication	Defines the set of capabilities that support obtaining information about	Security Management	Identification and Authentication	Select...		Internal	10

	those parties attempting to log on to a system or application for security purposes and the validation of those users.						
ACF: Inbound Correspondence Management	Defines the set of capabilities that manage externally initiated communication between an organization and its stakeholders.	Routing and Scheduling	Inbound Correspondence Management	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Outbound Correspondence Management	Defines the set of capabilities that manage internally initiated communication between an organization and its stakeholders.	Routing and Scheduling	Outbound Correspondence Management	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Case Management	Defines the set of capabilities that manage the life cycle of a particular claim or investigation within an organization to include creating, routing, tracing, assignment and closing of a case as well as collaboration among case handlers.	Tracking and Workflow	Case Management	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Process Tracking	Defines the set of capabilities that allow the monitoring of activities within the business cycle.	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Activity-Based Management	Defines the set of capabilities that support a defined, specific set of finance-related tasks for a given objective.	Financial Management	Activity-Based Management	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Program / Project Management	Defines the set of capabilities that manage and control a particular effort of an organization.	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Alerts and Notifications .	Defines the set of capabilities that allow a customer to be contacted in relation to a subscription or service of interest	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications	Select...		Internal	10
ACF: Self-Service	Defines the set of capabilities that allow an organization's customers to sign up for a particular service at their own initiative.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	Select...		Internal	10

ACF: Contact and Profile Management	Defines the set of capabilities that provide a comprehensive view of all customer interactions, including calls, email, correspondence and meetings; also provides for the maintenance of a customer's account, business and personal information.	Customer Relationship Management	Contact and Profile Management	Select...		Internal	10
NSF: Application Status	Tool to facilitate timely communication between grantees and agencies by allowing them to check on the up-to-date status of proposals as agencies review and receive them	Data Management	Loading and Archiving	Select...		No Reuse	8
NSF: Content Management System	Tool that provides easier management of and greater access to multi-agency content, offers educational benefits, and increases awareness of government resources; including: a cross-agency grant policy library, children's page, and a tool to highlight research discoveries	Content Management	Content Publishing and Delivery	Select...		No Reuse	1
NSF: Federal Financial Report (FFR)	Service that simplifies financial reporting requirements by providing user-friendly financial management forms that are pre-populated and can be downloaded in MS Excel, allowing grantees to cut and paste financial information	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture	Select...		No Reuse	7
NSF: FFATA Award Search	Service that helps provide transparency and accountability for government funds, while increasing the ease with which the research community can find grants information by providing a single location for conducting	Search	Classification	Select...		No Reuse	5

	research grants searches						
NSF: Payment and Cash Requests	Service that serves as a one-stop payment and cash request tool, allowing grantees to request and receive payments for participating agencies in one location	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement	Select...		No Reuse	19
NSF: PDF File Conversion	Tool to easily convert file attachments to the format required for government acceptance	Document Management	Document Conversion	Select...		No Reuse	2
NSF: Research Performance Progress Reports	Service which provides an automated mechanism for submission and review of research project performance reports and creates standardization in government forms	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture	Select...		No Reuse	25
NSF: Research Portal	Portal that provides grantees with modern online capabilities for conducting grant business with federal research agencies	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Select...		No Reuse	27
ED: Hardware	Provide hardware to support G5 solution.	Asset / Materials Management	Computers / Automation Management	Select...		No Reuse	6
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution	Data Management	Data Exchange	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Independent Verification and Validation	Provides for independent assessment and risk mitigation of G5 development efforts	Development and Integration	Instrumentation and Testing	Select...		No Reuse	10
ED: Migration from GAPS	Provides for the data migration of existing GAPS data to the G5 solution.	Development and Integration	Legacy Integration	Select...		No Reuse	2
ED: Contractor Services .	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution	Financial Management	Credit / Charge	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Training	Provides for the training of Education internal and external users on the G5 solution.	Human Resources	Education / Training	Select...		No Reuse	5
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution	Reporting	Standardized / Canned	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Project Management Office (PMO)	Provide consultation services,	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management	Select...		No Reuse	8

	administrative support and program support for the G5 project.						
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Tutorials	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Reservations / Registration	Select...		No Reuse	3
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Scheduling	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Customer Initiated Assistance	Self-Service	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Customer Relationship Management	Customer / Account Management	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Customer Relationship Management	Surveys	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Document Management	Document Review and Approval	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Document Management	Library / Storage	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Knowledge Management	Information Retrieval	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Knowledge Management	Information Sharing	Select...		No Reuse	4
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture	Select...		No Reuse	3
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Systems Management	Case Management	Select...		No Reuse	3
ED: Contractor Services	Services for Design and Development of G5 solution.	Search	Query	Select...		No Reuse	2
ED: Security	Provides for ensuring data is stored and accessed in accordance with Federal guidelines.	Security Management	Access Control	Select...		No Reuse	1
ED: Security	Provides for ensuring data is stored and accessed in accordance with Federal guidelines.	Security Management	Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	Select...		No Reuse	1
ED: Security	Provides for ensuring data is stored and accessed in accordance with Federal guidelines.	Security Management	Cryptography	Select...		No Reuse	1
ED: Security	Provides for ensuring data is stored and accessed in accordance with Federal guidelines.	Security Management	Digital Signature Management	Select...		No Reuse	1
ED: Security	Provides for	Security	Identification and	Select...		No Reuse	1

	ensuring data is stored and accessed in accordance with Federal guidelines.	Management	Authentication				
ED: Software	Provides for ensuring data is stored and accessed in accordance with Federal guidelines.	Systems Management	License Management	Select...		No Reuse	1

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as “NEW”. A “NEW” component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. ‘Internal’ reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. ‘External’ reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in this column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

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

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	FEA Service Specification (b)
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	ACF: Apache
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	ACF: File Transfer Protocol (FTP)
Software Development	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	ACF: Java 2 Enterprise Edition
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	ACF: Java 2 Enterprise Edition
Software Development	Component	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side	ACF: Java Server Pages

	Framework		Display	
Information Retrieval	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	ACF: Lightweight Directory Access Protocol
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	ACF: Oracle
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	ACF: 36 CFR Part 1194
Email	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	ACF: Secure / Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions
Email	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	ACF: Secure / Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions
Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	ACF: Secure Sockets Layer
Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	ACF: Secure Sockets Layer
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	ACF: Security Assertion Markup Language
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	ACF: Simple Key Management Protocol
Library / Storage	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	ACF: Sybase
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	ACF: Sybase
Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	ACF: The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.1
Cryptography	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	ACF: The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.1
Identification and Authentication	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	ACF: Web Services Security (WS-Security)
Extraction and Transformation	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	ACF: XML Metadata Interchange
Data Classification	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	ACF: XML Schema
Data Exchange	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	ACF: TCP/IP
Knowledge Engineering	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	ACF: Microsoft Internet Information Services 6.0
Library / Storage	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	ACF: Microsoft SQL Server
Library / Storage	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	ACF: Microsoft SQL Server
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	ACF: Microsoft SQL Server
Access Control	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ACF: Oracle 9i Application Server
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ACF: Oracle 9i Application Server
Data Exchange	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ACF: Oracle 9i Application Server
Information Sharing	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ACF: Apache Tomcat
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ACF: Apache Tomcat
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	ACF: Mercury Interactive Test Director
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	ACF: SOAP
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	ACF: Oracle Developer Suite

Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	NSF: BEA Web Logic Application Server
Loading and Archiving	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Web Servers	NSF: BEA Portal Server, Apache Web Server
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	NSF: SUN JES Directory, MS Access, Oracle 10g
Loading and Archiving	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	NSF: SUN JES Directory, MS Access, Oracle 10g
Document Conversion	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	NSF: Microsoft Internet Explorer
Document Conversion	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	NSF: SUN JES Service Registry
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	NSF: BEA
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	NSF: BEA Web Logic
Document Conversion	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	NSF: Not Specified
Document Conversion	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	NSF: Apache, BEA
Document Conversion	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Document Conversion	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	NSF: BEA Web Logic Application Server
Document Conversion	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	NSF: TBD
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	NSF: Microsoft Internet Explorer
Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	NSF: SUN JES Service Registry
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	NSF: BEA
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	NSF: BEA Web Logic
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	NSF: SUN JES Directory, MS Access, Oracle 10g
Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	NSF: Not Specified
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	NSF: Apache, BEA
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	NSF: N/A
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	NSF: BEA Web Logic Application Server
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	NSF: TBD
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Discovery	NSF: JSP, HTML, CSS

Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	NSF: Microsoft Internet Explorer
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	NSF: SUN JES Service Registry
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	NSF: BEA
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	NSF: BEA Web Logic
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	NSF: SUN JES Directory, MS Access, Oracle 10g
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	NSF: Not Specified
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	NSF: Apache, BEA
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	NSF: N/A
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	NSF: BEA Web Logic Application Server
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	NSF: TBD
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Discovery	NSF: JSP, HTML, CSS
Payment / Settlement	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	NSF: Microsoft Internet Explorer
Payment / Settlement	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	NSF: SUN JES Service Registry
Payment / Settlement	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	NSF: BEA Portal Server
Payment / Settlement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Payment / Settlement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Channels	Portal Servers	NSF: BEA
Payment / Settlement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	NSF: Not Specified
Payment / Settlement	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	NSF: SUN JES Directory, MS Access, Oracle 10g
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	NSF: BEA Portal Server
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	NSF: SUN JES Identity Manager, SUN JES Access Manager, SAML, SSL
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	NSF: Apache, BEA
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT

Payment / Settlement	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	NSF: BEA Web Logic Application Server
Query	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	NSF: Microsoft Internet Explorer
Query	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Extranet	NSF: SUN JES Service Registry
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers	NSF: BEA
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	NSF: BEA Web Logic
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Query	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	NSF: Not Specified
Query	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	NSF: Apache, BEA
Query	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	NSF: Apache
Query	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Query	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Query	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	NSF: N/A
Query	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	NSF: BEA Web Logic Application Server
Query	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	NSF: TBD
Query	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	NSF: J2SE, J2EE, EJB, XML, XSLT
Query	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Discovery	NSF: JSP, HTML, CSS
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	ED: IBM WebSphere Process Server
Data Exchange	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	ED: Oracle 10g
Information Retrieval	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	ED: JDBC
Surveys	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	ED: COGNOS
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	ED: IBM WebSphere Portal
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	ED: IBM WebSphere Portal
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	ED: IBM WebSphere Portal
Customer / Account Management	Component Framework	Security	Certificates / Digital Signatures	ED: TBD
Case Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Collaboration / Communications	ED: TBD
Credit / Charge	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Other Electronic Channels	ED: TBD
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	ED: IBM WebSeal
Identification and Authentication	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	ED: eAuthentication - GSA
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Service Requirements	Hosting	ED: TBD
Customer / Account Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	ED: TBD
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	ED: IBM WebSphere

Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	ED: IBM WebSphere Enterprise Service Bus
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	ED: IBM Rational Data Architect
Data Exchange	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	ED: IBM Rational Data Abstract
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	ED: Oracle 10g
Library / Storage	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	ED: IBM DS4800
Case Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	ED: IBM WebSphere Application Server
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	ED: IBM HTTP Server
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	ED: FS Big-IP; ASA Firewall; PIX Firewall
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	ED: IBM P-Series
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	ED: WebSphere
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Modeling	ED: Rational Data Architect
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	ED: IBM Rational ClearCase
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	ED: IBM Rational Test Manager
Customer / Account Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	ED: IBM AIX

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

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

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

a. If "yes," please describe.

Yes, GMLOB will leverage the following existing components and/or applications: Grants.gov – GMLOB Consortia Leads will use Grants.gov FIND and APPLY capabilities; Integrated Acquisition/Business Partner Network (i.e. CCR) – This service will provide a repository for grantee organizations; E-Authentication – E-Authentication technology will be used to validate the identity of users of the Service Centers.

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

Part IV should be completed only for investments identified as an E-Gov initiative, a Line of Business (LoB), or a Multi-Agency Collaboration effort. The “Multi-Agency Collaboration” choice should be selected in response to Question 6 in Part 1, Section A above. Investments identified as “Multi-Agency Collaboration” will complete only Parts I and IV of the Exhibit 300.

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

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

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

Partner Agency	Joint Exhibit Approval Date
011	08/22/2007
021	08/22/2007
014	08/22/2007
012	08/22/2007
184	08/22/2007
474	08/23/2007
007	08/23/2007
018	08/24/2007
019	08/24/2007
015	08/24/2007
020	08/24/2007
026	08/24/2007
005	08/24/2007
417	08/24/2007
009	08/24/2007
393	08/28/2007
422	08/28/2007
485	08/28/2007
024	08/28/2007
006	08/28/2007
010	08/28/2007
025	08/28/2007

418	08/28/2007
028	08/28/2007
016	08/28/2007
029	08/28/2007

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

Capital Assets Within This Investment		
Partner Agency	Partner Agency Asset Title (Max 250 Characters)	Unique Project Identifier
018	G5 – Grants Management Re-Design	
009	ACF GrantSolutions.gov / Grants Administration Tracking Evaluation System (GATES) - Grants Center for Excellence	
422	GMLOB Research.gov	

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

Partner Funding Strategies (\$ Millions)					
Agency	Partner Exhibit 53 UPI	CY Contribution	CY Fee For Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee For Service
485	485-00-04-01-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
005	005-03-01-81-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.113	
006	006-03-01-50-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	

007	007-97-01-22-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
018	018-14-01-01-04-1300-24	\$0.198		\$0.198	
019	019-60-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
024	024-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
009	009-00-01-99-01-1300-24	\$0.198		\$0.198	
025	025-00-01-09-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.113	
010	010-00-01-07-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
011	011-03-01-10-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
012	012-25-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.113	
014	014-00-01-08-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
021	021-04-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.113		\$0.113	
015	015-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
020	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
474	474-00-04-01-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
393	393-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
026	026-00-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
417	417-00-04-01-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
418	418-00-01-02-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
422	422-00-01-04-01-1300-24	\$0.174		\$0.174	
028	028-00-01-99-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
016	016-00-01-02-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	
184	184-15-01-02-04-1300-24	\$0.059		\$0.059	
029	029-00-01-21-04-1300-24	\$0.028		\$0.028	

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

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

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

08/31/2005

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

c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

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

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

	grants awarded to all types of recipients.		
--	--	--	--

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

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

7. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Achieving GMLOB's objectives benefits the grant community and grant-making agencies by:

- Streamlining business and technical processes across government and reducing redundant requirements for applicants and agencies.
- Reducing administrative burden on grantees.
- Producing more efficient and effective agency execution of grants through uniform application of advanced electronic grants administration processes.
- Reducing government-wide reporting burden through standardization of electronic forms and forms management.
- Enabling interoperability between systems for the pre-award, award, and post award components of grant administration.
- Developing standardized nomenclature, harmonized processes, and identification of common interface touchpoints to reduce costs and effort associated with maintaining multiple interfaces, and interacting with diverse Federal and applicant systems.

8. What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars)?

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

Year	Savings		Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance
BY+4 and Beyond	\$1,120.250	\$342.995		

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

a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment?

Migration Investment

b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

Name Of Legacy System	Legacy UPI	Date Of Retirement
HHS (Indian Health Services Discretionary System): I-GEMS		12/31/2006
HHS AoA: Grants Management System (UPI: 009-75-04-00-02-1001-00-207-087)		12/31/2006
HHS: GMATS (CMS Discretionary System)		12/31/2006
HHS OPHS: eGrants		01/31/2007

HHS HRSA: Electronic Handbooks ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by HRSA (UPI: 009-15-04-00-02-1010-00-404-138)		12/31/2007
Treasury: Grants Management System		12/31/2009
ED: Grants Administration Payment System (GAPS)	018-14-01-01-01-1030-00	12/31/2010
EPA: Integrated Grants Management System	020-00-04-00-03-1306-24	07/31/2011
State: ABACUS	014-00-01-05-02-1534-00	12/31/2011
State: GFMIS		12/31/2011
State: Grants Database Management System		12/31/2011
State: Grants Module of Tracker		12/31/2011
State: OAISIS		12/31/2011
State: Solicitations and Proposals		12/31/2011
DOC: Economic Development Administration Grants System ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by DOC pending resolution of FFATA compliance issues.	006-06-04-00-01-6001-00	12/31/2010
DOC: National Institute of Standards and Technology Grants Management System ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by DOC pending resolution of FFATA compliance issues.	006-55-04-00-01-7080-00	12/31/2010
DOC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Grants Online ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD by DOC pending resolution of FFATA compliance issues.	006-48-04-00-01-3802-00	12/31/2010
DOT: FedStar (PHMSA) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-00-04-00-02-0000-00	12/31/2010

DOT: FMIS (FHWA) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-15-04-00-02-1120-00	12/31/2010
DOT: GIS (OST M-60) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-04-04-00-02-3010-00	12/31/2010
DOT: GNS (OST Gov Affairs) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-04-01-01-02-3120-00	12/31/2010
DOT: GTS (NHTSA) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-18-04-00-02-1020-00	12/31/2010
DOT: SOAR (FAA) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-12-04-00-02-3030-00	12/31/2010
DOT: TEAM (FTA) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY **	021-36-01-14-02-1010-00	12/31/2010
IMLS: Applications & Awards Management System (AAMS) *** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** Retirement TBD when IMLS commits to a consortia lead.	474-00-04-01-01-0004-00	12/31/2010
NEA: Grants Management System (GMS) *** Date is a placeholder ONLY ***		12/31/2010
NSF: FastLane: Proposal Status	422-00-04-00-01-0028-00	09/30/2011
USDA: Consolidated Natural Disaster Relief Programs #0102 ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** - will be rolled into USDA's implementation of GMLOB.	005-49-01-51-02-0102-00	12/31/2010
USDA: Cooperative Research, Education, and Extension Management System (C-REEMS) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** - will be rolled into USDA's implementation of GMLOB.	005-20-04-51-02-0004-00	12/31/2010
USDA: CSREES Electronic Grants ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** - will be rolled into USDA's implementation of GMLOB.	005-20-04-01-02-0001-00	12/31/2010
USDA: FAS Marketing Assistance and Market Infrastructure Development (MAMID) ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** - will be rolled into USDA's implementation of GMLOB.	005-68-01-51-02-0051-00	12/31/2010
USDA: FNS Advanced Planning Documents (APDs) -- IT Investment Grants to States ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** - will be rolled into USDA's implementation of GMLOB.	005-84-05-01-02-1011-00	12/31/2010
USDA: FNS Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) -- IT Investment Grants to States ** Date is a placeholder ONLY ** - will be rolled into USDA's implementation of GMLOB.	005-84-05-01-02-1070-00	12/31/2010

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

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

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

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan? yes

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

03/31/2006

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

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

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

a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

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

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

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

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

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

1. Are you using EVM to manage this investment? no

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

Select...

b. If "no," explain plans to implement EVM:

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

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

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

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

b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

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

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

a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline:

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of

Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active.

Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline										
Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Actual % Comp	Agency
	Planned Completion Date	Total Cost (\$M) Estimated	Completion Date - Planned	Completion Date - Actual	Total Cost (\$M) Planned	Total Cost (\$M) Actual	Sched Var (# days)	Cost Var (\$M)		
GATES GCoE Expansion-FY 2005	11/30/06	\$0.770	11/30/06	11/30/06	\$0.770	\$0.780	0	\$0.010	100.0	009
GATES Operations and Maintenance__Fixed Price-FY 2005	8/18/06	\$3.580	8/28/06	8/18/06	\$3.580	\$3.580	0	\$0.000	100.0	009
Entitlement Grants Process Module (TBD)-FY 2007	8/18/07	\$1.000	8/18/07		\$1.000	\$0.807		-\$0.193	81.0	009
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2006	8/18/07	\$3.580	8/18/07		\$3.580	\$3.098		-\$0.482	86.54	009
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2007	8/18/08	\$3.590	8/18/08		\$3.590				0.0	422
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2008	8/18/09	\$3.664	8/18/09		\$3.664				0.0	009
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2009	8/18/10	\$3.660	8/18/10		\$3.660				0.0	009
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2010	8/18/11	\$3.710	8/18/11		\$3.710				0.0	009
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2011	8/18/12	\$3.770	8/18/12		\$3.770				0.0	009
Operations and Maintenance-- FY 2012	8/18/13	\$3.880	8/18/13		\$3.880				0.0	009
Develop and pilot service offerings	9/30/07	\$7.718	9/30/07	9/17/07	\$7.718	\$7.700	13	-\$0.018	100.0	422
Develop and pilot service offerings	9/30/08	\$7.006	9/30/08		\$7.006				0.0	422
Deploy service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/08	\$7.224	9/30/08		\$7.224				0.0	422
Operate and maintain service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/08	\$0.675	9/30/08		\$0.675				0.0	422
Deploy service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/09	\$10.421	9/30/09		\$10.421				0.0	422
Operate and maintain service offerings in a shared services environment	9/30/09	\$4.246	9/30/09		\$4.246				0.0	422

FY 11 Hardware										
Software										
FY 07 Software	9/30/08	\$0.200	9/30/08		\$0.200				0.0	018
FY 08 Software	9/30/08	\$0.200	9/30/08		\$0.200				0.0	018
FY 09 Software	9/30/09	\$0.050	9/30/09		\$0.050				0.0	018
FY 10 Software										
FY 11 Software										
Training										
FY 08 Training Support	9/30/08	\$0.300	9/30/08		\$0.300				0.0	018
FY 09 Training Support	9/30/09	\$0.500	9/30/09		\$0.500				0.0	018
FY 10 Training Support										
FY 11 Training Supp										
Security	9/30/09	\$0.200	9/30/09		\$0.200				0.0	018
FY 08 Security	9/30/08	\$0.100	9/30/08		\$0.100				0.0	018
FY 09 Security	9/30/09	\$0.100	9/30/09		\$0.100				0.0	018
Project Management Office	9/30/08	\$1.050	9/30/08		\$1.050	\$0.222	0	-\$0.828	20.48	018
PMO FY 06	9/30/06	\$0.500	9/30/06		\$0.500	\$0.222	0	-\$0.278	43.0	018
PMO FY 07	9/30/07	\$0.500	9/30/07		\$0.500				0.0	018
PMO FY 08	9/30/08	\$0.050	9/30/08		\$0.050				0.0	018
Customer Service Support										
FY 09 Customer Ser Support										
FY 10 Customer Serv Support										
FY 11 Customer Service Support										
FY2005 GML0B PMO Support	9/30/05	\$0.898	9/30/05	9/30/05	\$0.798	\$0.223			100.0	422
FY2006 GML0B PMO Support	9/30/06	\$0.780	9/30/06	9/30/06	\$0.708	\$0.721			100.0	422
FY2007 GML0B PMO Support	9/30/07	\$1.504	9/30/07		\$1.444	\$0.428			92.0	422
FY2008 GML0B PMO Support	9/30/08	\$1.840	9/30/08		\$1.840				0.0	422
FY2009 GML0B PMO Support	9/30/09	\$1.840	9/30/09		\$1.840				0.0	422